When Multiplication Doesn't Equal Quick Addition: Examining Intersectionality as a Research Paradigm

Ange-Marie Hancock

In the past twenty years, intersectionality has emerged as a compelling response to arguments on behalf of identity-based politics across the discipline. It has done so by drawing attention to the simultaneous and interacting effects of gender, race, class, sexual orientation, and national origin as categories of difference. Intersectional arguments and research findings have had varying levels of impact in feminist theory, social movements, international human rights, public policy, and electoral behavior research within political science and across the disciplines of sociology, critical legal studies, and history. Yet consideration of intersectionality as a research paradigm has yet to gain a wide foothold in political science. This article closely reads research on race and gender across subfields of political science to present a coherent set of empirical research standards for intersectionality.

By the time Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. publicized his idea for his Poor People's March, the National Welfare Rights Organization (NWRO) had preceded him with an identical call for such a march by nearly three years. When King and his associates from the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) met with Johnnie Tillmon, Chairwoman of the NWRO, and her associates about just such a march, he stared blankly when asked his opinion on PL 90-248, which in January 1968 provided work incentives for public welfare recipients while increasing the amount of permissible outside earnings for disabled widows. As the tension rose within the room between the Black female welfare recipient leadership of the NWRO and the middle class Black male leadership of the SCLC, Tillmon stated the obvious and proposed a solution, "You know, Dr. King, if you don't know about these questions, you should say so and then we could go on with the meeting." King was forced to acknowledge his ignorance and that he had come to the meeting to learn; his failure to recognize the power of gender and class in defining a comprehensive political agenda for the entire Black community was recognizable to all who attended this meeting in Chicago.[1]

Nearly a century earlier Emma Goldman—anarchist, free speech activist and family planning advocate—realized that her commitment to transformation of the economic system was equally shaped by gender politics in both her native Russia and her adopted homeland of the United States: "Now that I had learned that women and children carried the heaviest burden of our ruthless economic system, I saw that it was mockery to expect them to wait until the social revolution arrives in order to right injustice."[2] This led her to battle with compatriots in both the anarchist and socialist movements for a more egalitarian notion of gender roles throughout the course of her life as an activist. Goldman's memoir, *Living My Life,* details both personal and political struggles with gender norms within the class-based movements she supported, not simply outside of such self-professed radical and progressive politics.

Both Martin Luther King and Emma Goldman's experiences at the crossroads of multiple social movements presaged the arguments put forth by intersectionality theorists today. In fact the idea of analyzing race, gender and class identities together has existed for over a century. The term "intersectionality" refers to *both* a normative theoretical argument *and* an approach to conducting empirical research that emphasizes the interaction of categories of

Ange-Marie Hancock is Assistant Professor of Political Science & African American Studies at Yale University (ange-marie.hancock@yale.edu). She is the author of The Politics of Disgust: The Public Identity of the "Welfare Queen." *The author thanks Christian Davenport, Gary Goertz, Errol Henderson, Gerald Jaynes, Eric Juenke, Alondra Nelson, Valerie Purdie-Vaughn, Mark Sawyer, James Scott, Evelyn Simien, Lester Spence, Dara Strolovitch, and the anonymous reviewers of* Perspectives on Politics *for their comments on previous versions of this paper, which substantially improved the manuscript.* *She is currently a visiting faculty fellow at the Research Institute for Comparative Studies in Race and Ethnicity at Stanford University.*

DOI: 10.1017/S1537592707070065

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592707070065 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 1
Conceptual differences among approaches to the study of race, gender, class and other categories of difference in political science

	Unitary Approach	Multiple Approach	Intersectional Approach
Q1: How many categories are addressed?	One	More than one	More than one
Q2: What is the relationship posited between categories?	Category examined is primary	Categories matter equally in a predetermined relationship to each other	Categories matter equally; the relationship between categories is an open empirical question
Q3: How are categories conceptualized?	Static at the individual or institutional level	Static at the individual or institutional level	Dynamic interaction between individual and institutional factors
Q4: What is the presumed makeup of each category?	Uniform	Uniform	Diverse; members often differ in politically significant ways
Q5: What levels of analysis are considered feasible in a single analysis?	Individual *or* institutional	Individual *and* institutional	Individual *integrated* with institutional
Q6: What is the methodological conventional wisdom?	Empirical or Theoretical; Single method preferred; multiple method possible	Empirical or Theoretical; Single method sufficient; multiple method desirable	Empirical and Theoretical; Multiple method necessary and sufficient

difference (including but not limited to race, gender, class, and sexual orientation). Emerging over the past 20 years as an explicitly interdisciplinary approach, intersectionality considers the interaction of such categories as organizing structures of society, recognizing that these key components influence political access, equality, and the potential for any form of justice.

Paradigms, as defined by theorists and philosophers of science, represent a set of basic beliefs or a worldview that precedes any questions of empirical investigation.[3] In this sense a paradigm provides a wealth of problems to be investigated and forces the analyses of such problems to attain a detail and depth that is otherwise out of reach.[4] Calls have emerged for the consolidation of intersectional research into a paradigm that animates work in anthropology, critical race theory, critical legal studies, economics, ethnic studies, feminist philosophy, literary criticism, history, political science, sociology, women's studies, and many other disciplines.[5] Within political science, while the embrace of intersectionality has received its widest acceptance in feminist theory, intersectional research has pushed the boundaries in critical legal studies, social movements, public policy, international human rights, and racial/ethnic politics, though it should by no means be limited to these areas of research. The current turn towards discussion of intersectionality as a research paradigm rather than a content specialization in populations with intersecting marginalized identities necessitates further investigations of intersectionality as an approach to conducting empirical research. This article intends to do just that.

Most recently scholars have called for the consolidation of normative and empirical work that focuses on intersecting categories of difference. Table 1 identifies three conceptual approaches to the study of race, gender, class and other organizing structures of society. The answers to each of the six questions in table 1 provide a foundation for the claim that intersectionality is a paradigm—an approach to conducting research—rather than simply a content specialization. I discuss each strand of research in turn after examining the challenge intersectionality poses to the standard logic of identity politics.

Intersectionality's Challenge to Identity Politics

In response to the pluralist logic regarding the democratic guarantee provided by cross-cutting political cleavages, both activists and scholars have long noted that different citizens fare differently based on certain aspects of their presumably inalterable identities. Due to common experiences such as institutionalized discrimination, legalized marginalization, or sociopolitically sanctioned violence, political

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592707070065 Published online by Cambridge University Press

actors who shared the same racial, gender, or class identity logically envisioned these shared experiences as a basis for collective politics. Put most succinctly, the foundational argument for this collective political action now known as identity politics states "before a group can enter the open society, it must close ranks."[6] These analyses depend on a logic of "group solidarity" that has traditionally been interpreted to equate group unity with group uniformity. For standard identity politics supporters, a *unitary* category serves to bind people into a political group based on a uniform set of experiences, as the replies to questions 1, 2, and 4 of table 1 imply.

This logic has inspired theorists and political actors alike in their quest to unite people across local or international boundaries. Both modern civil rights movement activists and theorists across the ideological spectrum have identified and claimed political bonds based on a shared yet permeable set of experiences for people of African descent throughout the world. Upon recognition of these experiences, "closing ranks" would logically occur, producing collective efforts across national boundaries for political change. Similarly, activists and theorists of the more recent "indigenismo" movements throughout the Americas have linked the political efforts of groups the U.S. government identifies as different—Native American and Latino—with the efforts of indigenous populations in Guatemala, Mexico and Peru, among other countries. Importantly, some of these international lines of communication were forged by women, continuing a tradition with over a century of history.[7]

During the nineteenth century, women suffragists and policy advocates in the United States met and consulted with their counterparts in Britain and much of western Europe.[8] Both this wave of women's organizing and the second, more racially diverse wave of international feminist organizing in the latter half of the twentieth century were premised upon the same identity-politics logic articulated by racial/ethnic politics scholars noted above. Maternalist arguments of the nineteenth century argued for women's unique perspective based on their presumably shared character traits.[9] Academic members of the second wave of the U.S. women's movement continued this logic across ideological and disciplinary boundaries. Presumably shared character traits were considered "natural impulses" by some, suggesting a political response that revalues what was previously devalued. Others pointed to such character traits as socially constructed phenomena that were imposed upon women, suggesting a completely different political response.[10] Yet none of these scholars fundamentally questioned the a priori assumption of shared experiences that undergirded a belief in the necessity and possibility of a collective response.

Though the above review is in no way intended to be exhaustive, the identity politics logic to unite people sharing at least one common politically salient identity is clear. Several refinements to this logic have emerged as different political movements have varied in their ability to leverage it for political change.[11] Nevertheless groups are still considered able to advocate a specific set of policy proposals based on a pre-existing presumption of shared political goals.[12]

From the normative point of view, intersectionality has emerged as a compelling critique of this group unity equals group uniformity logic. Most frequently, scholars have focused on the material effects of in-group essentialism, which occurs when a sub-set of a group's populations (e.g. elites) seeks to fix the characteristics of a specific identity such as race or gender, marginalizing those group members who differ in other aspects of their identity (e.g., their class or sexual orientation).[13] Such material effects have included the enforced silence of sub-group members in an effort to present a united front, the miscalculation among marginalized group elites regarding the penetration of certain policy benefits to the least advantaged members of the group, and the actual loss of life, family, fortune or freedom such an assumption costs marginalized members of these groups. In response to the entreaty to place one identity ahead of another simultaneously held identity for political expediency's sake, current intersectionality proponents have argued that one cannot privilege a single aspect of one's identity to the detriment of another, just as Goldman did in her day. The answers to questions one and two of table 1 derive from this normative response to the logic of unitary identity politics. Most intersectionality scholars share the logic that multiple marginalizations of race, class, gender, or sexual orientation at the individual and institutional levels create social and political stratification, requiring policy solutions that are attuned to the interactions of these categories. Intersectionality theory claims that these policy problems are more than the sum of mutually exclusive parts; they create an interlocking prison from which there is little escape.

These normative claims raise a number of questions regarding the way in which public policy and social movements are now studied in relation to each other. Traditional analyses of public policy decision-making have focused on what is at stake. Early legislative analyses introduced individual legislator goals into the equation such as reelection and personal ideology. Access to federal funding, feasibility of implementation, policy agendas, and public opinion all influence legislators as they make decisions about how to alter public policy. More recently, findings across policy domains have demonstrated that who is at issue matters just as much as what is at stake. Several scholars have focused on introducing the social construction of target populations process into models of policy design.[14] These social constructions of target populations are based upon stereotypes about particular groups from politics, culture, the media, and history, among other influences.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592707070065 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The inclusion of how policy target populations are construed by legislative decision makers owes some of the force of its argument to parallel lines of research that have chronicled the influence of racism or sexism in American political culture. Such studies have proceeded at the individual level as well as at the institutional level.[15] Both research traditions have been shaped by the collective efforts of marginalized groups—racial/ethnic minorities on the one hand, women on the other—to force governments like that of the United States to live up to what it wrote in its founding documents. The work of social movements such as the modern civil rights movement in the United States as well as the first and second waves of the women's movement both domestically and abroad have in many ways produced public policy that is somewhat responsive to individual and institutional discrimination.

Intersectional work goes deeper to examine the limits of policy-making designed to assist target populations who should theoretically benefit from *either* racially-targeted *or* gender-targeted public policy but in reality benefit from *neither.* For example, who has the authority to define public policy goals that are in the interests of race or gender groups? How might we account for the wide variations in either political resources or political outcomes within race or gender groups? Instead of designing policies that create a talented tenth or a fortunate fifth of a marginalized group, how might we redesign domestic and foreign policies to ensure that *all* members of any marginalized group are enabled to empower themselves?

In positing interconnecting relationships between race, gender, class, and often sexual orientation, scholars have continued to note an imbalance between the plethora of theoretical studies and the relative paucity of empirical work in intersectionality.[16] One primary reason for this disparity is the conflation of two different theoretical approaches that are assumed to follow from the challenges to static definitions of race, class, and gender categories. As noted by the questions in the previous paragraph, intersectionality theory to date has emphasized intra-category diversity—that is, the tremendous variation within categories such as "Blackness" or "womanhood." This assertion has been conflated with postmodern and poststructuralist critiques of modern western philosophy and history, which question the existence of such categories at all. Intersectionality argues for new conceptualizations of categories and their role in politics, rather than seeking an abolition of categories themselves.[17]

Even without this conflation, however, empirical researchers find themselves stymied in the pursuit of research questions that dictate some categorization strategy, however contingently conceptualized. The powerful reply that all categories can be fractured into ever-exponentially increasing sub-categories once intersectionality is addressed empirically has led to a rejection of intersectionality by a number of variable-oriented researchers who envision a paralysis emerging from the inclusion of increasing numbers of variables. The rule of parsimony, so the argument goes, would be violated with little to no gain in explanatory power for political problems such as persistent poverty or discrimination. This logic has largely gone unchallenged, leading many empirical political scientists to envision intersectionality solely as a set of untestable normative claims rather than as a research paradigm which not only answers questions left unanswered in policy design but also generates testable hypotheses.

To date, most empirical intersectionality research has emphasized case studies of varying sizes and demographic populations, leading to the common assumption that intersectionality is a content area focusing solely on "mere description." Case studies chronicling or comparing the political experiences of Black, Latino, Native American, or Asian American women of different class, sexual orientation, or national origin have generated critically important knowledge essential for testing time-worn theories such as the gender gap, pluralist models of democracy, approaches to peacemaking, sustainable development, and international law on refugees. As intersectionality scholars have sought to overcome the obstacles pointed out by parsimony-conscious empiricists, they have emphasized one or another intersectional group, examining relative differences and similarities using a multi-method approach. Yet to move beyond testing time-worn theories, to examine the as-yet unanswered questions intersectionality generates, intersectional empiricists cannot rely on the same old data, or more precisely, data collected in the same old unitary way.

Quantitative scholars have used variable-oriented surveys not explicitly designed to capture the qualitative within-group diversity posited by intersectionality theorists. This practice corresponds to the assumptions of the multiple approach regarding the number of categories addressed and their relative importance in the model (assumptions shared, of course, with the intersectional approach), yet the data at the heart of these analyses remains multiple as we answer questions three and four of table 1: they are static, snapshot data for the most part, with two critical assumptions: uniformity within multiplicative categories like "black women" and within-case independence of categories like race and gender. Most of this data further reverts to the unitary approach regarding question five: the analyses are aggregated across individuals without concomitant institutional components featured in the multiple and intersectional approaches.

Any empirical analysis is only as good as the data collected prior to it. My claim is not that intersectionality scholars should eschew rich datasets with thousands of data points in favor of traditional ethnography or participant observation. Instead, I argue that continuing to collect data in the same way helps us assimilate into the old questions generated by old paradigms regardless of their

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592707070065 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ongoing utility at the cost of answering the pesky new questions unanswerable by the old approaches.

Yet this challenge is not insurmountable. We can collect data in a manner that acknowledges contingency and enables quantitative empirical work using fuzzy-set theory. In the final sections of this article I argue that fuzzy-set logic, which has been part of our daily lives for over forty years through the design of automobiles and airplanes, provides important resources for empirically-oriented intersectionality scholars.[18] However, a clear articulation of the three approaches to research on categories like race, gender, and class must precede an examination of how to collect intersectional data and design intersectional research.

Historically approaches to the incorporation of the fundamental insight that race (and I would argue, gender, class, ethnicity and/or sexual orientation) matters more frequently than not in many analyses of politics has produced three significant shifts in the way political scientists have addressed (or have avoided addressing) these political cleavages, identities, categories of difference, or variables, as they might be called depending on one's own ontological position in the discipline.[19] I seek to examine these transitions from political science research that examines or privileges a single category of sociopolitical difference (e.g., race *or* gender) to work that examines multiple categories of sociopolitical difference as isolated phenomena (e.g., race *and* gender) to, most recently, work that examines intersecting categories of sociopolitical difference (e.g., race *interacts* with gender). As I noted earlier, the typology of these shifts emerges from answers to six questions regarding research across subfields of political science that examines issues of race, gender, class, and sexual orientation.[20]

Transitions in the Study of Categories of Difference

Table 1 demonstrates the distinctions among the three strands of race, gender, and class-oriented research. I call the first strand the *unitary* approach, because of its *presumed* emphasis on a single category of identity or difference or political tradition as the *most* relevant or *most* explanatory. Research and political movements emphasizing gender, class, or race proceeded on parallel tracks for a long period despite efforts among some political actors to bring the tracks together.

The second strand of research is called the *multiple* approach because it recognizes a priori the role of several categories, such as race *and* gender or race *and* class as equally important yet conceptually independent considerations when examining political phenomena. For example, African American activists in labor movements struggled at length within their groups to gain recognition of the equal constitutive power of race and economic class in the United States as well as around the world.

The final strand of research is called the *intersectional* approach because it not only recognizes the political significance of one or another category (like the unitary approach), but it also sees more than one category's explanatory power in examining political institutions or political actors (like the multiple approach). The intersectional approach moves beyond the multiple approach in several theoretically important ways. First, it changes the relationship between the categories of investigation from one that is determined a priori to one of empirical investigation. This is an important shift for large-n quantitative studies in particular, which tend to assume that race operates identically across entire cities, states, and nations when placed in *interaction* with gender or class.

Second, intersectionality posits an interactive, mutually constitutive relationship among these categories and the way in which race (or ethnicity) and gender (or other relevant categories) play a role in the shaping of political institutions, political actors, the relationships between institutions and actors, and the relevant categories themselves. Much work in this area has emerged from work in international law—specifically international human rights research regarding women's political participation in developing societies.

Research on international development and empowerment has found that North-South relationships among international organizations, nongovernmental organizations, state institutions, and civil society, even when sharing a commitment to enhancing women's rights, must contend with ethnic and cultural differences that can thwart even the best intentions in research, development programs, and politics.[21] In particular, many northern women scholars, activists, and practitioners have previously characterized non-Western women as static, primitive beings who lack agency or knowledge.[22] This has created an opportunity for local elite framing of women's development and empowerment programs as flash points sparking anti-western sentiment in many parts of Africa.[23] Moreover, this social construction of African women violates the intersectional responses to questions three and four of table 1: it fails to acknowledge the negotiation routinely engaged in by women involved in an anti-patriarchal project and a diversity of African women on the continent as regards class, religion, and ethnic origin. The critical contributions of indigenous feminisms in the African context have problematized the terms of western feminist theory, proceeding in much the same way as intersectionality did in the United States: through a stage involving "specialist" oriented, practical case studies within the development and nation-building projects of post-colonial African nations.

There is a great deal of slippage in the literature among the terms *multiple* identities (or traditions), *multiplicative* identities (or traditions), and *intersecting* identities (or traditions). The next two sections distinguish between the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592707070065 Published online by Cambridge University Press

multiple and intersectional approaches. I turn to a discussion of education policy to demonstrate the crucial role intersecting categories of race, gender, and class might play and the ways in which new questions are generated for this policy domain. Derrick Bell's recent *Silent Covenants* illuminates the policy pitfalls of the unitary and multiple approaches.

Earlier Approaches: The Unitary and Multiple Strands of Research

In some ways the unitary approach emerges most intuitively out of a political science tradition that valorizes Lockean Liberalism. In a situation of categorical marginalization, such as apartheid South Africa or the antebellum United States, strong arguments were made for the aforementioned "closing ranks" strategy. The normative arguments for natural rights and a social contract between rulers and the governed are clearly violated by slavery, apartheid, or the formal exclusion of women from political life. In addition to its emphasis on a single category, the unitary approach is also a universalizing approach—it considers one category as most salient for political explanation. One explanation fits all members of the group uniformly, and one explanation is considered the most important over time. In this approach, the thought that class or race might have an impact on gender is more a factor of the wily nature of patriarchy than an open theoretical or empirical question. Thus in the unitary approach, one category reigns paramount among others and is therefore justifiably the sole lens of analysis. While this approach might seem outdated, it still appears in the literature, often with a caveat justifying its exclusive focus.[24]

Within these earlier approaches categories are usually conceptualized as static and enduring. Empirically, this may include the use of data with government-mandated categories or the aforementioned survey data. Beyond the empirical challenges of unitary cross-sectional analysis for practical application, because the categories are assumed to be static, the unitary approach assumes that an individual's memberships are permanent, when in fact they can shift due to institutional policy changes. Much of the political firestorm over the possibility of adding a multiracial category to the census involves the fear among Black and Latino elites that their communities' numbers and subsequently their resource allocation would decline because migration from these two categories was predicted to be larger than migration from the White/Caucasian category. While this fear seems irrational to many in the multiracial movement, anecdotal evidence of Dred Scott in the 1860s and Susie Phipps in the 1970s, as well as the arguments of critical race theorists regarding the political economic value of white category membership gives many elites pause.[25]

Categorical boundaries so carefully drawn and rigidly enforced for over two centuries in the United States create two problematic outcomes. First, groups at the bottom of the hierarchy compete rather than cooperate in a winner-takes-all system. Claims that race equality or gender equality represent a single magic bullet have facilitated an "Oppression Olympics," where groups compete for the mantle of "most oppressed" to gain the attention and political support of dominant groups as they pursue policy remedies, leaving the overall system of stratification unchanged.[26]

Second, the categories themselves elide important differences within groups—leaving groups with an ongoing hierarchy within. The assumption of static, uniform, categories presents a serious problem for education policy scholars. For example, the needs of Laotian, Cambodian, and Vietnamese American children in the U.S. public schools are often ignored and overlooked as they are presumed to fall under the "model minority" stereotype of East Asian Americans whose ancestors came from China, Japan, and Korea. These within-group differences trump between racial group differences as predictors of student academic performance, drop-out rates, and family resources available in making a child "ready for school."[27] A similar process operating in reverse occurs among students of recent Caribbean and African descent who attempt to set themselves apart from African American students who are stereotyped to eschew strong academic performance as "acting white."[28]

Unitary aspects of Silent Covenants

Derrick Bell's *Silent Covenants* challenges the tangible significance of *Brown v. Board of Education* in actually desegregating the schools. Bell defines the decision as an instance of racial fortuity, where Black and White interests converged due to White Cold War anxiety.[29] As this convergence disintegrated, the expressed commitment to desegregation of the schools met with insufficient enforcement in the years following the decision. In light of these failures and the apparent re-segregation of the public schools by the end of the twentieth century, Bell analyzes two different avenues for addressing educational inequality in the twenty-first century.[30] He does so in a manner that is firmly grounded in the unitary approach, even when multiple categories seem to come up in the text.

For Bell the social construction of race and the individual and institutional behavior it produces, racism, is "the dominant interpretive framework for a social structure that organizes the American garden's very configuration."[31] He acknowledges the role of class in organizing American society, but again argues for the supremacy of race as an explanatory variable when he states,

> today many whites oppose all social reform as "welfare programs for blacks." They ignore the fact that poor whites have employment, education, and social service needs that differ from the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592707070065 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> condition of poor blacks by a margin that, without a racial scorecard, becomes difficult to measure. In summary the blatant involuntary sacrifice of black rights to further white interests, so obvious in early American history, remains as potentially damaging as it ever was to black rights and the interests of all but wealthy whites.[32]

While Bell confronts the idea that race (and later class or gender) matter, he assumes a priori that race matters more than class, situating him firmly in the unitary approach. This assumption then grounds the way in which Bell selects and analyzes what he deems relevant policy options for improving the racial disparities in education in the United States: affirmative action, public school financing, and inner-city education.

In his discussion of affirmative action, Bell reviews much of what is already known about the topic, both pre- and post-*Gratz* and *Grutter.*[33] Interestingly, he appears to make a turn toward the multiple approach at the conclusion of the chapter as he laments the absurdity of framing affirmative action as purely racial: "More importantly, as with school desegregation, racial controversy obscures economic issues that will adversely affect far more minority students than the headline-grabbing affirmative action issue."[34] In fact, he appears to acknowledge class inequality as an increasingly problematic line of difference in public education. He closes the affirmative action chapter with a call to investigate school finance and budgeting as "true" battlegrounds for equal educational access by racial minorities.[35] Bell's next two directions, public school funding disparities and inner-city educational efforts, are selected in part due to his unitary approach on race. Moreover, they are analyzed with unitary answers to questions three and four from table 1 in mind.

Bell recognizes the limitations of racial desegregation efforts in improving between-race differences in educational outcomes. Rather than argue, however, that race and class inequality together contribute to such disparities, he switches from one unitary category—race—to another—class. Bell lauds these changes in school financing policies as a start. His remedy to any flaws in the schools is now purely financial:

> Second, there is reason to doubt that equalizing funding without additional funds will always make a substantive difference. The latter problem should come as little surprise. Schools in poor, segregated neighborhoods that have been marginalized for decades will not suddenly achieve high-quality education and produce students competitive with those of the traditionally privileged schools just because they are now given equal funding. That is like expecting a Pinto to keep up with a Porsche simply because their engines both burn gasoline.[36]

Bell concludes his evaluation of this kind of litigation with the term "efficient education," one garnered from Texas case law and the Texas state constitution. In six pages Bell has shifted his approach from one that recognizes the role of race to one recognizing class.

The implications of the unitary approach's assumption of a uniform makeup of racial categories like African American (see question four in table 1) is apparent in Bell's analysis of educational efforts in what he terms "inner city" independent schools. By placing "inner city" in quotation marks, he seeks to contest the idea that "inner city" should be associated solely with African Americans, and he includes Catholic and Jewish schools in New York City as interesting counter-examples to his focus—African American independent schools. Yet despite his punctuation-based contestation of the term inner city, Bell constructs African American independent schools as a uniquely urban phenomenon with tremendous promise for the educational uplift of black children.

According to the past two census collections, African Americans reside primarily in the South. This regional concentration is particularly relevant for Bell's educational policy, as ten of twelve southern states ranked among the bottom 20 in K–8 student achievement in 2005.[37] Clearly southern students, many of whom are African American (Bell's focus) deserve a better education than that. But the discussion of one policy solution, independent African American schools, proceeds with no recognition of census or Department of Education figures. Not only does the South have a lower concentration of urban regions, but according to the 2000 census, 95 of the 96 counties in which African Americans comprise more than 50 percent of the population are in the South. Only 2 of these 96 (Baltimore City and Prince George's County in Maryland) are considered urban.[38]

Bell's unitary approach conceptualizes the racial category of African American as static and uniform (see questions three and four in table 1). There is no attention to the way in which African American independent schools operate in a non-urban context, despite the fact that so many African Americans live in non-urban contexts. Non-urban schools serving Black students may have to contend with financial situations similar to their urban counterparts, such as a low property tax base among the rural poor. But different financial considerations may also apply—increased transportation costs for a more widely dispersed school population, or competing demands for resources from suburban parents who seek comprehensive neighborhood schools. From Bell's analysis and review of the policy options, we have no way of knowing whether proposing African American independent schools can work in non-urban contexts.

My contention with Bell's work is not intended to delegitimize his well-considered evaluation of the success or failure of *Brown.* I seek to challenge the fundamental assumptions that undergird his racial fortuity argument by questioning whether the policy universe should be limited to increased or equal funding for poor, racially homogenous school districts and individual African American independent schools. To say that money talks in these discussions

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592707070065 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of education policy should not be assumed to mean that race walks—right out of the picture. It may very well be that race has now been supplanted by class as a focus for civil rights attorneys arguing educational equity cases in U.S. courts. But whether such a unitary policy can achieve a goal of quality education for all students in the United States is a claim that suffers under problematic assumptions.

Living in the south may constitute yet another obstacle to overcome in educational policy. It is also entirely possible that three of the lowest performing states—Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama—may receive an infusion of resources to try new programs and approaches in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. Could his solution work in these high rural-population, low population-density states? We cannot tell from Bell's analysis.

Multiple Approach Aspects of Silent Covenants

As Bell moves to consider the role of single-sex African American independent schools, he shifts to a multiple approach with some uncertainty. He is in part limited by his dependence on a literature that mostly studies gender differences without regard to race—but partly the limits of his analysis are due to the similarly problematic aspects of the multiple approach—static categories and a priori assumptions of their predetermined relationships to each other (see question two in table 1). When contending with the fact that many independent African American schools are exclusively or predominantly focused upon providing services for Black males, Bell cites the literature on gender and violence and the literature on race and violence as reasons why certain programs such as teen pregnancy prevention should target Black girls, while anti-violence programming should be targeted at Black males. In so doing, Bell implies that a comprehensive curriculum can be achieved by adding the findings of these two discrete literatures together. This logic is deeply flawed, not least because young Black women are not amoeba; they do not reproduce on their own. Inattention to the underlying assumptions of such logic suggests a deeply patriarchal view of heterosexual relationships.

Criminological research that contends with the interaction effects of race and gender upon crime rates of both juveniles and adults finds that the largest gains in arrests and convictions is occurring among young women of color.[39] As well, female gang membership is up among poor and working class Black, Latina, and Pacific Islander young women overall; meanwhile teen pregnancy rates are down among all female populations in the United States.[40] If we follow Bell, who emphasizes teen pregnancy prevention programs for girls who are facing increased levels of violence within their cohorts, no one is then charged with addressing the expansion of violence as a public health problem. Any good doctor will tell you that a misdiagnosis of the problem most often produces a misprescription of the treatment.[41]

By depending on two discrete literatures—one that treats race and violence and one that treats gender and violence—Bell moves to the multiple approach by assuming that adding the two sets of findings will create a comprehensive solution for independent African American schools to address the needs of both sexes. The logic that supports this theoretical move assumes that the political development of the category of race has developed independently of the category of gender. In fact, research on the intersection of race and gender in criminology is available to correct this misconception.[42]

This additive assumption is common practice among political science scholars who embrace the multiple approach. The gradual incorporation of race into studies of gender and the state and gender into studies of race and the state have emerged in this manner.[43] Empirically, scholars have tested the normative claims of early multicultural feminists using a similarly additive procedure, by using interacting terms in linear regression equations in an attempt to capture the simultaneous impact of race and gender as it occurs for women of color in various aspects of politics, including political attitudes and voter turnout.[44] This work is multiplicative in that it tests whether race; gender; or race and gender provide the greatest explanatory power. This methodological approach also presumes that the categories are static and that the relationship between them is predetermined. More importantly, as I noted earlier, the data involved in these studies was collected with assumptions like homogeneity of cases and independence of variables that are contested by the intersectional approach.[45]

Treating race and gender (or other categories of difference) as parallel, often conflicting phenomena creates three problems—two normative and one empirical. First, as I noted above, it produces an additive model of politics leading to competition rather than coordination among marginal groups for fringe levels of resources rather than systemic reform that could transform the entire logic of distribution. While ruling elites are quite content to let marginal groups duke it out, it is unclear that these battles move marginal groups beyond the phase of advanced marginalization, where de jure injustice is legally forbidden but informal patterns of prejudice and discrimination keep the system of social stratification firmly in place for the majority of marginal groups' members.[46] Second, the multiple approach denies certain groups who fall between the intersections of multiple groups the political space for claims of qualitative, not merely quantitative difference.[47]

The third ramification, misdiagnosis of a problem that requires a policy solution, is just as threatening. The analysis of Bell's move toward multiple analysis reveals that not only do we risk missing a greater threat to children's flourishing in favor of a diminishing one, our drunkard's search for a single cause often attempts to treat multiple diagnosis problems with a single magic policy prescription. In

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592707070065 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a world in which all three ramifications occur routinely, a permanent set of marginal groups is created, which a democratic system premised upon the logic of cross-cutting cleavages and an ongoing equally distributed opportunity to land on the winning side is ill-equipped to handle.

In this section, I've used a specific work in education policy to illuminate the shortcomings of both the unitary and multiple approaches to categories of difference. In the next section, I will outline the broad applicability of the intersectional model. As well, I will return to the arena of education policy and develop a hypothetical approach to studying education that could emerge from Bell's facts if an intersectional approach is utilized. In other words, I seek to answer the question, how can we avoid the ongoing search for a single magic bullet?

Beyond the Magic Bullet to Yin and Yang: Intersectional Approaches

Intersectionality, as a body of research, is concerned even in its theoretical voice about the practical implications of its arguments. While intersectionality is by no means unique in its attention to applications, the ways in which it conceptualizes the constitution of, relationship between, and multi-level analysis of categories of difference is in fact unique. In this sense intersectionality as an approach to conducting research answers questions left unanswered by the unitary and multiple approaches.

A large proportion of intersectional research is dependent upon the seminal articles of critical race feminists who forcefully outline the ramifications of a legal system mired in the unitary approach for women of color who are victims of sexual assault, domestic violence, and employment discrimination.[48] To prove racial discrimination, claimants must demonstrate that the policy has a disparate impact on men and women of the racial group. To prove gender discrimination, claimants must demonstrate the policy's disparate impact on women across racial groups. Because claimants cannot argue that a particular policy targets women of color disparately (without including men of color or white women in the claim), they are denied equal protection of the law. These issues are more than abstract conjecture; failure to attend to cultural differences and differential status for Latinas has had a dangerous impact on the provision of local police protection for domestic violence victims.

In order to avoid the conclusion that intersectionality is simply a body of research concerning women of color, another example in which within-category difference has politically relevant ramifications focuses neither on women of color nor the American context. The answer to the question raised in the introduction, "who has the authority to define public policy goals that are in the interests of race or gender groups" is addressed implicitly by the answers to questions three, four and five of table 1. It is perhaps the most familiar normative argument of intersectionality scholars.

Instead of race or gender as dividing lines, the role of elite framing and manipulation of language can exemplify the significance of within-category diversity, dynamic interaction between institutions and individuals, and multiple levels of analysis. The linguistic association of one group with all the power and a subordinate group with little to no power can help facilitate an ongoing or episodic cycle of intergroup conflict. Some of the most tragic aspects of the 1994 Rwandan genocide are traced to the social constructions of Hutu and Tutsi identities as proxies for other intersecting phenomena (such as economic class stratification) at the individual and institutional levels despite their common language, genetic heritage, and kinship networks.[49] The setting of a policy, even one as nefarious as genocide, is necessarily based upon what the perceived needs of the relevant group are. That list of needs is usually constructed based on generalizations of who the group is and their relevant norms and behaviors. Intersectional research reveals and challenges the efficacy of these generalizations.

The intersectional approach has been partially implemented in the public policy literature through the specific domains of AIDS and welfare policy. What would a comprehensive intersectional approach to education policy look like? Returning to *Silent Covenants,* I proceed through the six dimensions of the intersectional approach in outlining research strategies that would satisfy Bell's desired policy outcome—equal, effective education for all students regardless of their race or ethnicity.

Intersectionality first recognizes that designing successful race-conscious education policy requires a comprehensive diagnosis of the problem. Thus an intersectional approach would first claim that race is not the only category of difference at work in producing unequal outcomes among racial/ethnic groups. This position answers question one in table 1.

Before moving on to question two, there is the essential matter of data collection. How will we measure the four categories the review of *Silent Covenants* revealed to be minimally required for educational policy analysis? Due to resource limitations, most intersectionality researchers have used pre-existing datasets, collected without attention to the relevant features of intersectionality theory. In this hypothetical design, we can briefly articulate a different approach to data collection and measurement.

Fuzzy-set logic can best capture the within-group diversity at stake among categories of race, class, gender, and region already deemed relevant in the previous section.[50] Using fuzzy-set theory allows a scholar to attend to the issue of within-group diversity in each category in a manner that is substantively and theoretically consistent with the claims of intersectionality. The first two categories provide divergent examples of data collection. Applying fuzzy-set logic

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592707070065 Published online by Cambridge University Press

can move us beyond nominal measures of a socially-constructed category like race in two different ways.

If a researcher wants to capture the increasing heterogeneity of people living in the United States, relying solely on census data or self-reported identification, especially when constructed as a single survey question, does not fulfill the demands of intersectional research. As noted in table 1, individual and structural factors shape the group boundaries of a specific racial/ethnic group. Several questions tapping the four dimensions of the Multidimensional Model of Racial Identity (MMRI) may capture individual-level perceptions of racial identity. Yet contextual factors such as the racial composition of a neighborhood and school (not simply their reports of these factors) must also be considered as preconditions for the racial salience and centrality aspects of the MMRI. Moreover, further contextual or institutional data may be relevant for political science, such as census category shifts, law enforcement-community relations or the legal status of undocumented immigrants in mixed households.

All of this data taps factors racial identity experts deem important in ascertaining the status of membership in a racial or ethnic category. A nuclear member would be a person fully in the set (value = 1), a modal member would be almost fully in the set (value = .75), a marginal member might represent the crossover point of being equally in and out of the set (value = .5), a dormant member be a person more out of than in the set (value = .25) and a non-member would be a person fully out of the racial group (value = 0). These values do not need to correspond exactly to genetic heritage—a biracial person is not automatically a .5 member of two racial groups. Rather, the investigator sets these cut points in qualitative terms first; a nuclear member is one whose identity is fully involved based on the evaluation of all relevant case data. Survey responses can be set as closed- or open-ended depending on the substantive literature and goals of the research. Questions can also be adjusted based on the extensive review of the policy literature at issue.

This intersectional approach to collecting data is grounded in fuzzy-set logic. There are two benefits of this approach. First, it acknowledges the extensive psychological literature on identity development, which argues not simply that categories are socially shaped, but that young individuals develop and navigate their identities in ongoing ways based on their family, school and neighborhood interactions at the individual and institutional levels.[51] The cut points need not even correspond to being all, mostly, or not at all Black, Latino, Asian, white or Native American. The stages of racial identity development for various populations make qualitative rather than quantitative distinctions.

If a quantitative distinction is warranted, however, then this fuzzy-set logic is capable of attending to it, particularly regarding the issue of multiraciality. For example, blood quantum continues to be a controversial, government-imposed standard used for Native American tribal membership. In some cases it is a prerequisite for access to educational resources like tribal schools, colleges, or scholarships. Interpreting the cut points more quantitatively may be necessary for educational policy analyses in this regard, despite ongoing contestation of the standard.[52]

Class is similarly a "fuzzy" concept, most often operationalized as self-reported income. Yet in terms of educational outcomes, other aspects of an individual's profile have been previously mentioned as relevant, including family resources beyond income. In particular, children who have parents with college degrees are more likely to consider college a viable option. Instead of merely using income as a proxy for class, an intersectional approach might define membership in a particular class based on replies to a series of questions that again reflect not simply quantitative differences but theoretically relevant qualitative differences.

Take, for example, a group most readers of this journal once belonged to: the set of graduate students. Graduate students can be defined, depending on with whom you speak, as "educated working poor"—making comparatively little money while in the process of acquiring the highest level of education available. Incorporating categorical intersection prior to data collection rather than post-data collection changes the information available for consideration in establishing comparison cases for analysis. Attending to intersectionality in collecting class data would first mean an expanded definition of socioeconomic class, as I have noted above.

Yet this action, while necessary, is not sufficient. Beyond the collection of additional data, accounting for causal complexity would include the attention to intersections of class and gender prior to data analysis. Given longstanding findings of an ongoing gendered division of labor in the home, it would certainly make sense to ask which parent is the graduate student. While the gendered household labor question is largely settled, a graduate student in most cases (male or female) has more flexible time to spend with a child than a blue- or white-collar co-parent. In other words, the relationship between the gender of the graduate student parent and time invested in socializing the child is an open empirical question (see table 1, question 2) that may vary based on a number of individual and institutional factors, including but not limited to the availability of affordable quality daycare (e.g., the University of North Carolina's University Child Care Center or Columbia University's Rita Gold Early Childcare Center) or education (e.g., UCLA's University Elementary School); the occupation of a spouse and the spouse's available time for child-rearing; the stage of the graduate student's studies (e.g., coursework, exams, submitting the dissertation). One could imagine a variety of combinations of these causal factors that could lead to a fuzzy-set of graduate

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592707070065 Published online by Cambridge University Press

student children with upper-middle class social capital available to them.

This example illuminates the role of time in such measures as well. Most graduate students are part of the educated working poor until they obtain their degree, when they become qualified for full-time white-collar work in or out of academe. A question about job status of the primary caretaker could serve as an important corrective to a simple numerical income reply. While graduate student poverty is almost always temporary, a lifetime migrant worker or a social-security dependent retiree's poverty is much more entrenched.

At this stage it may seem to conventional variable-oriented scholars that I am introducing variables that are highly correlated into the class construct. Importantly, I propose fuzzy-set logic as an effective strategy for handling causal complexity—causation that is both conjunctural and multiple.[53] In particular, causal complexity defined under this strategy avoids assuming that independent categories are necessary or sufficient for the outcome under study.[54]

Causal complexity, a clear part of intersectional policy dilemmas, requires the relaxation of the simplifying assumption that each causal factor can be isolated from the next. The data collection process described here would require explicit theoretical and substantive justifications for each delineation of set membership. Rather than count mere genetic heritage, returning us to the dreaded one-drop rule, race is operationalized as a much more fluid, dynamic construct, as is class.

For the two types of geographical contexts discussed earlier, population density (urban/rural) and region (north/south) might vary in their relationship to each other even within the same policy domain. Allowing for this possibility enables variation in the role of violence and youth gangs among young men and young women in the public schools. An intersectional approach might use quantitative strategies to account for this variation across time and space, or might depend on earlier qualitative fieldwork. Recognizing the variation possible across the urban-rural divide may limit or increase the generalizability of any redesign initiative. Finding the answer to this question requires an approach like fuzzy-set logic that is consistent with the intersectional approach to question two in table 1: categories should not be dismissed a priori, but should be ruled in or out based on empirical study.

Given Bell's own personal history and the degree to which it shaped many of the legal outcomes he discusses, it is understandable that his framework assumes a Black-white binary and leaves little room for individual agency in shifting that binary. This presumption of categories as static at the institutional level is elided by his own dependence upon recent case law in Texas that shifts the binary within the racial category to include Latinos. While I don't think that Bell is ideologically averse to the inclusion of Latinos as an educationally underserved population, his turn to white vs. people of color retains the binary, glossing over the combination of individual and institutional factors that would produce a typology rather than a binary of races. Yet an intersectional approach would not simply expand to a typology of discrete racial/ethnic groups within the category. Most importantly, intersectional approaches to collecting and analyzing data would attend to issues of hybridity or multiraciality recognizing the contingency and limitations of groups within categories to self-identify in a personally relevant or empowering way. These dynamic understandings of race have already been established as having an impact on student test performance, which is increasingly the indicator of teacher, school, and district performance, as dictated by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2002.[55] Moreover, as the logic applies to race in an empirical analysis, each relevant category has its own trajectory of dynamic interaction between individual and institutional factors. An intersectional analysis would attend to this dynamic process of racial-gender formation as the answer to question three in table 1.

Recognition of ethnic, regional, gender, and class diversity among the school-age population that Bell seeks to empower is also critically important in developing effective comprehensive education policy. While these four categories might seem intuitive, a fifth, English-language proficiency, affects students who are from English as a Second Language families and social contexts.[56] While smaller schools seem to work for many aspects of educational outcomes, persistent cross-racial gaps in test performance, cross-class gaps in drop-out rates, and gender gaps in subject area performance point toward roads that still need to be trod in ensuring equal educations at the K–12 level. Intersectional research in this area would recognize the need to tailor programs based on the empirical findings regarding the relationships illuminated by dimension two of table 1. The incorporation of this within-group diversity into policy proposals and implementation is consistent with an intersectional answer to question four from table 1. It is also facilitated by an approach to data collection that is consistent with fuzzy set analysis.

Bell's analysis of civil rights law emphasizes the role of political institutions in guaranteeing equitable educational outcomes across race. He unwittingly points us to another set of factors that perpetuate inequality with his evocative image illustrating the limits of school financing's ability to create change: "That is like expecting a Pinto to keep up with a Porsche simply because their engines both burn gasoline."[57] Focusing solely on individual or institutional factors for education policy to date has not produced equal educational outcomes. In fact emphasizing the interaction between these factors will illuminate a comprehensive picture, providing the best chance for an effective diagnosis and ultimately an effective prescription. An incorporation of individual and institutional factors would

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592707070065 Published online by Cambridge University Press

produce intersectional analysis in a manner consistent with question five of table 1.

Finally, as I have alluded, an intersectional approach to educational equity would require multiple methods and a design that can produce both empirical and normative theoretical results. It is clear from the hypothetical questions that no project can be addressed by a single method. As stated in the intersectional answer to question six, in order to provide a comprehensive, valid, and generalizable answer to a policy research question, multiple methods are necessary and sufficient.

Intersectionality is sympathetic and applicable to both the structural level of analysis, and individual-level phenomena via its domains of power thesis, which recognizes the various terrains on which politics plays out—structural and interpersonal.[58] In recognizing both aspects of "intractable political problems," intersectionality bridges part of the theoretical gap between critical theory, which often faces the dilemma of overemphasis on structural explanations, and liberalism's privileging of the atomized individual.[59] Intersectionality plays a mediating role between the yin of conspiracy-theory levels of structural research and the yang of pathologizing individual-level microanalyses. Just as neither yin nor yang can function alone, structural and micro-level research pursued in isolation from each other lack significant utility in addressing intractable political problems like persistent poverty, lack of political empowerment, and educational inequality.

The intersectional approach can produce empirical and normative results that can improve both the diagnosis of a policy problem and a prescriptive solution. In so doing, it enables a comprehensive, multi-level approach that dynamically engages individual and institutional factors in policy making across several relevant categories of difference. In the conclusion, I turn to the theoretical underpinnings of intersectionality, along with final comments regarding its impact on public policy.

Intersectionality as a Research Paradigm

Intersectionality stands ontologically between reductionist research that blindly seeks only the generalizable and particularized research so specialized that it cannot contribute to theory. While each individual claim of intersectionality as articulated in table 1 may not be unique, the synthesis produced by the six dimensions is indeed more than the sum of its parts. In this article I have reviewed the three predominant approaches to studying categories like race, gender, class, and sexual orientation in political science.

Intersectionality emerges out of the earlier unitary and multiple approaches, joining with other constructivist efforts in asserting first and foremost that reality is historically and socially constructed. In this way intersectionality represents an emerging paradigm from critical theory and its companion deconstructivist approaches, critical legal studies, critical race theory, feminist legal theory, and critical race feminism. All of these approaches acknowledge and incorporate the historical context in which contemporary power relations operate.

Most significantly for our purposes, although intersectionality emerges out of a deconstructionist tradition, it does not remain there. The domains of power thesis elaborates upon these theoretical roots by delineating a shared, integrated terrain upon which various categories of difference interact. It identifies the hegemonic (ideas, cultures, and ideologies), structural (social institutions), disciplinary (bureaucratic hierarchies and administrative practices), and interpersonal (routinized interactions among individuals) playing fields upon which race, gender, class, and other categories or traditions of difference interact to produce society.[60] Recognition of interactions in multiple domains may reveal additional options for non-traditional coalition building among groups.

While the recognition of four different contexts for policy change may initially appear daunting, designing policy with components in all four areas may succeed to a greater degree than narrowly-focused interventions. Intersectional investigations can shed light upon a number of new questions that remain uninvestigated or unanswered in the discipline. By unpacking the assumptions of the unitary and multiple approaches, intersectionality can fundamentally reshape the way in which political science research is conducted.

First, intersectionality serves as an important corrective for imprudent overemphasis on generalizability that overlooks the priority of producing valid knowledge claims.[61] Opening up rather than assuming a priori the relationship between categories in policy research, for example, provides greater targeting of funds, programs, and resources to groups and communities who require it. Moreover, intersectionality's emphasis on the relationships among categories can illuminate the most effective policy designs, not merely to whom money or other resources should be given.

Intersectionality's emphasis on the dynamic interaction between individual and institutional actors provides a more comprehensive examination of policy success and failure. Methodologically, this has traditionally meant an emphasis on the importance of holistic research that examines the potentially cross-cutting roles of race, class, and gender in the lives of a particular population.[62] Yet this emphasis does not then create a pre-determined set of methodologies or doctrines acceptable to all intersectionality theorists.[63] One area of research that remains under explored within intersectionality is the development of research designs and methods that can capture effectively all of the tenets of intersectionality theory outlined in table 1.[64]

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592707070065 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This article has attempted to begin a conversation in that regard rather than dictate a definitive methodological approach to intersectionality. When combined with fuzzy-set logic, it gains empirical utility and potentially improves data collection for all empirical researchers. In this sense intersectionality as a research paradigm can generate problem-driven research: it takes a problem in the world, analyzes and moves beyond earlier approaches to studying the problem, and develops a more powerful model to test for its effectiveness in addressing the problem.[65]

Notes

1 Giddings 1984; West 1981.
2 Goldman 1931/1970.
3 Guba and Lincoln 1994, 107.
4 Kuhn 1996, 10, 23.
5 McCall 2005; see also Hawkesworth 2003.
6 Ture and Hamilton 1967/1992, 44.
7 See Jung 2003 for a comprehensive introduction to the development of indigenous political identity in Mexico, its international and regional influences, and its links to international movements for gender equity.
8 Skocpol 1995.
9 Skocpol 1995; Sapiro 1990.
10 More current research on the gender gap in American politics tends to share this logic as well.
11 Cruz 1998; see also West and Fenstermaker 1995.
12 Cohen 1999.
13 Calhoun 1995; Cohen 1999 uses the term "secondary marginalization" to identify the same phenomenon.
14 See Schneider and Ingram 1993, 1995; Schroedel and Jordan 1998; Hancock 2004. While intersectionality clearly would be part of a larger constructivist tradition, I leave the ontological and epistemological concerns of constructivism and their relationship to intersectionality for another article.
15 See Sniderman, Tetlock, and Brady 1991; Dawson 1994; Tate 1994; Kinder and Sanders 1996. See also Quadagno 1994; Mink 1998, 1999.
16 Carter, Sellers, and Squires 2002; Hawkesworth 2003.
17 McCall 2005, 7.
18 The reverse is also true; the plethora of in-depth case intersectionality studies is ripe for testing with fuzzy-set methods.
19 See King and Smith 2005.
20 These four categories arise most frequently in the literature, though national origin, citizenship status, and [dis]ability have also emerged. See Cohen 1999; Collins 2000.
21 Oloka-Onyango and Tamale 1995, 704; see also Wing 2001.
22 Talpade Mohanty 1991; Hancock 2005.
23 El Saadawi 1981; Morsy 1991; Ogundipe-Leslie 1994.
24 See Darder and Torres 2004, 22 for one such example. Whether the categories are placed in a hierarchical relationship or even in opposition to each other, the a priori determination of these relationships results in an overly narrow diagnosis of the situation and subsequent proposed remedies to the problem, as I will demonstrate in the next section.
25 C. Harris 1993.
26 Martinez 1993.
27 Ogbu and Simons 1998.
28 Ogbu and Fordham 1986.
29 Bell builds upon the earlier work of Gerald Rosenberg and Mary Dudziak in this regard; 134–36; 60, 66.
30 Orfield, Gary. Presentation at "Brown at 50" conference, Yale University, April 2004.
31 Bell 2004, 82.
32 Ibid., 84–85.
33 *Gratz v. Bollinger,* 539 US 244; *Grutter v. Bollinger,* 539 US 982.
34 Bell 2004, 158.
35 Ibid., 159.
36 Ibid., 163–164.
37 For the data that produced this assertion see: http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/.
38 For the data that produced these assertions see www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr-01.5.pdf.
39 U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics from the year 2000 indicate that the number of women per capita involved in the criminal justice system has grown 48 percent between 1990 and 1998, vs. 27 percent for males, the number of women on probation has grown 40 percent, the jail rate of women grew 60 percent, the imprisonment rate grew 88 percent, and the number of women offenders on parole has increased by 80 percent (2000, 6). Nearly two thirds of the jail/prison population of women in the U.S. is not white (African American, Hispanic or "other races". Two thirds of the women on probation are white (2000, 7). See also Schaffner, Shick, and Stein 1997.
40 Laidler and Hunt 1997.
41 U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; Prothrow-Stith 1991. Juenke 2005 demonstrates the pitfalls of misspecification for developing policy solutions that can reduce the Latino dropout rate.
42 In addition to the citations noted above, see also Madriz 1997; Wing and Willis in Wing 1997.
43 See Skocpol 1995; Smith 1993, 2003; King and Smith 2005.
44 Gay and Tate 1998; Clawson and Clark 2003.
45 See Ragin 2000 for a critique of this assumption under conditions of causal complexity.
46 Cohen 1999, 63–64.
47 See Wing 2005.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592707070065 Published online by Cambridge University Press

48 Crenshaw 1991, 1995; see also Rivera in Wing 1997.
49 Mamdani 2001.
50 See Ragin 2000.
51 Sellers and Shelton 2003; Shelton and Sellers 2000; Root 1989, 1992; Helms 1995.
52 Taliman 2003.
53 Ragin 2000, 15.
54 Ibid., 89.
55 Steele 1992; Steele and Aronson 1995.
56 Juenke 2005.
57 Bell 2004, 164
58 Collins 2000.
59 Shapiro 2002.
60 Collins 2000, 276.
61 See Shapiro 2002, 11.
62 See McCall 2005.
63 See Crenshaw 1995.
64 McCall 2005.
65 Shapiro 2002.

References

Appiah, Kwame Anthony, and Amy Gutmann. 1996. *Color Conscious: The Political Morality of Race.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Baumgartner, Frank, and Bryan Jones. 1993. *Agendas and Instability in American Politics.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bell, Derrick. 2004. *Silent Covenants:* Brown v. Board of Education *and the Unfulfilled Hopes for Racial Reform.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Bobo, Lawrence, and Frank Gilliam. 1990. Race, sociopolitical participation and Black empowerment. *American Political Science Review* 84 (2): 377–93.

Bowen, William, and Derek Bok. 1998. *The Shape of the River: Long-Term Consequences of Considering Race in College and University Admissions.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Calhoun, Craig. 1995. *Critical Social Theory: Culture, History and the Challenge of Difference.* Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Carter, Prudence, Sherrill Sellers, and Catherine Squires. 2002. Reflections on race/ethnicity, class and gender inclusive research. *African American Research Perspectives* 8 (1): 111–24.

Clawson, Rosalee A., and John A. Clark. 2003. "The Attitudinal structure of African American women party activists: The Impact of race, gender, and religion." *Political Research Quarterly* 56 (2): 211–21.

Clawson, Rosalee, and Rakuya Trice. 2000. Poverty as we know it: Media portrayals of the poor. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 64 (1): 53–64.

Cockburn, Cynthia. 1998. *The Space Between Us: Negotiating Gender and National Identities in Conflict.* New York: Zed Books.

Cohen, Cathy J. 1999. *The Boundaries of Blackness.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cole, E.R., and Abigail Stewart. 2001. Invidious comparisons: Imagining a psychology of race and gender beyond differences. *Political Psychology* 22 (2): 293–308.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 1998. It's all in the family: Intersections of gender, race and nation. *Hypatia* 13: 62–82.

———. 2000. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness and the Politics of Empowerment.* New York: Routledge.

Crenshaw, Kimberle Williams. 1991. Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. In *Feminist Legal Theory: Readings in Law and Gender,* eds. Katherine Bartlett and Rose Kennedy. San Francisco: Westview Press.

———. 1995. Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics and violence against women of color. In *Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings that Formed the Movement,* eds. Kimberle Crenshaw, Neil Gotanda, Gary Peller and Kendall Thomas. New York: New Press.

———. 2002. "The First Decade: Critical Reflections, or 'A Foot in the Closing Door.'" *UCLA Law Review* 49 (5): 1343–72.

Cruz, Jose. 1998. *Identity and Power: Puerto Rican Politics and the Challenge of Ethnicity.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Darder, Antonia, and Rodolfo Torres. 2004. *After Race: Racism after Multiculturalism.* New York: New York University Press.

Dawson, Michael. 1994. *Behind the Mule: Race and Class in African-American Politics.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

El Saadawi, Nawal. 1981. *The Hidden Face of Eve.* London: Zed Press.

———. 1988. Growing up female in Egypt. In *Women and Family in the Middle East: New Voices of Change.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Fraser, Nancy. 1989. *Unruly Practices: Power, Discourse and Gender in Contemporary Social Theory.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Gamson, Joshua. 1996. Must identity movements self-destruct? A queer dilemma. In *Queer Theory/Sociology,* ed. Steven Seidman. Cambridge: Blackwell.

Gay, Claudine, and Katherine Tate. 1998. Doubly bound: The impact of gender and race on the politics of Black women. *Political Psychology* 19 (1): 169–84.

Giddings, Paula. 1984. *When and Where I Enter: The Impact of Black Women on Race and Sex in America.* New York: Bantam Books.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592707070065 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Gilens, Martin. 2000. *Why Americans Hate Welfare: Race, Media and the Politics of Antipoverty Policy.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Goldman, Emma. 1970 [1931]. *Living My Life: In Two Volumes.* New York: Dover Publications.
Gratz v. Bollinger. 2003. 539 US 244.
Grutter v. Bollinger. 2003. 539 US 982.
Guba, Egon, and Yvonne Lincoln. 1994. Grounded Theory. In *Handbook of Qualitative Research,* ed. Yvonne Lincoln and Norman Denzin. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
Guinier, Lani. 1994. *The Tyranny of the Majority: Fundamental Fairness in Representative Democracy.* New York: Free Press.
Hancock, Ange-Marie. 2003. Contemporary welfare reform and the public identity of the "welfare queen." *Race, Gender and Class* 10 (1): 31–59.
———. 2004. *The Politics of Disgust: The Public Identity of the "Welfare Queen."* New York: New York University Press.
———. 2005. Overcoming willful blindness: Building egalitarian multicultural women's coalitions. In *Female Circumcision and the Politics of Knowledge: African Women in Imperialist Discourses,* ed. Obioma Nnaemeka. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
Hancock, Ange-Marie, and Karen Bower, eds. 2003. Symposium: Ubuntu—Humane solutions and success stories from Africa. *Peace Review* 15 (3): 251–317; 357–68.
Harris, Angela P. 1994. Foreword: The jurisprudence of Reconstruction. *California Law Review* 82 (4): 741–85.
Harris, Cheryl I. 1993. Whiteness as Property. *Harvard Law Review* 106 (8): 1709–91.
Hawkesworth, Mary. 2003. Congressional Enactments of Race-Gender: Toward a Theory of Race-Gendered Institutions. *American Political Science Review* 97 (4): 529–50.
Helms, Janet. 1995. An update of Helms' white and people of color racial identity models. In *Handbook of Multicultural Counseling,* ed. J.G. Ponterotto, J.M. Casas, L.A. Suzuki, and C.M. Alexander. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Holden, Matthew. 1973. *The Divisible Republic.* New York: Abelard-Schuman.
Hooks, Bell. 1989. *Talking Back: Thinking Feminist, Thinking Black.* Boston: South End Press.
Jacobs, Susie; Ruth Jacobson, and Jennifer Marchbank, eds. 2000. *States of Conflict: Gender, Violence and Resistance.* New York: Zed Books.
Juenke, Eric Gonzalez. 2005. "Macro-economic Labor Conditions and Latino Students: How Unemployment Changes Affect Dropout Rates." Policy paper prepared for the CANTU Foundation.
Jung, Courtney. 2003. The politics of indigenous identity: Neoliberalism, cultural rights, and the Mexican Zapatistas. *Social Research* 70 (2): 433–61.
Kelley, Robin D.G. 2002. *Freedom Dreams: The Black Radical Imagination.* New York: Beacon Press.
Kinder, Donald R., and Lynn M. Sanders. 1996. *Divided by Color: Racial Politics and Democratic Ideals.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
King, Desmond, and Rogers Smith. 2005. Racial orders in American political development. *American Political Science Review* 99 (1): 75–92.
Kuhn, Thomas. 1996. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Laidler, Karen, and Geoffrey Hunt. 1997. Violence and social organization in female gangs. *Social Justice* 24 (4): 148–69.
Lieberman, Robert, Anne Schnedier, and Helen Ingram. 1995. Social construction (continued): Response. *American Political Science Review* 89 (2): 441–46.
Lien, Pei-Te. 1998. Does the gender gap in political attitudes and behavior vary across racial groups? *Political Research Quarterly* 51 (4): 869–94.
Madriz, Esther. 1997. *Nothing Bad Happens to Good Girls: Fear of Crime in Women's Lives.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
MacKinnon, Catherine. 1989. *A Feminist Theory of the State.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Mamdani, Mahmoud. 2001. *When Victims Become Killers: Colonialism, Nativism, and the Genocide in Rwanda.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Martinez, Elizabeth. 1993. Beyond Black/white: The racisms of our time. *Social Justice* 20 (1–2): 22–34.
McCall, Leslie. 2005. The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 30 (3): 1771–1800.
McClintock, Anne. 1993. Family feuds: Gender, nationalism and the family. *Feminist Review* 44 (Summer): 61–80.
Mekuria, Salem, Seble Dawit, and Nahid Toubia. 1995. Female genital mutilation in Africa: Some African views. *ACAS Bulletin* 44–45: 2–6.
Mendelberg, Tali. 2001. *The Race Card: Campaign Strategy, Implicit Messages and the Norm of Equality.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Merelman, Richard M. 1984. *Making Something of Ourselves: On Culture and Politics in the United States.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
Mink, Gwendolyn. 1998. *Welfare's End.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
———. 1999. *Whose Welfare?* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
Morsy, Soheir. 1991. Safeguarding women's bodies: The white man's burden medicalized. *Medical Anthropology Quarterly* 5 (1): 19–23.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592707070065 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Newbury, Catharine. 1994. Introduction: Paradoxes of democracy in Africa. *African Studies Review* 37 (1): 1–8.
Nnaemeka, Obioma. 1998. Introduction: Reading the Rainbow. In *Sisterhood, Feminisms and Power.* Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, Inc.
Ogbu, John. 1995a. Cultural problems in minority education: Their interpretations and consequences—Part One: Theoretical Background. *Urban Review* 27 (3): 189–205.
———. 1995b. Cultural problems in minority education: Their interpretations and consequences—Part Two: Case Studies. *Urban Review* 27 (4): 271–97.
Ogbu, John, and Signithia Fordham. 1986. Black students' school success: Coping with the burden of "acting white." *Urban Review* 18 (3): 176–206.
Ogbu, John, and Herbert Simons. 1998. Voluntary and involuntary minorities: A cultural-ecological theory of school performance with some implications for education. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 29 (2): 155–88.
Ogundipe-Leslie, Molara. 1994. *Recreating Ourselves: African Women and Critical Transformations.* Trenton: Africa World Press.
Okeke, Philomena E. 1996. Postmodern feminism and knowledge production: The African context. *Africa Today* 43 (3): 223–34.
Oloka-Onyango, J., and Sylvia Tamale. 1995. The personal is political, or why women's rights are indeed human rights: An African perspective on international feminism. *Human Rights Quarterly* 17 (4): 691–731.
Orfield, Gary. 2004. "Equal but Separate? The Shape of Public Education Today." Presented at *Brown* at 50 Conference, Yale University Law School, April 1–3.
Prothrow-Stith, Deborah. 1991. *Deadly Consequences: How Violence Is Destroying our Teenage Population and a Plan to Begin Solving the Problem.* New York: Harper Collins.
Quadagno, Jill. 1994. *The Color of Welfare: How Racism Undermined the War on Poverty.* New York: Oxford University Press.
Ragin, Charles. 2000. *Fuzzy-Set Social Science.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Rivera, Jenny. 1997. Domestic violence against Latinas by Latino males. In *Critical Race Feminism,* ed. Adrien Katherine Wing. New York: New York University Press.
Root, Maria P.P. 1989. Resolving "other" status: Identity development of biracial individuals. In *Diversity and Complexity in Feminist Therapy,* ed. L.S. Brown and Maria P.P. Root. New York: Haworth Press.
———, ed. 1992. *Racially Mixed People in America.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Sapiro, Virginia. 1990. The gender basis of American social policy. In *Women, the State and Welfare,* ed. Linda Gordon. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
Schaffner, Laurie, Shelley Shick, and Nancy Stein. 1997. Changing Policy in San Francisco: Girls in the Juvenile Justice System. *Social Justice* 24 (4): 187ff.
Schneider, Anne, and Helen Ingram. 1993. Social construction of target populations: Implications for politics and policy. *American Political Science Review* 87 (2): 334–47.
———. 1995. Social construction (continued): Response. *American Political Science Review* 89 (2): 441–46.
Schram, Sanford. 1995. *Words of Welfare: The Poverty of Social Science and the Social Science of Poverty.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Schroedel, Jean, and Daniel Jordan. 1998. Senate voting and social construction of target populations: A study of AIDS policy making, 1987–1992. *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law* 23 (1): 107–32.
Scott, Joan. 1984. Gender: A useful category of historical analysis? *American Historical Review* 91 (December): 1053–75.
Sellers, Robert, and J. Nicole Shelton. 2003. The role of racial identity in perceived racial discrimination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 84 (5): 1079–92.
Sen, Gita, and Caren Grown. 1987. *Development, Crises and Alternative Visions: Third World Women's Perspectives.* New York: Monthly Review Press.
Shapiro, Ian. 2002. Problems, methods and theories in the study of politics; or, what's wrong with political science and what to do about it. *Political Theory* 30 (4): 568–611.
Shelton, J. Nicole, and Robert Sellers. 2000. Situational Stability and Variability in African American Racial Identity. *Journal of Black Psychology* 26 (1): 27–50.
Sklar, Richard. 1996. Democracy in Africa. *African Studies Review* 26 (3–4): 11–24.
Skocpol, Theda. 1995. *Social Policy in the United States.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Smith, Rogers M. 1993. Beyond Toqueville, Myrdal and Hartz: The multiple traditions thesis in America. *American Political Science Review* 87 (2): 549–65.
———. 2003. *Stories of Peoplehood.* New York: Cambridge University Press.
Sniderman, Paul, Philip Tetlock, and Paul Brady. 1991. *Reasoning and Choice: Explorations in Political Psychology.* New York: Cambridge University Press.
Soss, Joe. 1999. Lessons of Welfare: Policy design, political learning and political action. *American Political Science Review* 93 (2): 363–80.
Soss, Joe, and Danielle LeClair. 2004. Race, sex and the implicit politics of welfare reform. Presented at

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592707070065 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meetings, Chicago, April 15–18.
Spelman, Elizabeth. 1988. *Inessential Woman: Problems of Exclusion in Feminist Thought.* Boston: Beacon Press.
Steady, Filomena Chioma. 1987. African feminism: A worldwide perspective. In *Women in Africa and the African Diaspora,* ed. Roslyn Terborg-Penn et al. Washington: Howard University Press.
Steele, Claude M. 1992. "Race and the Schooling of Black Americans." *Atlantic Monthly* 269 (4): 68–78.
Steele, Claude M., and Joshua Aronson. 1995. Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 69: 797–811.
Steele, Claude M., and David Sherman. 1999. The psychological predicament of women on welfare. In *Cultural Divides: Understanding and Overcoming Group Conflict,* ed. David Prentice and David Miller. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
Sylvester, Christine. 1995. African and western feminisms: World traveling the tendencies and possibilities. *Signs* 20 (4): 941–69.
Taliman, Valerie. 2003. "Native Currents: Termination by Bureaucracy." *Indian Country Today,* May 28.
Talpade Mohanty, Chandra. 1991. Under western eyes. In *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism,* ed. Chandra Talpade Mohanty et al. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
Tate, Katherine. 1994. *From Protest to Politics: The New Black Voters in American Elections.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Ture, Kwame, and Charles V. Hamilton. 1992 [1967]. *Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America.* New York: Random House.
U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics. http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/. Accessed April 2005.
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. http://www.hhs.gov/. Accessed April 2005.
West, Candace, and Sarah Fenstermaker. 1995. Doing difference. *Gender and Society* 9 (1): 8–37.
West, Guida. 1981. *The National Welfare Rights Movement: The Social Protest of Poor Women.* New York: Praeger.
Williams, Melissa. 1998. *Voice, Trust and Memory: Marginalized Groups and the Failings of Liberal Representation.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Wing, Adrien Katherine, ed. 1997. *Critical Race Feminism.* New York: New York University Press.
———. 2000. *Global Critical Race Feminism.* New York: New York University Press.
———. 2001. Polygamy from Southern Africa to Black Brittania to Black America: Global critical race feminism as legal reform for the twenty-first century. *Journal of Contemporary Legal Issues* 11 (2): 811–63.
———. 2005. Examining the correlation between disability and poverty: A comment from a critical race feminist perspective—Helping the Joneses to keep up! *Journal of Gender, Race and Justice* 8 (3): 655–66.
Wing, Adrien Katherine, and Catherine Willis. 1997. Sisters in the hood: Beyond bloods and crips. In *Critical Race Feminism.* New York: New York University Press.
Young, Iris Marion. 1997. *Intersecting Voices: Dilemmas of Gender, Political Philosophy and Policy.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592707070065 Published online by Cambridge University Press