Article

International Sociology
28(1) 121–138

DOI: 10.1177/0268580912463155
iss.sagepub.com

Hierarchies of social location, class and intersectionality: Towards a translocational frame

Floya Anthias
Roehampton University and City University, London, UK

Abstract

This article evaluates the potential found within two approaches that recognize the complexity of social hierarchy in different ways. First, it looks at the revival of class analysis within culturally inflected approaches to class. These have incorporated a number of societal relations, broadly referred to as the symbolic, the social and the cultural, into the analysis. Second, the article assesses attempts to theorize the intersections of gender, ethnicity and class through the intersectionality framework. It considers the potential for developing more integrated analytical frameworks for understanding social hierarchy through cross-referencing these debates. It proposes an intersectional framing which centres on social location and translocation.

Keywords

Class, ethnicity, gender, hierarchy, intersectionality, social location, translocational positionality

Introduction

This article contributes to the important debate on the ways in which social identities and hierarchies can be understood. Whilst the rethinking of class has moved in a number of directions in the last 20 years from debates on Marxism, a concern with class boundaries and employment relations to culture and lifestyle, it has largely been unable to address issues raised by gender, ethnicity and transnational actors. The matrix of gender, ethnicity and class has been theorized through the lens of intersectionality for at least two decades also and now occupies a central place in academic and political life. However the two academic debates rarely meet or occupy the same terrain, with distinctive

Corresponding author:
Floya Anthias, School of Social Sciences, Roehampton University, Roehampton Lane, London SW15 5PU, UK.
Email: F.anthias@roehampton.ac.uk

writers, bibliographies and primary sources of citation. In this article I attempt to bring together debates on class and intersectionality as a means of clarifying some of the issues at stake and pushing the debate forward, setting out a particular analytical sensitivity for doing this. I consider the potential for developing more integrated analytical frameworks for understanding social hierarchy, proposing an intersectional framing which centres on social location and translocation (Anthias, 2002a, 2002b, 2008, 2009).[1]

The article starts by critically examining the potential in the newer, more culturally inflected revival of class analysis, particularly prominent in the UK.

The problem of 'class'

There is a 'fuzziness' to the class concept as it constitutes a particular way of explaining or understanding economic inequalities and also stands as a shorthand for economic inequalities (Anthias, 2001b). Here I will focus particularly on debates in the UK where there has been a contemporary concern with the cultural aspects of class (e.g. Savage, 2000; Savage and Devine, 2000). This latter is echoed by work more internationally (e.g. Lamont, 1992; Lamont and Small, 2008). The culturalist, lifestyle or status formulations of class have yielded concrete and localized analyses (e.g. Savage et al., 2001; Skeggs, 1997, 2004), countering the labour market based approaches found in the employment relations problematic (e.g. Goldthorpe, 1996; Goldthorpe and Marshall, 1992; Marshall, 1997) or the 'employment aggregate approach' as Crompton (1998) calls it.

Within the culturally inflected approach to class in the UK, we can find a wide variety of foci. Some work (such as Savage et al., 2005) is concerned with the conditions which allocate class position as well as constructions of belonging (using the term 'elective belonging': Savage et al., 2005; Savage, 2010). The other manifestation is a concern with taste and the consumption of cultural products (e.g. Warde et al., 1999). Within these approaches emphasis is placed on cultural values, ways of life, taste and social preference, or on the making of social distance. There is also an important analysis which is concerned with the moral aspects of class (e.g. Lawler, 2005, Sayer, 2005). These tendencies echo some earlier work on lifestyle approaches to class (also see Tomlinson, 2003) as well as partially tallying with Beck's idea about the individualization of inequality (Beck, 1992; Beck and Beck Gernsheim, 2002).

There has been an analysis of lives which are seen as 'classed' (Reay, 1998, 2004; Skeggs, 1997, 2004) in tandem with these tendencies, and within this a particular focus on gender and ethnic forms. Although these do not present themselves, explicitly at least, in terms of an intersectionality framework, they are clearly relevant for the development of a wider and more integrated analysis of relations of hierarchy and inequality.

Much of this work derives from an impetus given by the Bourdieusian theoretical framework. Whilst Bourdieu (1985, 1986, 1999 [1984]) sees economic capital as the most important resource in contemporary capitalism (Savage et al., 2005: 39), in his schema symbolic capital is that which legitimizes and gives value to all forms of capital, including the economic (Bourdieu, 1985: 725).

Bourdieu's concern with the class-differentiated nature of tastes (1999 [1984]) has been an influential perspective. However, utilizing Bourdieu in this way has certain dangers, arguably, in terms of Eurocentricity and ethnocentricity. As the diacritics of class

are various and shifting, distinctions relating to taste may not be universally valid or constitute an analytical principle of class relations. There has been very little comparative empirical work on this issue.

Bourdieu approaches class in relation to a range of forms of capital which are then transferable to the economic. However, this is not necessarily retained within the area of work referred to. In some approaches, 'class' stands for the everyday practices of people around social distinction that reproduce hierarchy, without this necessarily being articulated in class terms by the individuals themselves. In other words, the researcher depicts values, statements, activities and performances as 'classed' without relying on ideas of collectivity, solidary organization, antagonism or indeed relational conflict with other social groups: class is seen as constraining on an individual rather than a collective level (Bottero and Irwin, 2003; Savage and Devine, 2000). In the process of individualizing class there is a danger that systematic modes of social differentiation are no longer seen as important. Individual orientations – or a kind of class habitus which is embodied in individuals, their values and their behaviour – become a key area of concern instead.

Whilst these debates move away from constructing class as a primarily economic relation, they have a tendency to hold on to the idea of cultural forms representing and reproducing structured class hierarchies, however. As Bottero (2004) suggests such approaches fail to make a fundamental enough conceptual leap: they retain a discourse of class as something beyond individuals, whilst seeking to focus on individuals' performativity in relation to it, without that connection being refined. The concept of class, therefore, is retained in these approaches as something outside the individual re-enactments which feed into it; but the ways the connection between individualized cultural and identity subject positions is related to these remains untheorized.

Disidentification, 'ordinariness', 'people like us' and 'elective belonging'

A range of qualitative studies, particularly in the UK, have introduced notions of disidentification, 'ordinariness' and 'people like us', which have been used to describe class identifications. These approaches have argued that class identities are either more likely to be refused (through disidentification models as found in Skeggs, 1997), or that people use notions of ordinariness and 'people like us' when confronted with questions of class identity (see Savage et al., 2001; Southerton, 2002). The notion of elective belonging sees local or place-based identities as key to class belonging, particularly for the middle classes (see Savage, 2010; Savage et al., 2005).

Disidentification presupposes a recognition of class identity/location (to thereby refuse it), particularly as an attribution by others. It stresses the importance of marking one's position by denying that which either has been attributed to you, or is likely or feared as attributable to you. In the work of Skeggs (1997) the narratives of some of her female subjects often use disclaimers about the ways they think they are perceived by others and address issues of social stigma. However, disidentification is very gendered (and racialized) as Skeggs has shown, and her work pays attention to the links between gender, class and racialization although she does not explicitly apply an intersectional framing.

The notion of ordinariness and of 'people like us' has been highlighted in accounts particularly by research subjects of white English ethnicity (e.g. see Southerton, 2002). When people use notions of the ordinary or 'like us' they are constructing boundaries of difference which involve criteria, often implicit rather than explicit, about membership inside and outside a boundary. Whilst much of the argument about new forms of class is dependent on the idea of the individualization of class difference, where notions of 'the ordinary' or 'people like us' are used this indicates collectivized understandings of difference.

The refusal by subjects to talk about class, preferring terms like 'people like us' and 'ordinary', could be related to a generalized culture (and dominant political discourse) that enacts inequality but refuses to name it in class terms. For example, in public policy there is a focus on categories like single mothers, the poor, the old or those outside class categories such as the underclass. These pathologizing categories are categories people refuse to associate themselves with. In addition, it may be regarded as politically inexpedient, morally wrong or offensive to point attention to class differences for example.

It could be argued that much of what passes as class in these analyses (for example in the use of ideas of class preferences and lifestyle choices [Savage et al., 2005]) could be related to collective identity more broadly conceived, for example in relation to *ethnicity* and transnationalism. Within these approaches, the *transnational*[2] dimensions of class, both in terms of class being forged in relation to transnational migrant 'others' in particular localities, and in terms of global inequalities across nation-states, is under-explored. There is an important absence of transnational actors whose lifestyle preferences and class belonging may span different sites of social relations and who may produce complex class belongings, claims and attributions. The cartography of cultural tastes and the demarcations of social location may be more difficult to produce where such complexities exist.

Recent research (Archer and Francis, 2006) in the UK on Chinese pupils shows that parents use Chinese schools not just for ethnic but also for class reasons. Ethnic resources and social capital are used to facilitate educational capital, transferable to the economic, for the children. Valuing education involves a class habitus articulated through the medium of ethnic difference. Parents' preoccupation with the future and to escape was grounded in migrant hardship which again can be linked to class processes. In relation to gender, Lamont (1992) in her research in the United States and France, showed that working-class black men use notions of masculinity derived from white men to define their own class identity. Therefore in research on class identities where is the class rather than the ethnicity (or gender) to be found and recognized?

The emphasis in newer approaches to class has tended to be on the cultural understandings of white actors and this creates a subtext where lifestyle, image and identity issues for white people pertain to class rather than ethnicity for example, whereas similar forms of embodiment which articulate status and deference, valuation and symbolic effect for minority or racialized populations are seen to derive from race or ethnic constructions rather than those of class.

Whereas weak solidary links are identified relating to class, collective solidarities may be found around 'race' and ethnicity. The resource aspects of these solidarities around ethnicity and racism that relate to class strategies and processes are therefore

important and discourses around non-class forms of othering would be relevant here also, raising the issue of the extent to which analysis can be undertaken purely in terms of the concept of class.

Savage et al. (2005) develop the concept of elective belonging, which concerns the choices middle-class people make to live in neighbourhoods with others 'who are like them'. Elective belonging is defined as:

> . . . the way that middle class people claim moral rights over place through their capacity to move to, and put down roots, in a specific place which was not just functionally important to them but which also mattered symbolically. (Savage, 2010: 116)

There is however, the question of distancing from the 'other'. As Bourdieu says 'tastes are perhaps first and foremost distastes, disgust provoked by horror or visceral intolerance ("sick-making") of the tastes of others' (Bourdieu, 1999 [1984]: 56). Butler (2007) has also shown how gentrifiers distance themselves from the working class through the housing choices they make. One of the critiques of this is the emphasis on shared but individualized values and an under-emphasis on class formation as such (McDowell et al., 2006).

I would argue that the rich textured depictions of people's lives found in many of these qualitative studies have been far too narrowly placed within the class construct, since they spill over into other forms of difference and disadvantage such as gender and ethnicity. As Watt (2009: 5) argues:

> . . . choices about place and attachments also relate to judgements that are racialised as well as classed. Such judgements are at their most acute when the expressions of taste and distaste operate hierarchically, i.e. when they are directed against 'others' with lower volumes of capital in subordinate class or racialised positions. (see also Garner, 2007; Tyler, 2003)

If this is the case, then we need to rethink the newer approaches to class in tandem with other forms of social hierarchy and boundary construction which relate to difference and inequality, such as those of 'race' and gender and this is where the interrogation of the usefulness of intersectionality approaches is relevant.

Intersectionality frameworks

There cannot be a singular definition of an intersectionality framework as there is a great deal of diversity in the way it is theorized and applied. It has a long history as Ann Denis (2008) shows, but has its primary roots within anti-racist feminism in the United States, being originally concerned with the particular forms of oppression faced by racialized women (e.g. see hooks [1981] and Denis [2008] for an account of historical origins). However, the coinage of the term intersectionality has been attributed to Crenshaw (1994). It has been described as a 'fast travelling concept' (Knapp, 2005), and there are issues about transplanting the term to a range of other contexts.

In fact, since the early 1980s, the links between gender, race and class have been the subject of a great deal of social debate and commentary (e.g. Bilge, 2010; Choo and

Ferree, 2010; Denis, 2008; Dhamoon, 2011; McCall, 2001, 2005; Yuval Davis, 2006). Triple oppression, interconnections, interplay, interlocking systems of oppression, fractured identities, assemblages, overlapping systems, simultaneous oppressions are all terms that have been used to signify the processes highlighted. The recent European, American, Canadian and Australian debates have tried to broaden its ambit and consider its theoretical potential more widely (see Bilge and Denis, 2010; Bose, 2012). The importance of a transnational framework has been developed in a number of recent contributions (e.g. Pukayastha, 2010; Radhakrishnan, 2008).

Broadly speaking, intersectionality posits that different social divisions interrelate in terms of the production of social relations and in terms of people's lives and they are seen as 'mutually constitutive' in terms of experience and practice. The triad of gender, race and class has been added to by intersectional frameworks which have insisted on the need to look at other social categories such as sexuality, faith and disability, amongst others (see e.g. Meekosha and Shuttleworth, 2009; Taylor et al., 2011).

There are a range of intersectional approaches and it is not possible to refer to them all here. The work of Patricia Hill Collins on gender, race and class became central to feminist theory and method before the term intersectionality was coined. She treats these as modes for the exercise of power (Collins, 1990, 1993), and as historically contingent (as would be suggested in the work of Foucault [1972]). She proposes the notion of interlocking oppressions organized through a 'matrix of domination' (Collins, 1990: 276) which comprises structural, disciplinary, hegemonic and interpersonal power relations (see also the *Gender and Society* [2012] symposium on Collins).

Another particularly influential account of intersectionality, again from the United States, is that categories of discrimination overlap and individuals suffer exclusions on the basis of race and gender, or any other combination (Crenshaw, 1994). According to this approach, the unity of two minority traits constitutes in fact a distinct single-minority entity giving rise to unique forms of position and disadvantage that can neither be accounted for by race or gender or by adding the one to the other.

Within the UK, the work of Avtar Brah as well as Floya Anthias and Nira Yuval Davis located the articulation of social divisions within the context of power relations and the state, and was central to the entry of intersectionality approaches within the European context (Anthias and Yuval Davis, 1983, 1992; Brah, 1996). Anthias and Yuval-Davis (1992) look at social divisions as social ontologies around different material processes in social life, all linked to sociality and to the social organization of sexuality, production and collective bonds (for further developments see Anthias, 1998, 2001a, 2001b, 2008, 2009; Yuval-Davis, 1996, 2006). Other approaches use a more system-based framework, seeing gender, race and class as distinctive systems of subordination with their own range of specific social relations (Walby, 2007, 2009; Weber, 2001; Williams, 1989).

Recent debates have attempted to refine intersectionality. For example, McCall (2005) distinguishes between anti-categorical, intra-categorical and inter-categorical analyses. The first (anti-categorical) *refuses* categories, allowing for a narrative approach to complexity in terms of individual lives. The second (intra-categorical) looks at how gender, for example, is crosscut by race and class. The third approach (inter-categorical) focuses on connections *between* the categories (e.g. comparing data on gender and ethnic compositions of labour markets).

Choo and Ferree (2010) make a distinction between group-centred, process-centred and system-centred approaches and Winker and Degele (2011: 54) consider different levels of analysis in terms of 'intersectionality as a system of interactions between inequality-creating social structures (i.e. of power relations), symbolic representations and identity constructions that are context-specific, topic-orientated and inextricably linked to social praxis'. Walby (2007, 2009) draws on complexity theory, treating gender, race and class as distinctive systems which coalesce in different contexts. Ken's (2008) work tried to improve on the metaphor of intersection through using the analogy of sugar instead.

Other recent and important work is concerned with applying intersectionality within a transnational frame (see e.g. Pukayastha, 2010; Radhkrishnan, 2008). It is important to attend to the transnational dimensions of context and time, including the realities of multicultural and cosmopolitan spaces, digitalized communities, relating to virtual space and time (Pukayastha, 2010) and postcoloniality. For example, a Ghanaian migrant worker can inhabit a position of subordination in the UK but a position of class mobility in Ghana.

Bose (2012) argues:

> Just as there is diversity among individual women, based on their intersecting axes of . . . , there is diversity across countries in their national-level gender inequalities based on intersecting axes of transnational, regional, cross-cutting, and unique national issues that structure gendered differences and concerns. (Bose, 2012: 71)

This also highlights the challenges and insights that can be gained from a more transnational intersectionality framework.

Some have regarded intersectionality as a theoretical paradigm (Hancock, 2007), whilst others treat it as a sensitizing concept for addressing the complexity of social relations. Whilst Kathy Davis (2008) treats intersectionality as a buzz word, in my own work I have argued that it is a heuristic device (Anthias, 1998) and universally applicable as a tool for understanding social relations, including the intersections between advantage and disadvantage (Anthias, 2008, 2009). It is thus a general tool and not limited to exploring disadvantage (see also Anthias and Yuval-Davis, 1992; Crenshaw, 2012).

In the next section I discuss some of the potential pitfalls associated with intersectionality as well as the concept of 'intersection' which is central to the framework.

Intersectionality: Pitfalls, quandaries and the concept of 'intersection'

There are a number of potential pitfalls and quandaries associated with some of the ways in which intersectionality can be interpreted, although they are not necessarily inherent to an intersectional heuristic (Anthias, 1998) or prism (Crenshaw, 2012).

First, there is the issue of different levels of analysis which may not be attended to. It is possible, for example, to explore the analytical links between different types of social division, e.g. the similarities and differences between class division, gender division and ethnic division (as well as others such as sexuality) as *social ontologies* (see Anthias and

Yuval Davis, 1992), as well as their similarities and differences as *concrete social relations* of categorization, collectivity and inequality (Anthias, 1998). The issue of levels can also be linked to the need to be clear about different foci and methods, noted by many writers (including Choo and Ferree, 2010; McCall, 2001). One example is the danger of conflating questions of social position (concrete position vis-a-vis a range of social resources such as economic, cultural and political) and social positioning (how we articulate, understand and interact with these positions, e.g. contesting, challenging, defining) which relates to the structural and the identificational levels, and their possible connections.

Second, there is a danger that race, class and gender become taken-for-granted categories of social analysis, leading not only to their essentialization but also to presumptions about their saliency. As some writers have noted their saliency varies greatly in different contexts (see e.g. Anthias and Yuval Davis, 1983; Dhamoon, 2011; Ferree, 2012; Nash, 2008).

Third, there is the danger of a listing of differences (often reduced to identities) that intersect (potentially infinite), leading to a focus on individual differences, raising the question about differences that matter, when, where and how. There are questions for example about how many differences should be incorporated into an intersectional framework: answers have ranged from three (the gender, race and class trilogy) to nine (Equalities and Human Rights Commission, 2010). This also raises the issue of a potentially endless list of 'hybrid' crosscutting categories (such as black working-class, young white lesbian, white working-class young man, poor racialized disabled woman, etc.).

Fourth, linked to the issue of the focus on differences, there are potential competing claims about which are the most important of these (the Oppression Olympics as Hancock [2007] has called it). Should all socially salient categories of difference be seen as occupying equivalent domains in terms of power, and delineated as essential features of power relations? Should religion, age, disability be considered in the same way as gender, race and class, for example? To what extent are they all productive of inequality, as opposed to being outcomes or manifestations of how these play themselves out at specific times? If we single one out as an example, such as age, it is clear that the boundary between age groups is not binary as is the case with the gender category and the ethnic category where the boundary of insider and outsider is generally brighter and less fuzzy. Moreover, one or other of the divisions does not always matter in particular contexts or some may matter more than others, e.g. ethnicity does not always matter either at the structural or identity level: it has a spectrum of intensity and identification (Pieterse, 1997).

In addition to these pitfalls and quandaries, there are issues relating to the notion of 'intersection', the prime metaphor used within intersectionality and that which is its distinguishing mark. This powerful metaphor may be misleading as it suggests that what takes place is similar to being at an intersection (in terms of the traffic metaphor used by Crenshaw, 1994). It suggests, therefore, that there are points where categories meet and inequalities are produced. However, in the real world, categories are already formed or shaped via each other. They feed from each other as well as contesting and splintering off in the forms they take (linked to broader landscapes of power including political and

economic practices and interests that are not reducible to the working of the categories themselves) but within time and space specificities. For example categories of gender and the attributions they entail are used in providing criteria for employment or allocating value to employees. Formulations about gender feed into those of class, e.g. the view that women are mainly mothers and responsible for reproduction, that they are less rational and so on (see Anthias, 2001a) act as justifications for particular class practices and locations of women in the labour market. As Kimberlé Crenshaw has more recently stated 'The metaphor upon which intersectionality is scaffolded . . . is a provisional conceptualization, a prism refracted to bring into view dynamics that were constitutive of power but obscured by certain discursive logics at play in that context' (2012: 231). It is clear, therefore, that this does not disable locating the intersections of social categories and the concrete relations associated with them within a broader societal framework, relating to the exercise of power within a range of social domains, including discursive and institutional domains.

There is the assumption found in some accounts that all social categories are equally salient all of the time (this is a position taken by Hancock [2007] for example). But the degrees of importance of one or the other and their types of intersection will vary within different societal arenas such as different institutions or different discourses, as well as in terms of given social forces at different times and spaces (Anthias, 2002). Ferree (2012: 8) too notes that 'It is an empirical matter in any given context to see what concepts are important to the configuration of inequalities in discourse and in practice.' Practices of power can be directed particularly against racialized groups in ways which involve gender but which play out much more in terms of the salience of the ethnic or racialized boundary, as ontology, categorical formation as well as political process. For example practices of securitization of Muslims in Europe are much more tied to issues of religion, ethnicity and race although they also have class and gender dimensions. Therefore, it may be that the force of one category at a particular point is much stronger and more manifest than others.

Particular problems are raised in defining intersectionality in terms of the 'mutual constitution' of social categories. First, this disrupts the saliency of the categories in and of themselves and potentially does not attend to their specificities. For example, race and gender involve distinctive discourses and practices as well as having a different ontological basis (Anthias, 1998; Anthias and Yuval Davis, 1992). As Nash also argues, they 'utilize differing technologies of categorization and control, disciplining bodies in distinctive ways, and coalescing (or colliding) in particular formations in certain historical, social, cultural, representational, legal, and technological moments' (Nash, 2008: 13).

Second, an assumption often underlying the notion of intersection as mutual constitution is that social categories of difference and inequality reinforce each other in one direction, i.e. they strengthen each other. In my work, however, I have emphasized the existence of *dialogical and contradictory* positions and positionings which I will return to later on in the article.

However, despite these problems, looking for a better metaphor will not necessarily help, although some have tried to do this imaginatively (e.g. Ken [2008], who uses the analogy of sugar). This is because the issue of intersection is problematic not because we need to find a new metaphor but because it is often used in ways which do not signal

the role of the wider environment, and how the historical and broader landscape of power, both in terms of production and effects, incorporates gender, ethnicity and class already into its operations. Broader power relations need to be considered (as recognized by Collins [1993] and Crenshaw [2012], for example).

In the next section, I present a particular analytical sensitivity which deals with many of the issues raised.

Moving forward: Social location and translocation

In focusing on social divisions, as boundaries, hierarchies and ontological spaces (see Anthias, 1998 in particular), and using the notion of translocational positionality (Anthias, 2002, 2008, 2009), I have tried to work towards a complex recognition of hierarchical relations which has a wider theoretical resonance in terms of social stratification. This potentially enables a more integrated framing to issues of social inequality compared to traditional approaches to stratification, on the one hand, and to approaches that focus on the intersections of social categories as groups, or in relation to social categories and divisions alone, on the other. A *translocational* lens is a tool for analysing positions and outcomes produced through the intersections of different social structures and processes, including transnational ones, giving importance to the broader social context and to temporality.

First, with the idea of translocations, there is a focus on *social locations*, rather than a focus on *groups*, dealing therefore with one of the pitfalls mentioned earlier about the problem of sections or groups. Our 'location' is embedded in relations of hierarchy within a multiplicity of specific situational and conjunctural spheres. Therefore the lens is turned towards the broader landscape of power which is productive of social divisions and does not remain fixed on the manifestations of the latter. In other words locations relate to stratification (at local, national and transnational fields), within a contextual and chronographic context, i.e. they inhabit a 'real time and place' context.

Social categories and their ontological realms are boundary-making forces which assume particular historical and spatial forms. At this level there is a shaping, constitution or effectivity which seeps from one to the other. However, this does not mean that the categories, particularly in terms of their social ontological basis, are not salient in and of themselves. It is the saliency of the separate categories within particular environments that produces an effectivity relating to concrete embodied intersections. However, at the level of structural outcomes, as well as outcomes for human subjects, relating for example to forms of identity or discursive effects, it is difficult to unpack where they originate from because in practice they are mutually interactive and cannot be disassociated.

It is useful to delineate different societal arenas where intersections are played out (Anthias, 1998). The notion of societal arenas is heuristic rather than denoting actual distinct social systems (cf. Walby [2007], who provides a more system-based approach). Delineating societal arenas enables a comparison of how the social categories operate and intersect in terms of different foci of research and an analysis of the intersections of the societal arenas themselves (in terms particularly of different power relations). These comprise organizational/structural and representational/discursive spaces/arenas (often

cited as distinguishable in recent literature, e.g. see Choo and Ferree, 2010) but also arenas relating to the experiential/narrational and intersubjective/social interaction (see also Anthias and Yuval Davis [1992] for an early formulation, and Anthias [1998]). This framework deals with the idea that both the structural and identity levels need to be explored by intersectional frameworks, and goes beyond this. It recognizes the importance of context, the situated nature of claims and attributions and their production in complex and shifting locales.

Within this framework, difference and inequality are conceptualized as a set of processes (therefore there is a need to attend to historicity), and not possessive characteristics of individuals. This implies that there are no standard outcomes involved in the articulation of the boundaries and hierarchies of social relations. Social categorizations are not equally salient at all times and our approach has to be historically sensitive as there are complex new emerging constellations of disadvantage. This relates to one of the pitfalls referred to earlier concerning the problem of the listing of differences. It suggests that we should not see differences as empirically given but as part of a process relating to boundary-making and hierarchies in social life which might take different forms in different times and contexts and should be treated therefore as emergent rather than pre-given.

Just as a translocational lens moves away analytically from the focus on difference, politically it moves away from the governmentality of difference. Recognizing that there are new emerging constellations of invisible intersections, corrects the tendency to single out some at the potential expense of erasing other boundaries and inequalities which might exist but have not been articulated or claimed. Such a position provides a contextual answer to the Oppression Olympics issue raised by Hancock (2007). By denoting the temporal and differentiated spaces/arenas within which intersections are constituted and become effective as part of the operations of power, it not only addresses the complexities of hierarchy but allows privileging of a particular categorical formation (such as gender or class) at a specific conjunctural level, rather than in any essential or given way.

A temporal and contextual analysis shifts attention away from fixities of social position (usually underpinned by assumptions about the primacy of the nation-state boundary), and enables a more *transnational* as well as more *local-based* lens. The idea of 'translocation' thereby treats lives as being located across multiple but also fractured and interrelated social spaces of different types.

I suggested earlier some of the problems with the notion of intersection in terms of an assumption about how disadvantages are mutually reinforcing. Certainly, the articulation (intersection, interlocking or whatever term is preferred) of social divisions at the more concrete level of analysis can be mutually reinforcing (e.g. as in the case of particular racialized migrant women), in terms of subordination. However, the intersections may construct multiple and uneven social patterns of domination and subordination, i.e. produce *contradictor*y locations (Anthias, 1998, 2002; Wright, 1985), as in the case of racialized men or dominant women who inhabit a different location in terms of the parameters of race and gender. A person might be in a position of dominance and subordination simultaneously on the one hand or at different times or spaces on the other. A man may be subordinated in class terms, but is positioned advantageously in relation to his female partner. A person may be positioned higher in one social place than another,

e.g. migrants returning to their homelands may achieve class benefits as they display relative wealth to poorer villagers. A migrant woman may be subordinated in 'race' terms, but has a degree which gives her good life chances in some contexts. On visits to her country of origin, she may acquire higher social status through her relative economic success (see also Pukayastha, 2010), despite being subordinated in the country of migration, thereby giving her a contradictory social location transnationally.

In relation to our understanding of migrant identifications and practices it contextualizes the migrant within other relations of boundary-making and hierarchy-making in a range of social contexts, including transnational ones (for a critique of methodological nationalism, see Wimmer and Glick Schiller, 2002), and asks us to use a broader and more integrated frame relating to power and agency in understanding social positions and positionings.

Concluding remarks: Bringing the debates together

Whilst debates around class and intersectionality often remain separate they both grapple, however, with the ways we understand the non-economic bases of social inequality and social place. As we have seen, approaches to intersectionality, unlike newer forms of class analysis, attempt to move away radically from monolithic understandings of social division. I argued earlier that understandings of class by actors, noted by the more culturally inflected class approaches, are highly gendered and ethnicized. For example, it is clear that the boundary between class understandings of 'people like us' and ethnic facets (as well as gender ones) needs to be explored further since such notions construct people as within and outside certain boundaries of belonging (and entitlement). Therefore more explicit engagement with issues of gender and ethnicity is needed and therefore more intersectional forms of analysis.

Whilst the influence of Bourdieu is primary in new approaches to class, the intersectionality approach is less consciously reliant on this framework. Although Bourdieu's work has been of outstanding insight in the area of inequality, there are underdevelopments in his approach around ethnic and gender divisions which cannot be easily filled by those who want to embrace a Bourdieusian framework, within feminist analysis for example (McCall, 1992). The concern with different forms of capital (a major contribution of Bourdieu's work) does not engage enough with boundary-making and marking, and the categories of identity and difference which hierarchical social relations relate to.

However, claims and struggles over resources of various kinds, some of which can be converted to other resources, are pivotal elements for social relations, as Bourdieu rightly maintains. Therefore this raises the issue of how class relates to mobilizations around ethnic resources, for example (Anthias, 2007; Anthias and Cederberg, 2009). Ramji's (2005) research subjects in the UK drew on being important within the ethnic group, claiming higher ethnic capital by being good Muslim subjects as a way of coping with class or racial inferiorization or marginality and in order to counter lack of access to middle-class white capital. Thus, valuation within one's ethnic group may be drawn upon to counter devaluation in the wider society. This is paralleled by research into minorities in the food sector in a number of European countries, with some subjects using strategies of locating oneself within an ethnic category as part of the process of

pursuing class advantage, where positive ethnic capital was involved, for example (Anthias et al., 2006).

The narratives produced by people when describing how they place themselves in relation to others (treated by the culturally inflected class researchers as relating to class) involve intersections with ethnicity and gender. For example, different ethnic groupings may produce different narrations of class and gender as well as place (as will the crosscutting differentiations within them). Criteria of wealth, property and education may be used differently by various categories of women (see e.g. Skeggs, 1997) and by subordinated minority ethnic communities to the ways they are used by dominant groups and differently in local, national and transnational contexts. Class and gender discourse within minority ethnic groupings may take a range of different forms. Notions of ethnic authenticity, cultural transmission and being a good ethnic subject may function in ways denoted by Skeggs (1997) in her depiction of the role of respectability and disidentification for the women she researched.

Regarding the role of the cultural in the enactment of class relations, so prominent in the newer class analyses, particularly in the UK, it is important that we do not rely on the ways cultural and social location are enacted and articulated within white ethnicities only, or within western societies. The cultural manifestations of class distinction may not be so important for a range of societies and locales and the danger is that sociologists may extrapolate from their knowledge base to wider social relations in an ethnocentric and westocentric way. In an increasingly transnational world, it is also important not to use a methodologically nationalist approach. This is an additional reason why a transnationally focused intersectionality approach is so important for addressing issues of hierarchy and stratification. However, those researchers using intersectional analysis can also usefully learn from the more culturally inflected class analysis which focuses on the lived relations and the narratives of people around class categories, particularly from writers such as Skeggs (2004) and Reay (2004) who are sensitive to the articulations of class with race and gender, adopting an intersectional framing, albeit not in a deliberative way. The analysis of class, both in terms of structures and identities, has been seriously under-explored by many intersectional theorists who focus on identity issues instead (e.g. Nash [2008] defines intersectionality in terms of identities). However, social categories operate within multiple and complex social fields and pertain to both material and discursive facets of social relations (Anthias, 2001a).

In this article I have argued that both the newer culturally inflected class analysis and intersectionality lead us, in different ways, away from frameworks of analysis which read inequality and hierarchy through the lens of traditional stratification theory in its various forms. I have tried to correct the tendency whereby the two academic debates rarely meet or occupy the same terrain, by bringing them together in this discussion. I have argued that the analysis of social stratification would benefit from greater attention to the ways ethnicity and gender and other social divisions and locations coalesce to produce forms of inequality. Intersectionality approaches would also benefit by integrating class more robustly into the analysis. I have presented a particular intersectional framing which pays attention to spatial and time dimensions and broader social relations of power.

Funding

This is the sole work of the author and has received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the referees for their insightful comments on an earlier version of this article.

Notes

1. As I discuss later on in the article, a translocational lens enables a dynamic focus on social locations rather than identities and enables the understanding of contradictory social locations and therefore the intersection between privilege and disadvantage. It is a heuristic tool giving importance to the broader social context and to temporality rather than to points of intersection.
2. By transnational I am referring to *people* being positioned across nation-state borders both in terms of being diasporic or occupying more than one national space or ethnic location.

References

Anthias F (1998) Rethinking social divisions: Some notes towards a theoretical framework. *Sociological Review* 46(3): 506–535.

Anthias F (2001a) The material and the symbolic in theorising social stratification. *The British Journal of Sociology* 52(3): 367–390.

Anthias F (2001b) The concept of 'social division' and theorising social stratification: Looking at ethnicity and class. *Sociology* 35(4): 835–854.

Anthias F (2002) Where do I belong?: Narrating identity and translocational positionality. *Ethnicities* 2(4): 491–515.

Anthias F (2007) Ethnic ties: Social capital and the question of mobilisability. *The Sociological Review* 55(4): 788–805.

Anthias F (2008) Thinking through the lens of translocational positionality: An intersectionality frame for understanding identity and belonging. *Translocations, Migration and Change* 4(1): 5–20.

Anthias F (2009) Translocational belonging, identity and generation: Questions and problems in migration and ethnic studies. *Finnish Journal of Ethnicity and Migration* 4(1): 6–16. Available at: www.etmu.fi.

Anthias F and Cederberg M (2009) Using ethnic bonds in self-employment and the issue of social capital. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 35(6): 901–917.

Anthias F and Yuval Davis N (1983) Contextualising feminism: Ethnic gender and class divisions. *Feminist Review* 15: 62–75.

Anthias F and Yuval-Davis N (1992) *Racialised Boundaries: Race, Nation, Gender, Colour and Class and the Anti-Racist Struggle*. London: Routledge.

Anthias F, Cederberg M, Barber T and Ayres R (2006) Social capital and exclusion. In: *Ethnogeneration Final Report*, EU Sixth Framework, Brussels.

Archer L and Francis B (2006) Challenging classes? Exploring the role of social class within the identities and achievement of British Chinese pupils. *Sociology* 40(1): 29–49.

Beck U (1992) *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Beck U and Beck Gernsheim E (2002) *Individualisation*. London: Sage.

Bilge S (2010) Recent feminist outlooks on intersectionality. *Diogenes* 57(1): 58–72.

Bilge S and Denis A (2010), Introduction: Women, intersectionality and diasporas. *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 31(1): 1–8.
Bose C (2012) Intersectionality and global gender inequality. *Gender and Society* 26(1): 67–72.
Bottero W (2004) Class identities and the identity of class. *Sociology* 38(5): 985–1003.
Bottero W and Irwin S (2003) Locating difference: Class, 'race' and gender and the shaping of social inequalities. *The Sociological Review* 51(4): 463–483.
Bourdieu P (1985) Social space and the genesis of groups. *Theory and Society* 14(6): 723–744.
Bourdieu P (1986) The forms of capital. In: Richardson JG (ed.) *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. New York: Greenwood Press, pp. 241–258.
Bourdieu P (1999 [1984]) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. London: Routledge. (First published in 1979.)
Brah A (1996) *Cartographies of the Diaspora*. London: Routledge.
Butler T and Robson G (2003) *London Calling: the Middle Classes and the Re-making of Inner London*. Oxford: Berg.
Butler T (2007) For gentrification? *Environment and Planning A* 39(1): 162–181.
Choo HY and Ferree MM (2010) Practicing intersectionality in sociological research: A critical analysis of inclusions, interactions, and institutions in the study of inequalities. *Sociological Theory* 28(2).
Collins HP (1990) *Black Feminist Thought*. London: Harper Collins.
Collins HP (1993) Toward a new vision: Race, class and gender as categories of analysis and connection. *Race, Sex and Class* 1(1): 25–45.
Crenshaw K (1994) Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics and violence against women of color. In: Fineman MA and Mykitiuk R (eds) *The Public Nature of Private Violence: Women and the Discovery of Domestic Abuse*. London: Routledge, pp. 93–118.
Crenshaw K (2012) Postscript. In: Lutz H, Vivar MTH and Supik L (eds) *Framing Intersectionality: Debates on a Multi-Faceted Concept in Gender Studies*. Farnham: Ashgate.
Crompton R (1998) *Class and Stratification*, 2nd edn. Cambridge: Polity.
Davis K (2008) Intersectionality as buzzword: A sociology of science perspective on what makes a feminist theory successful. *Feminist Theory* 9(1): 67–85.
Denis A (2008) Review essay: Intersectional analysis. A contribution of feminism to sociology. *International Sociology* 23(5): 677–694.
Dhamoon RK (2011) Considerations on mainstreaming intersectionality. *Political Research Quarterly* 64(1): 230–243
Equality and Human Rights Commission (2010) Available at: www.equalityhumanrights.com.
Ferree MM (2012) The discursive politics of feminist intersectionality. In: Lutz H, Vivar MTH and Supik L (eds) *Framing Intersectionality: Debates on a Multi-Faceted Concept in Gender Studies*. Farnham: Ashgate.
Foucault M (1972) *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Tavistock.
Garner S (2007) *Whiteness: An Introduction*. London: Routledge.
Gender and Society (2012) Symposium on the contributions of Pat Hill Collins. 26(1): 14–72.
Goldthorpe J (1996) Class analysis and the re-orientation of class theory. *The British Journal of Sociology* 47(3): 481–505.
Goldthorpe J and Marshall G (1992) The promising future of class analysis: A response to recent critics. *Sociology* 26(3): 381–400.
Hancock A (2007) When multiplication doesn't equal quick addition: Examining intersectionality as a research paradigm. *Perspectives on Politics* 5(1): 63–79.
hooks B (1981) *Ain't I a Woman? Black Women and Feminism*. London: Pluto Press.
Ken I (2008) Beyond the intersection: A new culinary metaphor for race-class-gender studies. *Sociological Theory* 26(2): 152–172.

Knapp G-A (2005) Race, class, gender, reclaiming baggage in fast travelling theories. *European Journal of Women's Studies* 12(3): 249–265.
Lamont M (1992) *Money, Morals and Manners: The Culture of the French and American Upper Middle Class*. London: University of Chicago Press.
Lamont M and Small ML (2008) How culture matters: Enriching our understanding of poverty. In: Lin AC and Harris DR (eds) *The Colors of Poverty: Why Racial and Ethnic Disparities Matter*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, pp. 76–102.
Lawler S (2005) Disgusted subjects: The making of middle-class identities. *The Sociological Review* 53(3): 429–446.
McCall L (1992) Does gender fit? Bourdieu, feminism, and conceptions of social order. *Theory and Society* 21(6): 837–867.
McCall L (2001) *Complex Inequality: Gender, Class and Race in the New Economy*. New York: Routledge.
McCall L (2005) The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 30(3): 1771–1800.
McDowell L, Ward K, Perrons D et al. (2006) Place, class and local circuits of reproduction: Exploring the social geography of middle-class childcare in London. *Urban Studies* 43(12): 2163–2182.
Marshall G (1997) *Repositioning Class*. London: Sage.
Meekosha H and Shuttleworth R (2009) What's so critical about critical disability studies? *Australian Journal of Human Rights* 15(1): 47–76.
Nash J (2008) Rethinking intersectionality. *Feminist Review* 89: 1–15.
Pieterse JN (1997) Deconstructing/reconstructing ethnicity. *Nations and Nationalism* 3(3): 365–395.
Pukayastha B (2010) Interrogating intersectionality: Contemporary globalisation and racialised gendering in the lives of highly educated South Asian American and their children. *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 31(2): 9–29.
Radhakrishnan S (2008) Examining the 'global' Indian middle class: Gender and culture in the Silicon Valley/Bangalore circuit. *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 29(1): 7–20.
Ramji H (2005) Exploring intersections of employment and ethnicity amongst British Pakistani young men. *Sociological Research Online* 10(4). Available at: www.socresonline.org/10/4/ramji.html.
Reay D (1998) Rethinking social class: Qualitative perspectives on class and gender. *Sociology* 32(2): 259–279.
Reay D (2004) 'Mostly roughs and toughs': Social class, race and representation in inner city schooling. *Sociology* 35(4): 1005–1023.
Savage M (2000) *Class Analysis and Social Transformation*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
Savage M (2010) The politics of elective belonging. *Housing, Theory and Society* 26(1): 115–161.
Savage M and Devine F (2000) Conclusion: Renewing class analysis. In: Scott JC, Savage M, Devine F and Crompton R (eds) *Renewing Class Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 184–199.
Savage M, Bagall G and Longhurst B (2001) Ordinary, ambivalent and defensive: Class identities in the north west of England. *Sociology* 35(4): 875–892.
Savage M, Warde A and Devine F (2005) Capital, assets and resources: Some critical issues. *The British Journal of Sociology* 56(1): 31–47.
Sayer A (2005) Class, moral worth and recognition. *Sociology* 39(5): 947–963.
Skeggs B (1997) *Formations of Class and Gender*. Cambridge: Polity.
Skeggs B (2004) *Culture, Class, Self*. London: Routledge.
Southerton D (2002) Boundaries of 'us' and 'them' in a new town. *Sociology* 36(1): 171–193.

Taylor Y, Hines S and Casey M (eds) (2011) *Theorizing Intersectionality and Sexuality*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Tomlinson M (2003) Lifestyle and social class. *European Sociological Review* 19(1): 97–111.
Tyler K (2003) The racialised and classed constitution of English village life. *Ethnos* 68(3): 391–412.
Walby S (2007) Complexity theory, systems theory and multiple intersecting inequalities. *Philosophy of Social Science* 37(4): 449–470.
Walby S (2009) *Globalisation and Inequalities: Complexity and Contested Modernities*. London: Sage.
Warde A, Martens L and Olson W (1999) Consumption and the problem of variety: Cultural omnivorousness, social distinction and dining out. *Sociology* 33(1): 105–127.
Watt P (2009) Living in an oasis: Middle-class disaffiliation and selective belonging in a suburban private housing estate. In: *International Sociological Association RC43 International Housing Conference*, Glasgow, 1–4 September.
Weber L (2001) *Understanding Race, Class, Gender and Sexuality: A Conceptual Framework*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
Williams F (1989) *Social Policy: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Polity.
Wimmer A and Glick Schiller N (2002) Methodological nationalism and beyond: Nation state building, migration and the social sciences. *Global Networks* 2(4): 301–334.
Winker G and Degele N (2011) Intersectionality as multi-level analysis: Dealing with social inequality. *European Journal of Women's Studies* 18(1): 51–66.
Wright EO (1985) *Classes*. London: Verso.
Yuval-Davis N (1996) *Gender and Nation*. London: Sage.
Yuval-Davis N (2006) Intersectionality and feminist politics. *European Journal of Women's Studies* 13(3): 193–209.

Author biography

Floya Anthias is currently Professor of Sociology and Social Justice (Emerita) at Roehampton University, London and Visiting Professor at City University, London. She has written extensively on social divisions and identities with a special focus on gender, ethnicity, 'race', class and migration.

Résumé

Cet article évalue les potentialités que recèlent deux approches qui font état de la complexité de la hiérarchisation sociale à différents égards. En premier lieu, l'article examine le renouveau de l'analyse de classe dans le cadre de conceptions de classe influencées par la culture. Celles-ci ont incorporé à l'analyse un certain nombre de relations sociétales, ayant trait essentiellement au symbolique, au social et au culturel. En deuxième lieu, l'article fait le bilan des tentatives pour théoriser l'intersection entre genre, ethnicité et classe sociale en s'appuyant sur la notion d'intersectionnalité. Il étudie les possibilités de développer des cadres d'analyse plus coordonnés afin de comprendre la hiérarchie sociale en croisant les données de ces débats. Il propose une conception intersectionnelle, centrée sur la localisation sociale et le positionnement translocalisé.

Mots-clés: classe sociale, ethnicité, genre, hiérarchie, intersectionnalité, localisation sociale, positionnement translocalisé

Resumen

Este artículo evalúa el potencial de dos enfoques que entienden la complejidad de la jerarquía social a través de diferentes perspectivas. Primero analiza el revival del análisis de clase dentro de los estudios sobre la clase influidos por la cultura. Estos análisis han incorporado un buen número de relaciones sociales en el análisis, referidas en sentido amplio como lo simbólico, lo social y lo cultural. Segundo, el artículo valora los intentos de teorizar las intersecciones de género, etnicidad y clase a través del esquema de la interseccionalidad. El artículo analiza el potencial para desarrollar esquemas analíticos más integrados para entender la jerarquía social utilizando referencias cruzadas a estos debates. El artículo propone un esquema interseccional que se centra en la locación social y la translocación.

Palabras clave: clase, etnicidad, género, interseccionalidad, jerarquía, locación social, posicionalidad translocacional