

Course syllabus
Equality Policy in Comparative Perspective
Central European University, School of Public Policy
2020/2021

Course instructors: Andrea Krizsan and Violetta Zentai, School of Public Policy
Teaching assistant: Gunsyma Shaydorova, PhD candidate, School of Public Policy
Credit number: 2 (4 ECTS Credits)
Course level: M.A.
Office hours: by appointment requested at krizsana@ceu.edu and
zentaiv@ceu.edu and Shaydorova_Gunsyma@phd.ceu.edu

Brief overview

The main aim of this course is to familiarize students with how the abstract legal principle of and political claims for equality are turned into policy and practice in Europe and beyond. Starting from what equality means as a basic legal principle and right in modern democratic systems, the course will move on to critically analyze the policy visions, policy approaches and policy tools used to put equality into practice. The course will look at equality ideas and interventions through the lens of various grounds of inequality: race and ethnicity, gender, and disability and devote special attention to the intersection between different inequality axes. The focus will be on domestic and international policy practices developed in the last decades and will reflect upon recent challenges to equality thinking. Students will be encouraged to bring in the discussion issues and cases from the policy environments with which they are most familiar and look into how equality policy practices can travel across countries and regions.

Learning Outcomes:

The course will sensitize students interested in issues of governance, politics, and public policy to challenges of social diversity, cleavages and distinctions that are pertinent to developed and new democracies and societies in transformations. Due to the nature of the topic, the course will invite students to develop their skills of critical thinking by understanding major political and policy debates that shape considerations on the principles of equality and social justice. The teaching method will ensure that students have to regularly synthesize different pieces of knowledge (discussion of the core readings), to critically evaluate the differences and overlaps of arguments, to translate theoretical notions of equality into policy practice, and to recognize theoretical relevance of policy debates. Students will also learn to work in groups, to do targeted inquiries into relevant policy processes (group work and term paper), and to develop their academic writing skills (reflection papers and term paper).

Assignments and Assessment:

Students are expected to carefully consult the required readings each week prior to the classes, ideally by taking notes. The questions for discussion assigned to the sessions in the syllabus help students engage with the readings and identify the main conceptual

puzzles, arguments, and debates related to the topic of the session. To kick off the debate in each session, 2-4 students will be assigned to bring discussion points to the readings in the class and present those in 3-5 minutes. Each student should contribute with discussion points at least two times during the term. Active participation in the seminar discussions is expected from all students.

In sessions 6, 8, 10 and 12, we do policy practice related group work within class. Students will divide according to their interest in three groups (formed in the preceding session) and read three different readings (one per group). Groups discuss and present their respective themes to the rest of the class. During these sessions, students are expected to be active and cooperative participants in the group work and take turns in presenting group findings.

Weight to the grade: 30%

Students are expected to write 4 reflection papers related to mandatory readings (250-300 words in length). Reflection papers should reflect on the main arguments of the weekly mandatory reading possibly bringing in the student's theoretical and empirical background knowledge. Assignments are due at 9 AM of the day of the class for which the assignment is written (i.e. if you are commenting the readings for Class 5, you should submit on the e-learning website by 9 AM of the day when Class 5 takes place).

Weight to the grade: 30%

Students will write a term paper of 2,000-2,500 words. A list of recommended topics will be provided. Papers will have to use the literature assigned to the course. Additional references can be used from the recommended readings and beyond. The deadline for submitting the paper will be announced in due course during the term, adjusted to SPP exam schedules.

Weight to the grade: 40%

All written assignments will be checked for plagiarism via Turnitin.

Course materials:

Course materials are available from the e-learning site of the course:

<https://ceulearning.ceu.edu/course/view.php?id=11525>

RECOMMENDED PREPARATION FOR STUDENTS WITH NO BACKGROUND IN PUBLIC POLICY

Instructors recommend that students, who are enrolled in programs other than the master programs at SPP, consult selected chapters of a recommended public policy textbook prior to immersing themselves into the course readings. This is to get insights in the basics of the policy language, conceptual frames, and styles of reasoning pertinent to policy studies, and within that, a broader equality agenda.

Paul Cairney (2012) *Understanding Public Policy: Theories and Issues*. Palgrave MacMillan. Selection.

TOPICS AND READINGS

I. Introduction

Readings and discussions will overview the theoretical foundations of the equality concept and their roots in social, legal, and political theory.

1. First Week: Basic Concepts

This class will discuss dilemmas around defining categories used in equality policy and will do an overview of main equality concepts, their contradictions and complementarities, to be discussed in more detail in the next sessions. Questions addressed will include: Should equality policy thinking be informed by individualist or group-based thinking? What are the specific groups whose members should be protected? What criteria define such groups and their members? Can we justify protection for traditional equality grounds such as ethnicity or gender, while neglecting poverty or class?

Readings

Sandra Fredman (2002) "Equality: Concepts and Controversies" in *Discrimination Law*. Oxford UP. Pp. 1-26

Sandra Fredman (2002) "The Scope of Discrimination Law: Grounds of Discrimination" in *Discrimination Law*. Oxford UP. Pp. 66-82

Recommended

Iris Marion Young (1990) "Five faces of oppression" in *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Pp. 39-66.

Owen Fiss (1976) "Groups and the Equal Protection Clause", 5 *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 107.

Nancy Fraser (2003) "Rethinking Recognition: overcoming displacement and reification in cultural politics" in *Recognition Struggles and Social Movements: Contested Identities, Agency and Power*, edited by B. Hobson. Cambridge: Cambridge U.P.

II. Visions of Equality

This section of the class will discuss the three different general approaches to equality and the policy tools related to them. The three approaches are: equal treatment, positive action for disadvantaged groups and, third, transformation through mainstreaming equality.

2. Second Week: Equal Treatment – Anti-discrimination

This week's class will discuss formal, procedural equality, and the principle of non-discrimination. Legal concepts of direct and indirect discrimination will also be introduced. The discussion will be geared towards understanding how formal procedural

approaches to inequality prove to be insufficient in addressing the deeply rooted social problem of inequality.

Questions for discussion: What does equal treatment mean? Why do we need an anti-discrimination policy? What are the main strengths and weaknesses of the anti-discrimination approach?

Readings and other class material

Presentations to watch

Sandra Ferdman (2013) Anti-discrimination laws and work in the developing world: A thematic overview. BACKGROUND PAPER FOR THE WORLD DEVELOPMENT REPORT 2013. http://adapt.it/adapt-indice-a-z/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/wdr_anti-discrimination_laws_2013.pdf

Recommended

Sandra Fredman (2002) “Legal concepts: Direct, Indirect Discrimination, and Beyond” in *Discrimination Law*. Oxford UP. Pp. 92-116

EC Race Directive (43/2000/EC) <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32000L0043:en:HTML>

Paul Brest (1976) The Supreme Court 1975 Term. Forward: In Defense of the Antidiscrimination Principle, 90 *Harvard Law Review* 1-55.

Andrew Koppelman (1996) “Process Based Theories” in *Antidiscrimination Law and Social Equality*. Yale University Press New Haven, London. Pp. 13-57

Martin MacEwen, ed. (1997) *Anti-Discrimination Law Enforcement. A Comparative Perspective*. Introductory chapter. Ashgate Aldershot. Pp.1-30.

James Goldston (2006) “Public Interest Litigation in Central and Eastern Europe: Roots, Prospects, and Challenges” *Human Rights Quarterly*. Vol 28, Number 2. pp. 492-527

Rikki Holtmaat (2007) Catalysts for change? Equality Bodies according to Directive 2000/43/EC http://www.migpolgroup.com/publications_detail.php?id=159

Aron Buzogany (2012) Swimming Against the Tide: Anti-Discrimination Advocacy in Central and Eastern Europe. In Lombardo and Forest (eds.) *The Europeanization of Gender Equality Policies. A Discursive -Sociological Approach*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

O’Cinneide, C. (2013). Completing the picture: The complex relationship between EU anti-discrimination law and ‘Social Europe’. In N. Countouris & M. Freedland (Eds.), *Resocialising Europe in a Time of Crisis* (pp. 118-137). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

UN and the Rule of Law. Equality and Non-discrimination thematic website resources: <https://www.un.org/ruleoflaw/thematic-areas/human-rights/equality-and-non-discrimination/>

3. **Third week: Positive Action and Equal Opportunities**

Advanced understandings of discrimination will be introduced such as indirect discrimination and institutional discrimination. The concept of equal opportunities will be discussed along with different forms of positive action and preferential treatment. The class will also discuss affirmative action programs, and debates revolving around them. The distinction between process based and result based approaches will be addressed. Fields to consider: higher education, politics, company boards, employment.

Questions for discussion: What are the arguments that support positive action? What are the main criticisms that can be formulated? What are the different forms and instruments of positive action? Do these differ across various policy fields?

Readings and other class material

Presentations to watch

Ronald Dworkin (2005) “Affirmative Action: Does It Work?” and “Affirmative Action: Is It Fair?” in *Sovereign Virtue. The Theory and Practice of Equality*. Harvard UP. Pp.386-427

Recommended:

European Commission (2009) International perspectives on positive action measures - A comparative analysis in the European Union, Canada, the United States and South Africa <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/45515983-3e3e-4a24-bcbc-477f04f0ba04> (selected parts: chapter 2-3-5)

Jo Armstrong, Walby, Sylvia (2012) Gender quotas in management boards. <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/document/activities/cont/201202/20120216ATT38420/20120216ATT38420EN.pdf>

Sandra Fredman (2002) “Beyond Indirect Discrimination” and “Symmetry and Substance: Reverse Discrimination” in *Discrimination Law*. Oxford UP. Pp. 121-160

Christopher McCrudden (1982) “Institutional Discrimination”, *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, Vol. 2, No. 3. Pp. 303-367.

Colm O’Cinneide (2006) ‘Positive Action and the Limits of the Law’ in *Maastricht Journal of European and Comparative Law*. Vol. 13/3. Pp. 351-365.

Thomas Nagel (1977) “Introduction” in Cohen, Nagel, Scanlon eds. *Equality and Preferential Treatment*. Princeton UP. Princeton, New Jersey. Pp. VII-XIV.

Jones, Hardy (1977) On the Justifiability of Reverse Discrimination. In Barry Gross ed. *Reverse Discrimination*. Buffalo: Prometheus Books: 349-357.

Thomas Sowell (2004): The Past in the Future. In *Affirmative Action Round the World*. Yale University Press: 166-198.

Peria, Michelle, and Stanley R. Bailey. “Remaking Racial Inclusion: Combining Race and Class in Brazil’s New Affirmative Action.” *Latin American and Caribbean Ethnic Studies* 9, no. 2 (May 4, 2014): 156–76.

4. Fourth Week: Mainstreaming equality

This week the concept of mainstreaming equality will be discussed. Mainstreaming is the most novel approach to equality, which purports to transgress both the logic of the equal treatment and of the positive action approach, by suggesting a thorough cultural transformation in society and structures of inequality. Discussion in the class will address the conceptual underpinning of mainstreaming and dilemmas and tensions rising from putting it into policy practice. The class will also summarize and discuss the complementarity of the three main approaches used in equality policy: equal treatment, positive action and mainstreaming.

Questions for discussion: What can be lost and gained by applying the tool of mainstreaming compared to targeted (positive) actions? Do mainstreaming interventions make equal treatment and positive actions unnecessary? Explain/justify the response.

Readings and other class material

Presentation to watch

Teresa Rees (1998) *Mainstreaming Equality in the European Union: Education, Training and Labour Market Policies*, London: Routledge, Chapter 3 “Conceptualising Equal Opportunities” (p.26-49)

Recommended

- Sylvia Walby (2005) “Gender Mainstreaming: Productive Tensions in Theory and Practice” *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State and Society*. Volume 12, Number 3, Fall, pp. 321-34
- Booth, C. and Bennett, C. (2002). Gender mainstreaming in the European Union: towards a new conception and practice of equal opportunities? *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 9(4), 430-446.
- Council of Europe “Gender mainstreaming. Conceptual framework, methodology and presentation of good practices.” Final report of Activities of the Group of Specialists on Mainstreaming (EG-S-MS). Strasbourg, May 1998
- EC (2011) Compendium of Practice on Non-Discrimination/Equality Mainstreaming http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/files/compendium_mainstreaming_equality_en.pdf
- Fiona Beveridge, Sue Nott & Kylie Stephen (2000): Mainstreaming and the engendering of policy-making: a means to an end? *Journal of European Public Policy*, 7:3, 385-405
- Mark A. Pollack & Emilie Hafner-Burton (2000): Mainstreaming gender in the European Union, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 7:3, 432-456
- Sonia Mazey (2002) Gender Mainstreaming Strategies in the EU: Delivering on an agenda? *Feminist Legal Studies*. 10:227-240
- Mieke Verloo (2005). Displacement and Empowerment: Reflections on the Concept and Practice of the Council of Europe Approach to Gender Mainstreaming and Gender Equality. *Social Politics*, 12(3), 344-365.

- Laurel Weldon (2002) "Beyond Bodies: Institutional Sources of Representation for Women in Democratic Policy-Making" *The Journal of Politics*. Vol.64, No.4, pp.1153-1174
- Alison Woodward (2004) "Building Velvet Triangles: Gender and Informal Governance." in *Informal Governance and the European Union* edited by Simona Piattoni and Thomas Christiansen, London: Edward Elgar. Pp. 76-93
- Jo Shaw (2005) 'Mainstreaming Equality and Diversity in the European Union'. *Current Legal Problems*. Vol 58: 255-312
- Elisabeth Prugl (2011) Diversity Management and Gender Mainstreaming as Technologies of Government. *Politics & Gender*, 7 (2011), 71–89.
- Carol Bacchi and Joan Evelin eds. (2010) *Mainstreaming Politics. Gendering Practices and Feminist Theory*. <https://www.adelaide.edu.au/press/titles/mainstreaming>

III. Specific grounds of equality

Having discussed the more general approaches to equality, the course will turn to examine the specifics of the different grounds of inequality. The main question addressed in this part of the course will be: Can different inequality grounds be handled together theoretically and by policy? Are there any specifics of the different inequality grounds that merit special attention? Should the holders of multiple intersecting inequalities be treated as worth of specific consideration?

5. Week Five: Ethnicity and Race

Specifics of inequality on grounds of race or ethnicity will be discussed as structural forms of discrimination typical for this ground, such as segregation in different social fields, and minority rights, which constructs the concept of equality along the diversity of ethnic groups. Discussion of the two distinct issues will converge in a debate about the group of Roma; a specific group whose protection points both towards de-segregation policies as well as minority rights policies.

Questions for discussion: What is the better way to protect ethnic groups: minority rights or equality rights? Is this an either/or choice? What are the limitations of these two different approaches? Examples beyond the European context.

Readings and other class material

Presentation to watch

Kristin Henrard (2007) Equal Rights versus Special Right? *Minority Protection and the Prohibition of Discrimination. European Commission*. Parts I, II, V.

Recommended

EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies up to 2020

http://ec.europa.eu/justice/policies/discrimination/docs/com_2011_173_en.pdf

- Act LXXVII of 1993 on the Rights of National and Ethnic Minorities (Hungary)
http://www.minelres.lv/NationalLegislation/Hungary/Hungary_Minorities_English.htm
- Charles Taylor (1992) *Multiculturalism and the Politics of Recognition*, Princeton University Press.
- Will Kymlicka (1995) "Freedom and Culture" in *Multicultural Citizenship*. Oxford UP: 75-106
- Lilla Farkas (2007) *Segregation of Roma Children in Education. Addressing Structural Discrimination through the Race Equality Directive*. European Commission. DG Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities.
http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/fundamental_rights/pdf/legnet/seg07_en.pdf
- European Parliament (2011) *Measures to promote the situation of Roma EU citizens in the European Union*. A study. http://www.euromanet.eu/upload/77/37/EP_Roma.pdf
- Christopher McCrudden (2001) "International and European Norms Regarding National Legal Remedies for Racial Equality" in *Discrimination and Human Rights. The Case of Racism* edited by Sandra Fredman. Oxford UP. Pp.251-307.
- Greenberg, Jack. 2010. "Report on Roma Education Today: From Slavery to Segregation and Beyond." *Columbia Law Review* 110:919-1348.
- Lilla Farkas (2017) *The meaning of racial or ethnic origin in EU law: between stereotypes and identities*. European Commission. Directorate-General for Justice and Consumers. <http://www.equalitylaw.eu/downloads/4030-the-meaning-of-racial-or-ethnic-origin-in-eu-law-between-stereotypes-and-identities>
- Jean-Michel Lafleur and Elsa Mescoli (2018) Creating Undocumented EU Migrants through Welfare: A Conceptualization of Undeserving and Precarious Citizenship. *Sociology* Vol. 52(3) 480–496.

6. Week Six: Ethnicity and Race – Policy Practice

Group 1:

Matarazzo, Martina and Violeta Naydenova (2019) Post-2020 EU Roma Strategy: The Way Forward. Brussels / Budapest.
<https://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/uploads/7004b0da-956d-4df9-a1f7-d889a00ae9d5/post-2020-eu-roma-strategy-the-way-forward-20190627.pdf>

Group 2:

ICERD shadow reporting mechanism: Submission by the Hungarian Helsinki Committee regarding the 18th - 25th Periodic Reports of Hungary to the UN Committee on Elimination of Racial Discrimination at its 98th session
<https://www.helsinki.hu/wp-content/uploads/HHC-submission-to-CERD-2019.pdf>

Group 3:

Council of Europe Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities.
<https://www.coe.int/en/web/minorities>
 EC Race Directive <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32000L0043&from=en>

7. **Week Seven: Gender Equality**

We will specifically discuss how gender inequality is different from racial inequality and what constitutes its specificity, if anything. The main issues to be discussed will revolve around the concepts of sameness and difference and how these construct the understanding of gender inequality. We will address the problem of inequality in the private – family –sphere and how it impacts on gender inequality and we will discuss the issue of sexual violence as another issue that is particularly relevant if gender inequality and discrimination is to be understood. Discussion should also touch on whether sexual harassment is specific to gender equality or whether harassment cuts across all equality grounds.

Questions for discussion: How gender as a policy category differs from race? Think about boundaries between the public and the private (e.g. care, violence, etc.). Think about violence as an inequality mechanism! How can we operationalize gender? Are modes and fields of intervention into gender inequality specific? In what ways?

Readings and other class material

Presentation to watch

- Sandra Fredman and Erika Szyszczak (1992) “The Interaction of Race and Gender” in *Discrimination and the Limits of the Law* edited by Bob Hepple and Erika Szyszczak. Mansell Publishing, London. Pp. 214-227
- Mieke Verloo (2006) Multiple Inequalities, Intersectionality and the European Union. *European Journal of Women Studies*. Vol. 13(3):211-228

Recommended

- Catherine MacKinnon “Equality Remade: Violence against Women” in *Are Women Human?* Harvard UP. (2006) Pp. 105-111
- Nancy Fraser (1994) After the Family Wage. Gender Equity and the Welfare State. *Political Theory*, Vol. 22. No.4: 591-618.
- Kimberly Morgan & Kathrin Zippel (2003) “Paid to Care: The Origins and Effects of Care Leave Policies in Western Europe” in *Social Politics* 10/1. Pp. 49-85
- Dobash& Dobash (1992) *Women, Violence and Social Change* Chapter 4: The State, Public Policy and Social Change. Routledge. Pp. 99-145
- Diane Sainsbury (2009) “Gendering the welfare state” in *Politics, Gender and Concepts* eds. Goertz and Mazur. CUP. Pp. 94-114
- Jane Manslow Cohen (1994) “Private Violence and Public Obligation: The Fulcrum of Reason.” In *The Public Nature of Private Violence* eds Finneman & Mykitiuk. Routledge. Pp. 349-383
- Stetson DE and Mazur A (1995). *Comparative State Feminism*. Introductory chapter.
- Joyce Outshoorn and Johanna Kantola (2007) “Introduction” and “Conclusions” in Outshoorn and Kantola eds. *Changing State Feminism*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Carol Bacchi (2006) “Arguing for and Against Quotas” in *Women, Quotas and Politics* ed. Drude Dahlerup. Routledge.

Susanne Zwingel (2005) From intergovernmental negotiations to (sub)national change. A transnational perspective on the impact of CEDAW. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 7:3, 400-424.

Charlotte Bretherton (2001) "Gender mainstreaming and EU enlargement: swimming against the tide?" *Journal of European Public Policy* 8:1 February: 60–81

8. Week Eight: Gender Equality - Policy Practice

Group 1:

Council of Europe Istanbul Convention <https://www.coe.int/en/web/istanbul-convention>

Group 2:

M. Keck and K. Sikkink (1998) "Transnational networks on violence against women." In *Activists Beyond Borders*. Cornell University Press. Pp.165-199

Group 3:

Jacquot, S. (2017) "A Policy in Crisis. The Dismantling of the EU Gender Equality Policy" in Kantola, J., Lombardo, E. (Eds.) *Gender and the Economic Crisis in Europe. Politics, Institutions and Intersectionality*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

9. Week Nine: Disability

The main question to be answered this week is: how inequality on grounds of disability, a relative newcomer to equality policy, is different from the classical grounds of race and gender? We will look at the process of transforming a mainly medicalized, social welfare grounded approach to disadvantage caused by disability to a human rights approach. Along this wider policy shift, we will also discuss the concept most specific to disability discrimination, namely reasonable accommodation.

Questions for discussion: Are the equality policy puzzles brought up by disability different from those connected to gender inequality? Is the category of disability meaningful as a unitary ground? Is reasonable accommodation connected to the right to be free from discrimination or can it be seen as a form of positive action?

Readings and other class material

Presentation to watch

Sandra Fredman (2005) "Disability Equality: A Challenge to the Existing Anti-Discrimination Paradigm?" in *Disability Rights in Europe: From Theory to Practice* edited by A. Lawson and C. Gooding. Hart Publishing, Oxford. Pp. 199-218

Recommended

- Degener T. (2017) A New Human Rights Model of Disability. In: Della Fina V., Cera R., Palmisano G. (eds) The United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. Springer, Cham
- Lisa Waddington (2018) The Influence of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities on EU Non-Discrimination Law. In Uladzislau Belavusau & Kristin Henrard (eds.), EU Anti-Discrimination Law Beyond Gender, Hart, 2018
- Lisa Waddington (2001) “Evolving Disability Policies: From Social-Welfare to Human Rights. An International Trend from a European Perspective”, 19/2 NQHR
- Lisa Waddington and Aart Hendriks (2002) “The Expanding Concept of Employment Discrimination in Europe: From Direct and Indirect Discrimination to Reasonable Accommodation Discrimination”, 18/3 IJCLLR, p. 403
- European Commission (2011) Compendium of good practice Supported Employment for people with disabilities in the EU and EFTA-EEA. http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/files/supported_employment_study.compendium_good_practice_en.pdf
- Waddington, Lisa (1994) Legislating to Employ People with Disabilities: The European and American Way

10. Week Ten: Disability – policy practiceGroup 1:

UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.
<http://www.un.org/disabilities/default.asp?navid=13&pid=150> or
<https://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1138&langId=en>

Group 2:

Wyndham, Caitlin (2019) Terms of Engagement: How social movements influence government policy in a one-party state. Doctoral thesis. CEU. Chapter 5: The Movement of the People with Disabilities in Vietnam.
<https://cps.ceu.edu/sites/cps.ceu.edu/files/attachment/basicpage/131/phd-thesis-wyndham-2019.pdf>

Group 3:

Accessibility and Development. Mainstreaming disability in the post-2015 development agenda. http://www.un.org/disabilities/documents/accessibility_and_development.pdf

11. Week Eleven: Intersectionality, Competing Inequalities

Having seen the commonalities of equality policy on different grounds and then the specifics of each ground, this week we will move on to understand what happens if inequality grounds intersect: what are the consequences of intersectionality for categories and for group boundaries and how does the concept impact on policy answers? Both structural and political intersectionality will be discussed.

Questions for discussion: How can we operationalize intersectionality for policy purposes? Does talking about disadvantages of intersectional groups limit the efficiency of protection for the main status groups such as Roma, women or disabled? What are the best instruments for introducing intersectional thinking to policy making?

Readings and other class material

Presentation to watch

Sandra Fredman (2005) ‘Double trouble: Multiple discrimination and EU Law’,

European Anti-discrimination Law Review 2: 13-19.

Olena Hankivsky, Julia S. Jordan-Zachery (2019) Introduction: Bringing Intersectionality to Public Policy. *The Palgrave Handbook of Intersectionality in Public Policy* eds Olena Hankivsky and Julia S. Jordan-Zachery. Palgrave

Recommended

Kimberle Crenshaw (1989) Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory, and Antiracist Politics. *The University of Chicago Legal Forum*. 140:139-167

Kimberle Crenshaw (1991) Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color. *Stanford Law Review*, Vol. 43, No. 6. 1241-...

Ange-Marie Hancock (2007) ‘When Multiplication Doesn’t Equal Quick Addition: Examining Intersectionality as a Research Paradigm’, *Perspectives on Politics* 5 (1), 63-79.

Fiona Williams (2003) ‘Contesting “Race” and Gender in the European Union: A Multi-layered Recognition Struggle for Voice and Visibility’, In B Hobson, ed. *Recognition Struggles and Social Movements: Contested Identities, Agency and Power*, New York: CUP. Pp. 121-144

Week Twelve: Intersectionality – practice session

Group 1:

Group 2:

Group 3:

A pool of potential texts

Birte Siim; Skjeie, Hege (2008) Tracks, intersections and dead ends: state feminism and multicultural retreats in Denmark and Norway. *Ethnicities*, Vol. 8, No. 3: 322-344.

- Marie Laperrière, Éléonore Lépinard (2016) Intersectionality as a tool for social movements: Strategies of inclusion and representation in the Québécois women's movement. *Politics* 1–9
- Éléonore Lépinard (2014) Doing Intersectionality: Repertoires of Feminist Practices in France and Canada. *Gender and Society*. 28(6): 877-903
- European Commission (2007) Tackling Multiple Discrimination: Practices, policies and laws (23/11/2007)
- Andrea Krizsan, Hege Skjeie, Judith Squires (2012) “European Equality Regimes: Institutional Change and Political Intersectionality” in Krizsan, Skjeie, Squires eds. *Institutionalizing Intersectionality*. Palgrave MacMillan.
- Johanna Kantola, Kevät Nousiainen (2009) “Institutionalizing Intersectionality in Europe” in *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 11:4, 459-477
- Jovanovic, Jelena, Angela Kocze and Lidia Balogh (2015), *Intersection of Gender, Ethnicity, and Class: History and Future of the Romani Women's Movement* (Working paper), Budapest: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.
- Leanna Lucero (2017) Safe spaces in online places: social media and LGBTQ youth, *Multicultural Education Review*, 9:2, 117-128, DOI: [10.1080/2005615X.2017.1313482](https://doi.org/10.1080/2005615X.2017.1313482)
- Mengia Tschalaer (2020) Between queer liberalisms and Muslim masculinities: LGBTQI+ Muslim asylum assessment in Germany, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 43:7, 1265-1283, DOI: [10.1080/01419870.2019.1640378](https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2019.1640378)