



Contract No. 028545-2

QUING

Quality in Gender+ Equality Policies

Integrated Project

Priority 7 – Citizens and Governance in a knowledge based Society
7.1.2. Gender and Citizenship in a Multicultural Context

Deliverable No. 47/49: Series of explanatory country and thematic comparative reports in WHY

Paper Title: Towards a processual intersectional policy analysis

Author: Doris Urbanek

Due date of deliverable: 30.06.2009
Actual submission date: 29.06.2009

Start date of project: 01.10.2006

Duration: 54 Months

IWM Vienna

Project co-funded by the European Commission within the Sixth Framework Programme (2002-2006)		
Dissemination Level		
PU	Public	
PP	Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Services)	
RE	Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the Commission	X
CO	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	

ABSTRACT

Currently, attempts to operationalise intersectionality for an empirical analysis are high on the international feminist research agenda. Partly, this interdisciplinary debate seems to construct a methodological dilemma: Should an intersectional analysis focus on the micro or the macro level? On subjectivity or objectivity? On identities or overarching societal constellations? Even though some scholars consider locational and more structural approaches as complementary, research seems to be confined to adding rather than synthesising approaches.

This article argues that an intersectional policy analysis does not need to choose between one and the other position. On the contrary, it is this dichotomous way of thinking that reduces the possibilities an intersectional analysis, especially policy analysis, has to offer. Drawing from the data gathered in the frame of the project QUING (Quality in Gender+ Equality Policies), this article shows that 'structural' and 'locational' dimensions actually need to be analysed together. What the empirical material tells us to do is to look at policy processes that create intersectional subject positions. At the same time, these different subject positions reflect on the wider practice of political intersectionality in gender equality policies. The first aim is thus the conceptualisation of a *processual discursive analysis* which is able to pin down intersectional dimensions in a certain policy field.

In a second step and as part of the such an analysis, there is need to develop terminologies and categories describing whether and how many intersections are present in policies. Based on the QUING Country Study Germany (1995-2007), this article presents a preliminary *typology of (intersectional) policy strategies*. Identified strategies such as equality policy making, gender and intersectionality mainstreaming indicate some features of the practice of political intersectionality. The article will also reflect on what these strategies mean for the quality of gender equality and diversity policies.

Keywords: concept of intersectionality, policy analysis, gender equality policies, Germany

Intersectionality plays a mediating role between
the yin of conspiracy-theory levels of structural research and
the yang of pathologizing individual-level microanalysis.
Ange-Marie Hancock

INTRODUCTION

The concern with intersectionality has a long history in feminist activism and research, while not calling it as such. Even before notions of 'multiple discrimination' reached the political agenda, feminist activism and scholarship had already dealt with social divisions such as 'race', ethnicity, class, disability or sexuality intersecting with gender. Currently, the topic of multiple inequalities and diversity policies stir up traditional fields of (gender) equality policies, not at least influenced by EU Anti-Discrimination Directives. The term 'political intersectionality' is now increasingly established in feminist research and expresses the interest in how social categories are evoked and re/produced by the policy process (Crenshaw 1991).

Due to the popularity the concept of intersectionality faces in current international scholarship (Davis 2008), methodological questions of how to conduct intersectional analyses are also hotly debated. At an international conference at the Goethe-University Frankfurt¹ I had the

¹ Celebrating Intersectionality. Debates on a Multi-faceted Concept. International Conference at the Goethe-University Frankfurt am Main, 22 – 23 January 2009. The approaches described in my paper only capture some parts of the methodological debate and is not representative for the whole of the Conference. See <http://www.cgc.uni-frankfurt.de/intersectionality/>

impression that some feminist researchers were constructing a methodological dilemma. Scholars across disciplines discussed whether an intersectional analysis should aim at the micro or the macro level, should explore identities at intersections or larger societal constellations. Despite the optimistic statement by Ange-Marie Hancock (2007) that intersectionality would bridge locational and structural approaches, it seems that intersectional research has not quite lived up to its promises. This debate is mostly, but not only, led by sociologists with different research interests. While some emphasise empirical work that seems to imply a locational, also called intracategorical approach, others stress the importance of social theory that addresses structural dimensions by means of an intercategorical approach. Even though some theorists consider locational and structural approaches as complementary, research seems to be confined to adding rather than synthesising approaches.

From the perspective of a political scientist these debates are interesting in several respects. Not only these discussions, but already the studying of interdisciplinary literature on intersectionality raised the question why it is mostly sociologists² discussing theoretical and methodological concerns and why political scientists are so silent on this issue. Is this due to different research interests? Currently, political science seems busy to explore political processes dealing with multiple inequalities such as merged anti-discrimination legislation and equality bodies, but it is far less concentrated on the question of how to operationalise intersectionality for a policy analysis. While there is a growing body of literature on 'institutionalising intersectionality', the development of an intersectional policy analysis is still under-theorised. It would be exceeding the scope of this paper to analyse why this is the case, but it might be interesting to explore whether there are useful sociological contributions a methodologically interested political scientist can draw from.

While the debate about locational and structural approaches might make sense for a sociological audience³, neither approach seems to be exclusively suitable for conceptualising a policy analysis. Hence, the research question is which parts of either approaches could inform the development of a discursive policy analysis with an intersectional focus.

My interest in making a contribution to intersectional methodologies was not only sparked by the identified methodological lack in political science, but also triggered by my work with the empirical material gathered in the frame of the QUING project (Quality in gender+ equality policies⁴). The analysed (policy) texts seemed to tell something about the subject positions of target groups addressed by certain policies as well as to give a bigger picture about how political intersectionality was being practised in the field of gender equality and diversity policies in Germany. The methodological conceptualisations developed in the course of this article are thus theoretically *and* empirically informed.

This first part of the paper will be structured as following: Some elements of locational and structural approaches to intersectionality are outlined, followed by a discussion of the different logics of intersectionality which underpin them. I argue that the point of departure of structural approaches is problematic, at least for conceptualising empirical research. Moving on to the conceptualisation of an *intersectional policy analysis*, I will spell out which input can be taken from locational and structural approaches to then identify three essential pillars which will make up a processual intersectional policy analysis. Inspired by recent

² Clearly, other disciplines such as anthropology also engage in theoretical and methodological discussions. See the interdisciplinary conference 'Intersectionality – Theorien, Methoden, Empirien' at the Institute of European Ethnology, University of Vienna, 18 – 20 June 2009. See <http://euroethnologie.univie.ac.at>.

³ Sociologists such as West/Fenstermaker (1995:24) also criticise the strict distinction between micro and macro level research.

⁴ QUING – Quality in Gender+ Equality Policies (2006 - 2011, funded by the 6th EU Framework Programme) is one of the first comparative research projects that aims at applying 'intersectionality' in its analytical tools. The author of this paper was responsible for conducting the QUING Country Study on Germany. For further information on this European comparative project, coordinated by the Institute for Human Sciences (IWM), Vienna, please visit <http://www.quing.eu>.

publications of Ferree (2009) and Lenz (2007), it is the pillars of *sites, processes and subject positions* that such an analysis is based on.

The research question of the second part of the paper was again born out of the empirical work with the QUING Country Study Germany and can be considered a minor part of the above conceptualised policy analysis: How can we describe whether and how (many) intersections are applied in policy debates? What kind of policy strategies regarding 'intersectional target groups' can be classified? A preliminary *typology of (intersectional) policy strategies* will introduce necessary terminologies and categorisations. While identified policy strategies such as gender and intersectionality mainstreaming or equality policy making only give limited information about how subject positions are constructed and about the content of (intersectional) discourses, the typology still gives an overview of which and how many intersections are considered in the policy debates.

One of the major interests of the QUING project is to assess the quality of gender equality policies. If we depart from the understanding that quality in gender equality policies is not only a matter of numerical, but also substantive 'intersectional representation'⁵, looking at whether intersections 'are there at all' seems to be a very weak indicator. However, as indicators for the quality of gender equality policies still need to be developed, this article is confined to some preliminary statements about the application of intersections.

The second part of the paper asking *if* intersections are present in policy debates differs from the first part whose aim is the development of an analysis that should spell out *how* intersections are there and *which kind of intersectional subject positions* are created by dominant policy discourses. As a whole, the paper will contribute to address one of the methodological research gaps in current political science literature on intersectionality.

LOCATIONAL vs. STRUCTURAL INTERSECTIONALITY

Locational and structural approaches to intersectionality are often said to be only suitable for certain kinds of analysis. The micro-level or locational approach is usually characterised as analysing a group at one certain intersection in society. It is also called intracategorical (McCall 2005)⁶ and is closely connected to an intersectionality-only understanding (see Weldon 2008 below). This is said to be the starting point of the concept of intersectionality, when African-American feminists showed that they were subject to intersectional invisibility and thus sidelined by both, anti-racist and feminist movements as well as cut off from seeking legal remedy. This intracategorical approach is criticised for leading into a fragmentation into singular experiences of oppression (Squires 2008b) and/or to a hierarchy of oppression in which groups at intersections compete for rights and resources. On a more positive note, this approach is understood to give voice to previously unheard groups (Ferree 2009). Methodologically, there seems to be an assumption that it serves to talk about subjectivity and identities (Degele/Winter 2007⁷, Knapp 2005, Knapp 2008) and thus, is (only) a suitable approach for ethnography and sociological empirical case studies (McCall 2005).

⁵ I borrow this term from the study of women's political participation, but use it exclusively on the discursive level.

⁶ McCall (2005) distinguished three methodological approaches to intersectional complexity: anti-, intra-, and intercategorical.

⁷ One exemption is the development of a multi-level analysis (Degele/Winker 2007) which aims at analysing the level of identity, representation and structure. However, I do not draw from their conceptualisation as this rather static model seems to be more apt for sociological empirical analysis than for a (discursive) policy analysis.

Table 1: The locational/structural distinction

Locational	Structural
Intracategorical	Intercategorical
Intersectionality-only	Intersectionality-plus
Micro level case studies, identity	Macro level analyses, institutions and structures
Subject/group at intersection	Axes of inequality, logics of oppression

The intracategorical approach has been increasingly criticised by theorists who work on the macro-level and structural analyses (e.g. Weldon 2008). They are striving for an intercategorical approach that would seek to understand the relationship between axes of inequality and thus, reflect on social structures (Klinger 2003, Knapp 2005, Klinger 2007, Knapp 2008, Ross 2008, Degele/Winker 2007). In this way of thinking, intersectionality is in need for social theory and vice versa (Knapp 2008). Theorists depart from the understanding that 'it makes no sense to hint at the superimposing and intersecting aspects of class, "race" and gender in the worlds of individual experience without being able to specify how and by what means class, "race" and gender are constituted as social categories' (Klinger 2003, cited in Knapp 2005). This approach is closely connected to an intersectionality-plus understanding (see Weldon 2008 below).

Logics of intersectionality

Locational and structural approaches have different underlying rationales as to how they understand intersectionality; these different understandings have been called intersectionality-only and intersectionality-plus by Laurel S. Weldon (2008). According to her differentiation, the *intersectionality-only* point of departure is that there is no logic apart from intersectionality, thus there is no real essence of structures or axes of inequality. It rejects analytical separability of social categories. Weldon claims that if one applied this perspective consequently, it was not possible to say anything about social structures because of its fragmentary logic. This statement will be questioned below.

From the *intersectionality-plus* point of view, which Weldon advocates, there are structures or strands of inequality that have their autonomous logic (additive dimension) and intersect at some points (intersectional dimension). Also other scholars argue that different forms of oppression should not be conflated, as e.g. racial domination is not a product of gender oppression. Systems of oppression should be dealt with separately in a first step (analytical separability); in a second step, their intersectional dimensions should be explored (e.g. by identifying points at intersections that are analysed in detail). This is what Risman (2004) calls the both/and strategy. Summarising, the work of some structural scholars seems to be based on the assumption that one could find some kind of rules or parameters of how inequality strands interact on a more general, abstract level. They deal with the systems of oppression such as racism, sexism and capitalism, or also called imperialism, patriarchy and capitalism (e.g. Klinger 2003). Whereas structuralists acknowledge that these structures might mutually inform or constitute each other, it is often not elaborated how.

For me, as an advocate of the intersectionality-only way of thinking, the abstraction of intersectional social positionings into structures of inequality is problematic. The analytical achievements gained by separate inequality structures are not obvious, at least not for conceptualising empirical research. It seems that the analytical benefits of generalising statements on the gender regime, the migration regime and the like are limited. Let me clarify this by a number of examples: Thinking abstractly about the privileges/disadvantages of age or ageing ignores how persons of different gender, ethnic origin and social status experience age and ageing differently and are exposed to different societal problems. The same goes for immigrants whose class and/or marital status mitigate some situations and sexual orientation exacerbates others. Also, the gender dimension of let's say social benefits usually varies

according to marital status, citizenship status, probably also sexual orientation. Finally, what would be the gains of saying something 'general' about the gender regime such when it departs from the assumption of an unmarked (married, heterosexual) woman and does not talk about the positioning of lesbian women who might be excluded e.g. from reproductive rights?

Being trained in gender and development and aware of the context and time specific configurations of social relations, I am hesitant towards a high level of abstraction and generalisation. For me, the question of whether the abstraction into structures of inequality is helping us to conceptualise dynamics of privilege and disadvantage given the fact that these axes have no correspondence in reality is open for scrutiny. As Yuval-Davis (2006) states, there is no such thing as pure 'Blackness' or 'womanhood'. Racism is always gendered just like sexism has ethnic, class and many more dimensions. Basically, I argue that what gets sidelined by analytical separability of social structures is the very starting point of intersectionality: That identity or experience (whether individual or group) cannot be reduced to class, gender or ethnicity or cannot be thought of separately. This argument of mine is not new; it has already been subject to criticisms by other intersectionality-only scholars (see volume edited by Walgenbach 2007) who suggest conceptualising gender (and probably all other categories) as an interdependent category. They do so in order to avoid the assumption that there is a genuine essence of inequality strands that intersect at some cross-roads.

Does the rejection of separate axes of inequality imply that we, as intersectionality-only scholars, cannot say anything about structures, about institutions and logics of privilege and domination? Are we – as the dichotomy insinuates - confined to an intracategorical approach that does explore only the micro-level of locational intersectionality? I do not deny societal structures and I do not want to dismiss a structural analysis altogether. Clearly, I reject parallel structures of gender, 'race' and class. But who defined that social structures needed to be identified exclusively along the lines of separate inequality strands?

As has become clear, I call a certain analytical use of abstract social categories like gender, class, ethnicity and the famous etc. into question. Nevertheless, the abstraction into social categories might be valid in a constructivist use which explores the symbolic order. As Ferree (2009) argues the abstraction into categories might be an imperfect, but useful tool to describe processes. She does so by exploring intersectional discourses that have been institutionalised in laws and practices. In this case, Ferree uses the abstract categories of 'race', class and gender to show what discursive frameworks are available when addressing gender equality. This undertaking has a rather constructionist than structural focus (Prins 2006⁸).

Yet, there is another reason why I think that research should apply the terms of strands, structures or axes of inequality only very carefully. I fear that by doing so research is continuously reproducing a separate understanding of inequalities which intersectionality originally sought to deconstruct. How are we as researchers going to make policy makers aware of the problem of intersectional discrimination or privilege when experts themselves fall into the trap of talking about separate inequalities without referring to their intersectional character?

TOWARDS A PROCESSUAL INTERSECTIONAL POLICY ANALYSIS

Coming back to more methodological questions, this article argues to take the best insights of both locational and structural approaches in order to conceptualise an intersectional policy analysis.

⁸ Sceptical about a strong systemic approach with static conceptualisations of categories and systems of oppression, Prins (2006) promotes a more dynamic and relational model of power and agency.

What input can be taken from locational intersectionality? An intracategorical or even pre-categorical approach is commonly used to study subjects or groups at one intersection. It is deemed fruitful in order to understand what is going on at the micro-level, to understand how categories are experienced and enacted at the individual level and to learn which social categories are deemed important. It is, as we have seen above, criticised for neglecting social structures and institutions. Contrary, one could argue that structures and processes show also in a case study. One could furthermore argue that the logics of the intracategorical approach do not demand that ONLY ONE group is to be studied, even though this seems to be a commonly shared assumption (e.g. Weldon 2008). There is, at least for me, no reason why a study departing from an intracategorical understanding should not investigate more subject positions at various intersections and thus paint a bigger picture.

What input can be taken from structural intersectionality? Usually, the intercategorical approach (Mc Call 2005) is referred to for a structural analysis of inequalities. However, what McCall envisaged was exploring the relationship between groups at certain points of intersection. She did so by accounting for wage inequality in differently industrialised areas between groups intersected along the lines of 'race', gender, class/education. She sought to conceptualise a quantitative intersectional analysis; what she did not do in her article is to look for a grand theory of structures of inequality. While I do not aim at conceptualising a quantitative analysis, I still take the focus on groups at intersections – or in my terminology 'subject positions at intersections' - as an important input. Furthermore, it is the relation between subject positions which is of interest here because it will enable to paint a bigger picture.

I claim that the emphasis should lie on intersectional subjects/subject positions instead of categories or inequality axes in order not to reproduce the separate understanding of inequalities that also Hancock (2007) criticised in the unitary and multiple approaches. An analysis has to keep in mind that structures materialise in concrete social positionings of subjects (see also Lenz 2007, Walgenbach 2007). This is the more important as the 'Rückkoppelung' to subjects embodying and experiencing intersecting social categories is an important corrective for theories that sometimes threaten to 'go theoretical' without considering 'the practical'. Eventually, an analysis will always need to explain how structures play out for subjects at intersections.

Consequently, my model of analysis is based on three pillars: The focus is no longer inequality structures or inequality strands/axes, but on *sites, processes and subject positions*. These pillars are inspired by recent work of Myra Marx Ferree (2009) and Ilse Lenz (2007).

When developing her dynamic and discursive-institutional account of intersectionality, Ferree (2009) stresses that it has advantages vis-à-vis the locational approach. While the locational applies a matrix of known social categories⁹ and points of intersection, her dynamic approach begins from each context (*site*) and explores the forces operating within to produce inequalities. The focus is on interactions between *processes* that produce configurations or constellations of intersectional social relations. According to Ferree, this approach widens the field and allows for multiple level of analysis. It also draws unmarked groups, e.g. privileged groups, into the picture. At the same time, it problematises group formation and moves to processes and *sites* (e.g. the nation state). Given this approach does not longer depart from fixed categories and groups, but from certain sites and problems, it is also called 'problem definition processes'.

Also Ilse Lenz (2007) works with the notion of configurations, understood as the intersectional structuring of social relations. What she seeks to develop is a method by which structures and practices producing patterns of inequality can be explored. Based on a

⁹ As Andrea Bührmann (2008) has shown, the locational approach can also work with a 'pre-categorical' approach which has no pre-made matrix of known dimensions, but where the informants/interviewed raise social categories important to their understanding of themselves.

constructivist perspective, she does not start by asking 'how the social power axes such as gender, migration and class structure these practices, but rather the other way round, I shall *first* look at the social structures and *practices of doing intersectionality* or equalisation (2007:106)'. Such a dynamic approach departs from the understanding that we first need to look at forces and practices operating within a certain field, to then observe patterns and structures. As Ferree argues: 'This is what Prins (2006) defines as a "constructionist" rather than a "structural" understanding of intersectionality, but I prefer to call it "interactive" intersectionality to emphasize its "structuration" as an on-going multi-level process from which agency cannot be erased (2009: 2)'.

My third focus of *subjects/subject positions* seems to contradict Ferree's emphasis on processes and sites. This needs some clarification: I do agree with Ferree and Lenz on the starting point that we should look at sites and the processes. However, I argue that we need to explore whom these processes do effect and how. In this view, the subject is the missing link between locational and structural approaches. While the locational approach seems to know only the subject, structurally oriented approaches seem to lose it entirely. A synthesised approach departs from sites and processes and analyses how they construct subject positions in an intersectional way.

Transposing these theoretical considerations into an empirical analysis means: Looking at the policy field of gender equality and diversity policies (site); looking at how policies do intersectionality and what subject positions are constructed. In a further step, the relation between various intersectional subject positions can be explored. It is the aim of my dissertation thesis to conduct such an analysis for gender equality policies in Germany (1995-2007).

The second part of the paper will confine itself to outline some results of a preliminary classification of intersectional policy strategies. While these identified strategies do not tell us *how* intersectional subject positions are constructed in the policy process, they nevertheless aim at classifying *whether* intersections are addressed at all in policy debates.

A PRELIMINARY TYPOLOGY OF (INTERSECTIONAL) POLICY STRATEGIES

In order to talk about strategies at the policy level, categorisations and terminologies still have to be developed. The next section will thus outline a typology of (intersectional) policy strategies based on the empirical data gathered for the German Country Study in the frame of the QUING project (Quality in Gender+ Equality Policies). The criteria used to build the typology were developed out of 90 analysed texts around selected policy debates. Policy fields were general gender equality policies, policies of non-employment, intimate citizenship and gender-based violence¹⁰.

The first criterion is the distinction between issue based and target group policy. The difference lies in the fixed or open range of target groups. An issue based policy (such as tax policy or care policy) might have provisions for various target groups, but usually they are not predefined. Contrary, an explicit target group policy gives a predetermined list of whom the policy is going to address, be it gender equality policy or any other equality policy (people with disabilities, ethnic minorities or immigrants etc.). The second criterion is how many different target groups of a policy are mentioned; the third criterion is whether they are 'intersectional', like young migrant women or not (just 'women'). These distinctions build a matrix of seven strategies (see Table 3).

Table 2: Typology of (intersectional) policy strategies

	No target group	1 target group	More than 3 target groups
Issue based policies			
Intersectionality yes			Intersectionality mainstreaming
Intersectionality no	Intersection. blindness	Gender mainstreaming	Equality mainstreaming
Target group policies			
Intersectionality yes		Intersectional in/equality policy	(Intersectionality mainstreaming)
Intersectionality no		Equality policy (with some intersectional dimensions)	Multiple equality policy

Basically, it is an open empirical question which (intersectional) target groups are evoked in policy debates. However, as it is the aim to develop a feminist intersectional analysis, gender at intersections is a prerequisite for encompassing strategies such as intersectional equality policy and intersectionality mainstreaming. Other strategies such as equality policy, multiple

¹⁰

Analysed Policy Debates in Germany:

General Gender Equality Policies (GEN): General Equal Treatment Act (2006) (GETA); Anti-Discrimination Office (2006) (ADO).

Non-Employment Policies (NON EMP): Federal Equal Treatment Act (2001) (FETA) – public employment and Voluntary Agreement of the Private Sector (2001); Parental Benefit Act (2006) - child care leave and benefit; Income Tax (2007) – spouse/family splitting models; Care Time Act (2007) – elderly and sick care.

Intimate Citizenship Policies (INT CIT): Life Partnership Act (2001) – same sex partnership; Life Partnership Revision Act (2004) – same sex partnership/stepchild adoption; New Immigration Act (2007) – family reunion; Contestation of Paternity Acknowledgement Act (2007).

Gender-Based Violence Policies (GBV): Marital Rape (1997/8); Violence Protection Act (2001) – domestic violence; Forced Marriage (2005-2007).

For each policy, four types of texts were analysed: a law, a governmental policy plan, a parliamentary debate (different party voices) and a civil society text (CSO). This made a sample of 90 analysed texts.

equality policy or equality mainstreaming might have some gender dimensions, but not necessarily. Intersectionality blind strategies assume a neutral subject, ignoring all social dimensions.

Clearly, these types of policy strategies on their own do not say much about the content of policies. However, there is a *qualitative notion* attached to these strategies. The most encompassing strategy in the field of issue based policies is intersectionality mainstreaming. It signifies that at least three intersectional target groups (incl. gender) are addressed in a policy debate. This strategy is followed by equality mainstreaming, a strategy which also addresses manifold target groups; however, these are usually segregated along the lines of inequalities such as gender, class or marital status and *lack* intersectional dimensions. Yet, this strategy is also already relatively encompassing as it considers at least three different target groups. The strategy of gender mainstreaming means that at least one target group (gender) is considered throughout an issue based policy. The strategy of intersectionality blindness assumes a neutral subject, bare of any intersectional dimensions. This is the weakest and most biased strategy.

Target group policies follow a different logic than issue based policies, because the target groups that are going to be addressed are predefined. This is the case for 'classical' gender equality (women/men), same sex partnership (persons with same sex oriented sexuality) or disability policies (persons with disabilities). These policies figure under equality policy as they depart from one separate inequality. Sometimes, we find intersectional dimensions within these equality policies; however, the overall focus is on one category only. The strategy of intersectional in/equality policy defines an intersectional target group such as migrant, unmarried mothers and designs a special policy. This policy can be used for inclusionary and exclusionary ends, to exclude or include a certain target group from/into rights. It differs from intersectionality mainstreaming in the range of scope; intersectionality mainstreaming comprises of at least three intersectional target groups. Multiple equality policies are similar to the strategy of equality mainstreaming, but they define multiple target groups head-on. These target groups are segregated along the lines of separate inequalities and are lack intersectional dimensions.

Building and working with the typology has proved challenging. Sometimes it is not so clear whether a policy is to be classified under issue based or target group policy. Also, the line between equality policy and intersectional equality policy is hard to draw: Is a policy that mentions some intersectional dimensions still an equality policy or is it already an intersectional equality policy? These questions are open for discussion. Also the researcher's bias has to be acknowledged. It seems that what I perceived as the 'norm' remained an unmarked category (like heterosexual, married women) and the strategy identified was a (gender) equality policy. Only one category (gender), and not sexuality and marital status, was used for classification. But analytically, talking about women always means *intersectional women*. However, during the classification process, the bias kept emerging: When the debates were about migrant women, the classification under intersectional equality policy seemed evident. Contrary, I found myself classifying debates on German married women (e.g. tax policy) under equality policy (only gender). Also the debate on marital rape was categorised under (gender) equality policy. Analytically however, it is an example for intersectionality as it considers different social norms and unequal legal protection for married, heterosexual and non-married women. Trying to mitigate the researcher's bias complicated things even further: When listing all applied inequalities in an analytically correct way, every policy suddenly seemed to be intersectional. Hence, it was challenging to find a way between analytical accuracy and meaningful classification of policy strategies.

Policy strategies in German gender equality policy debates (1995-2007)

In the empirical material, the strategy of *intersectionality blindness* is applied in the case of the Care Time Act (2007). This means that in this policy debate a neutral family carer is

assumed to perform or at least organise home care for a sick or elderly relative; while there is a security to return to one's workplace after six months, this period of care work remains unpaid. Clearly, by not identifying who the main family carers are, the (intersectional) gender dimensions are faded out. While women perform a high share of private and professional home care, their situation on the labour market and their working conditions are not reflected. The underlying rationale of the Care Time (Act) that officially serves as a time to organise home care nevertheless is that care should be performed privately, by family carers. The respective CSO text, classified under the strategy of *gender mainstreaming*, outlines how a care system should be set up in a gender equal way, where professional care is provided for.

Examples of *equality mainstreaming* are often applied in non-employment debates. Texts on the Parental Benefit Act (2006) and the CSO text on income tax (2007) bring a multitude of target groups into the picture. Despite the fact that the target groups are not 'intersectional', they still represent various inequality strands and thus, contribute to the visibility and diversification of target groups. Clearly, texts differ on what needs (problems) and what solutions (policy actions) are identified, but at least more target groups than just heterosexual, middle class parents are considered. The Parental Benefit Act, which for the first time sets up a wage substituting benefit, rules different measures for various target groups: poor parents, disabled or sick parents, foreigners, parents with more children, life partners and single parents (however, neglects gender dimensions). Also the CSO text on income tax acknowledges many living arrangements and family forms. Identified target groups are high and low income families, single parents, life partners, non-married parents, bi-national families and migrant families. The 'spouse and family splitting model'¹¹ of income tax that tend to push women out of the labour market are rejected due to their gender unequal effects.

The qualitatively high strategy of *intersectionality mainstreaming* can be observed in policies on non-employment, but also gender-based violence. In some texts around the Parental Benefit Act different target groups such as young working women, women who lack social security in old age (but also some de-gendered groups such as families with more children and unemployed parents) are considered. It is also argued that especially low income parents and thereof single mothers earning little and single earners will benefit from the act. Thus, there is an intersectional awareness visible.

Also the CSO text of 2006 which deals with equal treatment in private sector employment (FETA) acknowledges differently situated women and men on the labour market. It demands the promotion of different groups of women and reconciliation measures for both genders. Besides, texts on violence such as the National Action Plan to Combat Violence against Women (1999) and the CSO text (2003) already display a wide range of women at intersections who are and should be addressed by anti-violence measures. Examples are elderly women, women with disabilities, foreign girls and women, children and women in poor living conditions. Texts who apply this strategy are usually encompassing not only with regards to the target groups, but also the policy actions to be taken. It is thus the most substantive and far-reaching strategy that was identified in the sample of texts. The difference to an intersectional equality policy - which picks out one or two intersectional target groups - is the range in scope which is wider in the strategy of intersectionality mainstreaming.

A weak example of intersectionality mainstreaming is found in the texts on the General Equal Treatment Act¹² (GETA) and the Anti-Discrimination Office (ADO, equality body) that talk about multiple discrimination - although without further specifying it.

¹¹ The spouse splitting model is based on the male-breadwinner model and allows married partners to declare taxes together. The benefits are the highest if there is one high income (mostly male full-time work) and one low income (mostly female part-time work), because the average income tax will be lowered.

¹² The GETA transposed four EU Anti-Discrimination Directives into national legislation such as Directive on Race/Ethnicity 2000/43/EC, The Framework Directive 2000/78/EC, The Amendment of the Gender Equality Directive 2002/73/EC and the Directive on Access to Goods and Services 2004/113/EC.

Table 3: Policy strategies in Germany (1995-2007)

(Intersectional) Policy strategies	Policy debates	QUING policy field
Issue based policies		
Intersectionality blindness	Care (2007)	NON EMP
Gender mainstreaming	Care (2007)	NON EMP
Equality mainstreaming	Tax/CSO (2007) Parental Benefit (2006)	NON EMP NON EMP
Intersectionality mainstreaming	Parental Benefit (2006) FETA/CSO (2006) Violence Protect.(1999/ CSO 2003) GETA/ADO (2006)	NON EMP NON EMP GBV GEN
Target group policies		
Equality policy (+intersec)	FETA (2001) Life Partner (2001/04) Marital Rape (1997/98) Violence Protection Act (2001)	NON EMP INT CIT GBV GBV
Intersectional in/equality policy	Tax (2007) New Immigration Act (2007) Paternity Acknowledgement (2007) Forced Marriage (2005 - 2007)	NON EMP INT CIT INT CIT GBV
Multiple equality policy	GETA (2006) ADO (2006)	GEN GEN

The more traditional strategy of *equality policy* is applied throughout various policies, ranging from the Federal Equal Treatment Act (FETA), the Violence Protection Act, the Penal Law Amendment on Marital Rape (all gender equality policy) and the Life Partnership Acts (sexual equality policy). These texts express some intersectional dimensions, but were overall discussed under a single-equality lens (i.e. gender and sexuality respectively). Some intersectional notions are found in the texts on the Federal Equal Treatment Act that account for the special situation in public service employment for women with disabilities. The texts on the Life Partnership Act (same sex partnership) are usually sexuality-only; only two parliamentary speeches briefly address the special situation of lesbian women and the need to regulate artificial insemination. Two more texts, among them a CSO text, acknowledge the importance to recognise same sex partnerships due to citizenship and residence issues. However, these are marginal 'intersectional' considerations within the overall policy debate.

The strategy of *intersectional in/equality policy* is mostly applied in relation to migration, both in intimate citizenship and gender-based violence policies. Intersectional criteria are taken either to include or exclude some groups of migrants. In *intersectional inequality policies* conditions for family reunion are age (minimum age of 18), education (language proficiency in German) and class (no social benefit receivers). Only certain intersectional target groups are eligible for family reunion. Contrary, *intersectional equality policies* reject these criteria for family reunion as they privilege some migrants target groups over others. In the debate categories such as nationality (and geo-political dimensions of northern/southern) and ethnicity with connotations of religion come into play when American, Japanese and Canadian immigrants are constructed as having less need for integration and thus face fewer conditions for family reunion than e.g. Turkish migrants. Especially when the aspect of forced

marriage connected to family reunion is raised, the debate is highly gendered. The criteria for family reunion are said to be justified by the policy text because of to their positive effect on gender equality due to the prevention of forced marriage.

The debates around fake paternity acknowledgments are another example for intersectional (in)equality policies. The identified intersectional target groups are unmarried foreigners (women) whose children are acknowledged by a German parent (men). The debate has evolved around the suspected abuse of residence rights which are attached to an acknowledgement of paternity. While the government parties lobby for the right of the public administration to contest these presumably false paternity acknowledgments, all the other parties reject this policy on grounds of discrimination of bi-national, unmarried (women and children) as compared to married parents.

The debates on forced marriage are mostly intersectional equality policies as they define mostly young women (and some men) with migrant background (ethnicity/migration¹³) as the intersectional target group. Some texts also bring religious dimensions (Muslim communities) and class (social problems) into play. Questions around resident permits are raised in almost all texts, although with different intensity (citizenship status). The policy plan of the Federal Council even diagnoses that forced marriage cuts across religion ethnic origin, class and cast, but mostly affects girls and young women and to lesser degree young men. This comprehensive list almost alludes to intersectionality mainstreaming; however, the list of policy actions to combat it are not as comprehensive.

Multiple equality policies address multiple target groups, but often talk about (separate) de-humanised 'markers of discrimination' and no longer persons. Usually, they list six grounds of discrimination like gender, race/ethnicity, age, disability, sexual orientation and religion as defined by the EU Anti-Discrimination Directives. In the parliamentary debates around the General Equal Treatment Act (GETA), however, not even markers of discrimination are identified; the debate evolves around instruments to combat discrimination. Some of the texts on the Anti-Discrimination Office, the equality body established by the GETA, are more aware of intersectional dimensions and talk about multiple discrimination and the special situation of women within discriminated groups. But overall, a parallel listing of inequality strands prevails.

CONCLUSION

All policy strategies except for intersectional inequality and intersectional blind policies aim at 'equality' – whatever meaning it might be given - or at least have some equality oriented underlying rationale. The degree to which they recognise intersectional dimensions within their target groups of course varies. An analysis of policy strategies in Germany over time shows a development towards intersectionality; however, not linear. The policy fields that have been traditionally part of gender equality policies such as (non-)employment related policies and anti-violence policies now increasingly include other inequalities and some even intersectional dimensions. However, recent policy debates such as the one on the Care Time Act (2007) – under a Christian democratic and Social democratic coalition - have mostly been led in an intersectionality blind way, while even earlier policy texts such as the National Action Plan to Combat Violence against Women (1999) – under a Social democratic and Green coalition - have known already many intersectional dimensions and point towards intersectionality mainstreaming. Thus, there is a simultaneity of strategies. Government seems to matter as much as European developments; but it might also be due to interventions from CSOs and experts that 'intersectionality' – although not in the term itself – comes onto the policy agenda.

¹³ To use the category 'ethnicity' seemed too strong or too explicit in cases, where original texts talked about migration. Clearly, the term migration has ethnic and also religious dimensions, when it is raised in German texts (mostly Turkish migrants with Muslim background); but other migrant communities could be meant as well.

As we have seen, there might be an increasing awareness of intersectional dimensions especially with regards to gender-based violence, e.g. in the debates on forced marriage. Also EU Anti-Discrimination Directives have triggered multiple equality policies that talk about lists of markers of discrimination that formally acknowledge that something like multiple discrimination exists. There are already examples for intersectionality mainstreaming and also equality mainstreaming that could serve as best practice examples, especially in the field of gender-based violence. While CSO texts play an important role in addressing the situation of women (and also men) at intersections, there are also governmental policy plans that are inclusive of intersectionality, like shown above. Also, some traditional gender equality policies related to employment already acknowledge intersectional dimensions such as the texts around the Federal Equal Treatment Act (2001) where a sensitisation for women with disabilities could be observed. At the same time, and on more negative note, there is a strong tendency towards intersectional inequality, especially in relation to migration, e.g. in the debates on family reunion and paternity acknowledgment.

These identified policy strategies do not reveal much about the problem definitions, solutions and discursive constructions of subject positions and their intersectional dimensions. However, what they tell us is that intersectionality has already, if not to say always, been practised. It will be subject to further research to assess whether these policy strategies are useful for my envisaged policy analysis or whether this has rather been an ordering exercise for the purpose of getting an overview of the empirical material.

As outlined in the first part of the paper, the main focus of my further research will lie on the development of an discursive intersectional policy analysis. Based on sites, processes and subject positions it will reflect on the discourses at work in the positioning of subjects and paint a picture of the practice of political intersectionality in German gender equality policy debates.

REFERENCES

- Bacchi, Carol Lee. 1999. *Women, Policy and Politics. The Construction of Policy Problems*. London, Thousand Oaks: Sage [Reprint 2001].
- Brah, Avtar and Ann Phoenix. 2004. Ain't I a Woman? Revisiting intersectionality. *Journal of International Women's Studies* 5 (3): 75-87.
- Bührmann, Andrea. 2008. *Herausforderungen der Intersektionalitätsperspektive für die empirische Sozialforschung – Methodologisch methodische Betrachtungen am Beispiel der Geschlechterforschung*. Paper presented at the Workshop 'Constellations of Inequality in Processes of Societal Reproduction and Transformation', Institute for Human Sciences (IWM), Vienna, 12-14 December 2008.
- Crenshaw, Kimberlé. 1991. Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color. *Stanford Law Review* 43 (6): 1241-1299.
- Davis, Kathy. 2008. Intersectionality as buzzword. *Feminist Theory* 9: 67-85.
- Degele, Nina und Gabriele Winker. 2007. *Intersektionalität als Mehrebenenanalyse*. [http://www.tu-harburg.de/agentec/winkler/pdf/Intersektionalitaet_mehrebenen.pdf, accessed on 14 May 2008].
- Ferree, Myra Marx (2009). Inequality, Intersectionality and the Politics of Discourse: Framing Feminist Alliances. In *The Discursive Politics of Gender Equality. Stretching, Bending and Policy Making*, ed. Emanuela Lombardo, Petra Meier and Mieke Verloo.
- Hancock, Ange-Marie. 2007. When Multiplication Doesn't Equal Quick Addition: Examining Intersectionality as a Research Paradigm. *Perspective on Politics* 5 (1): 63-79.
- Kantola, Johanna and Kevät Nousiainen. 2009. *Institutionalising Intersectionality in Europe: Legal and Political Analyses*. Paper presented in the First European Conference on Politics and Gender, Queen's University Belfast, 21-23 January 2009
- Klinger, Cornelia. 2003. Ungleichheit in den Verhältnissen von Klasse, Rasse und Geschlecht. In *Achsen der Differenz. Gesellschaftstheorie und feministische Kritik II*, ed. Gudrun-Axeli Knapp and Angelika Wetterer, 14-48. Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot.
- Klinger, Cornelia, Gudrun-Axeli Knapp and Birgit Sauer (eds.). 2007. *Achsen der Ungleichheit. Zum Verhältnis von Klasse, Geschlecht und Ethnizität*. Frankfurt a.M., New York: Campus.
- Knapp, Gudrun-Axeli. 2005. Race, Class, Gender. Reclaiming Baggage in Fast Travelling Theories. *European Journal of Women's Studies* 12 (3): 249-265.
- Knapp, Gudrun-Axeli. 2008. *Social theoretical perspectives on intersectionality*. Paper presented at the Workshop 'Constellations of Inequality in Processes of Societal Reproduction and Transformation', Institute for Human Sciences (IWM), Vienna, 12-14 December 2008.
- Lenz, Ilse. 2007. Power People, Working People, Shadow People... Gender, Migration, Class and Practices of (In)Equality. In *Gender orders unbound*, ed. Ilse Lenz et.al., 99-119. Opladen & Farmington Hill: Barbara Budrich Publishers.

Lepperhoff, Julia, Anneli Rüling and Alexandra Scheele. 2007. Von Gender zu Diversity Politics. Kategorien feministischer Politikwissenschaft auf dem Prüfstand. Einleitung. *femina politica* 2007 (1): 9-22.

Lombardo, Emanuela and Mieke Verloo. 2009. *Institutionalising intersectionality in the European Union? Policy developments and contestations*. Paper presented in the First European Conference on Politics and Gender, Queen's University Belfast, 21-23 January 2009

Lutz Helma. 2009. *Coexisting inequalities and other pitfalls of the debate on intersectionality*. Paper presented at the Conference 'Celebrating Intersectionality. Debates on a Multi-faceted Concept'. International Conference at the Goethe-University Frankfurt am Main, 22 – 23 January 2009.

See <http://www.cgc.uni-frankfurt.de/intersectionality/>

McCall, Leslie. 2005. The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs* 30 (3): 1771-1800.

Phoenix Ann and Pamela Pattynama. 2006. Intersectionality. *European Journal of Women's Studies* 13 (3): 187-192

Prins, Baukje. 2006. Narrative Accounts of Origins: A Blind Spot in the Intersectional Approach? *European Journal of Women's Studies* 13 (3): 277-290.

Sauer, Birgit. 2007. Diversity. Eine staats- und hegeomoniethoretische Reflexion. In *femina politica* 1: 33-44.

Sauer, Birgit and Stefanie Wöhl. 2008. Governing intersectionality. Ein kritischer Ansatz zur Analyse von Diversitätspolitiken. In *Überkreuzungen. Ungleichheit, Fremdheit, Differenz*, ed. Cornelia Klinger and Gudrun-Axeli Knapp. Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot.

Squires, Judith. 2005. Is Mainstreaming Transformative? Theorizing Mainstreaming in the Context of Diversity and Deliberation. *Social Politics* 12 (3): 366-388.

Squires, Judith. 2007a. *The New Politics of Gender Equality*. Houndsmill, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Squires, Judith. 2007b. Diversity Mainstreaming. Moving Beyond Technocratic and Additive Approaches. *femina politica* 1:45-56.

Squires, Judith. 2008a. Intersecting Inequalities: Reflecting on the Subjects and Objects of Equality. *The Political Quarterly* 79 (1): 53-61.

Squires, Judith. 2008b. Intersecting Inequalities: Britain's Equality Review. Paper presented at the ECPR Fourth Pan-European Conference on EU Politics, University of Latvia, Riga, 25-27 September 2008.

Verloo, Mieke. 2006. Multiple Inequalities, Intersectionality and the European Union. *European Journal of Women's Studies* 13 (3): 211-228.

Verloo, Mieke (ed.) 2007. *Multiple Meanings of Gender Equality. A Critical Frame Analysis of Gender Policies in Europe*. Budapest, New York: CPS Books, Central European University Press.

Walby, Sylvia. 2007. Complexity Theory, Systems Theory, and Multiple Intersecting Social Inequalities. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 37 (4): 449-470.

Walgenbach, Katherina et.al. (eds.). 2007. *Gender als interdependente Kategorie. Neue Perspektiven auf Intersektionalität, Diversität und Heterogenität*. Opladen & Farmington Hill.

Weldon, Laurel S. 2008. Intersectionality. In: *Politics, Gender and Concepts*, ed. Gary Goetz and Amy G. Mazur, 193-218. Cambridge University Press.

West, Candace and Sarah Fenstermaker. 1995. Doing Difference. *Gender & Society* 9 (1): 8-37.

Yuval-Davis, Nira. 2006. Intersectionality and Feminist Politics. *European Journal of Women's Studies* 13 (3): 193-209.

Yuval-Davis, Nira. 2009. *Intersectionality and stratification*. Paper presented at the Conference 'Celebrating Intersectionality. Debates on a Multi-faceted Concept'. International Conference at the Goethe-University Frankfurt am Main, 22 – 23 January 2009.

See <http://www.cgc.uni-frankfurt.de/intersectionality/>