



## Intersectionality *incarnate*: A case study of civil society, social capital, and its metamorphosis

Joel Tyler Alba

To cite this article: Joel Tyler Alba (2023) Intersectionality *incarnate*: A case study of civil society, social capital, and its metamorphosis, Journal of Civil Society, 19:3, 271-290, DOI: 10.1080/17448689.2023.2226253

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/17448689.2023.2226253>



© 2023 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 28 Jul 2023.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 310



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

## Intersectionality *incarnate*: A case study of civil society, social capital, and its metamorphosis

Joel Tyler Alba 

Risk Management & Societal Safety, University of Stavanger, Stavanger, Norway

### ABSTRACT



This paper investigates civil society's metamorphosis through the lens of intersectional risk theory. While numerous studies interrogate civil society's spatiotemporal evolution, there has yet to be an analysis of *how* and *why* the Intersectional Activist has gained such prominence. The interdisciplinary nexus between intersectionality, social capital, and civil society to that of the risk discipline requires a multi-tiered methodology to map the contours of this metamorphosis. Therefore, the choice of a hermeneutically-framed, exploratory case study, supplemented by semi-structured interviews, structures the research. The results support that the Intersectional Activist is a byproduct of capitalistic, multiply-burdening institutions of oppression. However, these overlapping institutions form a pressurized moulding onto the individuals' *tabula rasa*, whereby a transversal, paradigm-defiant coalition insurrects against hegemonic systems. Reactivating the five capacities of *the self*, knowledge, processes, agency, and power to bridge cross-sectorial mobilization, the Intersectional Activist is a direct riposte to the Precarious Risk Society. The collective has now become the connective–manifesting in the intersectional plight against systemic injustice, the Matrix of Power reactivates the capacities through an association of difference, reconstituting the nature of social capital. Within this reconstitution, the transversal activist realizes themselves in a new connective frontier, for they are intersectionality *incarnate*.

### KEYWORDS

Intersectionality; civil society; social capital; grassroots organizations; risk society

## Introduction

This text aims to bridge intersectionality to social capital through an exploratory, first-hand case study of grassroots organizations, civil society, and intersectional activism to effectuate policymaking on a systemic level. To operationalize intersectionality, a keen focus on the five capacities structures the discussion: *the self*, knowledge, processes, agency, and power. The interplay between these capacities, intersectionality, and risk governance contests the abstractly delimited conception of 'spaces' and

**CONTACT** Joel Tyler Alba  joel.t.alba@uis.no  Risk Management & Societal Safety, University of Stavanger, Kjell Arholms Gate 41, Stavanger, 4021, Norway

© 2023 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

‘public spheres’, whereby ‘transversal politics’ emerges as a riposte to the globalized ‘Risk Society’ (Beck, 1992; Collins, 2010; Fraser, 1990; Habermas, 1987; Massey, 2005; Yuval-Davis, 1997).

To that end, invoking an operationalization of intersectionality requires the understanding that individuals are an imbrication of identity constructs, continually evolving, adapting, and refracting within the spatiotemporal social arena (Collins, 2015; Crenshaw, 1989; Crenshaw, 1993; Hulko, 2009; Nash, 2008). Moreover, a socially constructed, socially imposed ‘Matrix of Domination’ exists over the intersectional individual, ‘locating and situating’ them in an interlocking, entropic vacuum of power, dependent on their socially imposed identity and ‘social location’ (Anthias, 2012; Collins, 1990; Cuadraz & Uttal, 1999; Haraway, 1988).

However, an existential-societal shift has revolutionized the activist and the democratic sphere, where the ‘distributive paradigm of social justice’ exists no more (Young, 1990). Continually rising with the ebbs and flows of societal revolutions, *the self* evolves in response to the Risk Society, systemic risks, and the catastrophic failures of ‘Organized Irresponsibility’ (Beck, 2015). The collective has now become the ‘connective;’ rising against these societal failures, the ‘connective’ transgresses individual qualities and personal causes, manifesting in the intersectional plight against systemic injustice as a metamorphosized form of ‘social capital’ (Bennet & Segerberg, 2012; Marks et al., 2021; Robison et al., 2010; Sørensen, 2002; Weldon, 2019).

Though several studies interrogate intersectionality across various social movements, they reside within a common paradigm that assumes intersectionality is simply an identity-defining concept that imbues the movement with coalescing ‘fates’ (Cole, 2008; May, 2015). While significant, this paper intends to pinpoint Intersectional Activists’ genesis as a *force d’esprit*, broadening the spectrum with which intersectionality interacts with civil society, policymaking, and social capital to effectuate systemic change. Intuitively, two research questions arise:

1. How has civil society evolved in response to the advent and proliferation of the Risk Society?
2. What part does intersectionality play in this metamorphosis, if any?

To address the questions, I build on three case studies (Daniel & Dolan, 2020; Macé, 2018; Terriquez et al., 2018). While successfully arguing their positions of intersectionality as a collective action frame, they do not grasp the parallels between the ‘precariousness’ of the ‘Risk Society’, the five capacities, and their relationship to intersectional social capital existing as a byproduct of ‘Emancipatory Catastrophism’ (Beck, 1992; Beck, 2015; Gill & Pratt, 2008).

However, before diving into the theoretical, I shall first review the research methodologies. Next, I provide the coded results from the semi-structured interviews, separating them into three iterative, yet defining categorical constructs. Then, I discuss the results through a paradigmatic nexus of risk governance, Risk Society, civil society, and intersectionality, thus establishing the theoretical latitude to propose intersectionality *incarnate*. Lastly, I review the research *in toto*.

## Materials & Methods

Due to the interdisciplinary nature of the research questions, the choice of a hermeneutically-framed, multi-tiered exploratory study, employing semi-structured interviews, case study analysis, and a critical theory lens structures the methodology.

Actualizing the methodology through a critical theory lens enables the individual ‘... to become self-consciously aware of knowledge distortions...’, understanding that society is an amalgamation of socially constructed edifices, continually defined and redefined dependent on the constituted knowledges (Ewert, 1991, pp. 346–347). As is with the nature of knowledge, there are no universal, foolproof methods to conduct research. Hence, the necessity to move away from ‘... narrow descriptions of knowledge transfer towards a broader sociological explanation’ (Ward et al., 2009, p. 157). Within this broader sociological explanation, one must reflect upon their own epistemological positionality, critiquing the paradigmatic spheres of influence, situating oneself both within and outside the source material; in other words, invoking a ‘standpoint epistemology’ (Harding, 1992).

To that end, I acknowledge that my privileged, Western-Dominated perspective is beholden to views originating from colonial-derived, epistemological spheres of influence (Held, 2019). While it may be impossible to extract oneself from the subconscious-hold of Western-Dominated influences, acknowledging one’s tethering to these paradigms situates one in a position to challenge and ‘demarginalize’ the ‘power asymmetries’ of research methodologies (Chughtai et al., 2020; Held, 2019; Vallet et al., 2020). In doing so, one transcends the spatiotemporal divide, assessing the author and interviewee’s relatability, differences, limitations, and seminal pieces of that era while mindful of their cognitive biases (Munro et al., 2016, p. 16). The combination of these methodologies supports an analytical framework for micro, meso, macro, and meta-analysis, thus demonstrating a consolidative relationship between the data and proposed theories (Serpa & Ferreira, 2019). Extrapolating these epistemic nuances to the methodology establishes a more comprehensive research process, increasing the opportunity to construct a valid and reliable study.

### Interview Construction & Selection

The interview’s structure pays homage to the Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women (CRIAW) (2006) and Hankivsky et al.’s (2014) studies. Utilizing four varied case studies, Hankivsky et al. (2014) convey the advantages of a dualistic system of guiding principles and twelve key questions to assess policy through an Intersectional-Based Policy Perspective (IBPA). Alternatively, the CRIAW (2006) focuses on an Intersectional Feminist Framework to overview policy through a marginalized perspective. However, I aim to merge the two tactics, emphasizing iterative questioning, ‘radical listening’, and theoretical interlocation to learn from these social movements’ evolution, plight, and engagement to unearth intersectionality *incarnate* (Tobin, 2009).

Therefore, the Organization selection became integral to the study. I set out to find Organizations whose primary function was preemptive policy warfare instead of reactionary policy responses; see CRIAW and Hankivsky et al.’s studies. After sending umpteen emails and numerous ‘ghostings’, four Organizations agreed to participate.

These Organizations range from 4,000 to 15,000 members and operate across four continents, concentrating primarily on climate justice, racial inequality, social justice, environmental psychology (Eco-Anxiety), class inequality, and police brutality.

Organization 1, with approximately 5,500 active members, concert their efforts towards the unwarranted and excessive police brutality inflicted on African American citizens. They then reify the necessity to build positive societal relations by educating, strengthening, and mobilizing marginalized communities toward effectuating change in their districts. Organization 1 also works closely with reproductive rights, women's rights, and climate injustice. Organization 1's headquarters are in California, though they operate throughout the entire (United States) West Coast.

Organizations 2 and 3, boasting roughly 15,000 and 4,300 members, respectively, operate in two countries (United States and Norway). They both work to enact proper, meaningful, and, most importantly, immediate climate policy. Both Organizations explicitly mandate that the government state a climate emergency, codify aggressive climate-positive laws, move 'beyond politics' by integrating a Citizen's Assembly, and take direct action to educate the masses on the dire climate situation. As a decentralized unit, they have led many successfully organized strikes, walk-ins, and blockades of highways and successfully disrupted business at major climate-affronting institutions. While Organizations 2 and 3 are fighting the 'same' fight, they are entirely independent of one another.

Organization 4, with approximately 14,500 members, is an international, youth-led movement arguing that there is no climate justice without social justice. Organizing through every platform, Organization 4 instils youth-driven empowerment through multifaceted activism worldwide. They have attended events from COP26 to United Nation's Panels, supporting and mobilizing rallies ranging from reproductive rights to income inequality. They are intent on bringing the fight straight to the policymakers' doors. The core organizers are from Ireland, Mexico, Pakistan, and the United States; however, their base is active in South America, Asia, North America, and Europe.

### **Interview Process**

Over five months (May 2022–September 2022), I initiated contact with each Organization, built rapport, earned trust, set realistic interview goals and timeframes, and conducted and transcribed the interviews. In upholding ethical interview standards, consent for recording was obtained while anonymity was maintained – participants requested confidentiality. Additionally, an understanding of the inherent interview power relations was adhered to by continuously reevaluating neutral and value-free positions (Davey & Liefoghe, 2004, p. 181). As such, the responses do not indicate an objective reality but better reflect those on the frontlines' *standpoint epistemology*.

Furthermore, a semi-structured interview style provides the necessary dialectic latitude, ensuring the respondents enough leeway to discuss their perspectives about their 'study phenomenon' while also addressing the 'aims and objectives of the research' (Gil et al., 2008, p. 292). As Habermas notes, '... the structural patterns of action systems are not accessible to [purely external] observation; they have to be gotten ... from the internal perspective of participants' (Habermas, 1987, p. 151). This technique requires the ability to construct and guide the interview in a fashion that builds upon

itself in a ‘reflexive’, ‘hermeneutic-frame’, while allowing for individual experiences to propel the discussion (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995, p. 24).

The interviews, consisting of 14 questions,<sup>1</sup> were conducted via the Zoom platform and lasted approximately one hour; two to three representatives from each Organization were interviewed, totalling eleven interviews. Representing five countries (five from the United States, three from Norway, one from Pakistan, one from Mexico, and one from Ireland), participants expressed their interest in being seen not as individual activists but as the amorphous construct of the Organization itself. Hence the Results section’s prose.

Lastly, upon completing and transcribing the interviews, an ‘interpretative-inductive’ approach to coding the interviews enables the ability to ‘... capture key aspects ... identified in the raw data ... to be the most important themes given the evaluation objectives’ (Kuczynski & Daly, 2003, p. 383; Thomas, 2006, p. 242). Therefore, to ensure that the iterative coding process aligned with the interviewees’ sentiments, participants were asked to join a 15-to-30-minute independent roundtable to reflect on the prior discussions. I would then subtly reintroduce the codes through backhanded-hermeneutic questioning, maintaining the anonymity of the explicit codes and other participants’ identities to test the reliability of the codes. Naturally, this inclusion of a Delphi-Inspired, blind check strengthens the validity and reliability of the study (McAuley, 2004, p. 198).

## Results

The following discussion amalgamates the responses from the semi-structured interviews into three categorical constructs: ‘Society’s existential crisis’, ‘Justice as a (defunct) paradigm’, and ‘The metamorphosis of the activist’.

### *Society’s Existential Crisis*

Across the interviews, a core theme of existential dread and an inherent feeling of a shift in public spheres and discourses is apparent. To that effect, I umbrella this category as ‘Society’s existential crisis’.

Organization 1 notes the stark differences in the concept of community, or *public spheres*, due to society’s polarization, stating:

Over time, we use global issues to shed light on local issues because another trope we hear is that that doesn’t happen here, which is not true ... The thing is, all groups want change. For example, right-wing extremists want systemic change, a *better* community, they say, but there are different ideas about what a *better* community is. It’s hard when a person might want worse situations because it will improve *their* conception of community. We see the system actively working against us, pitting groups against groups. The tension is palpable; just look at all the violence and anger, it’s everywhere.

In our roundtable-closing interview, Organization 2 echoes these sentiments, noting the shift in public discourse and public spheres, articulating:

Our organization sees a strict divide between people. There seems to be a societal change occurring beyond the capabilities of the current regime, and people are starting to wake up and rise against one another. I hate sounding too revolutionary, but we need to wake up and look at our system’s effects on the individual, the populace, or else we won’t have much left. We must create a space where our faculties can flourish toward social parity.

Organization 3 delves into the psychological-societal effects of existential risks, stressing:

There is the initial realization of how bad the crisis is, and people will start to slowly connect the dots themselves, where they will say, 'You know what ... this is all driven by capitalism; the system doesn't care about us ... .' We need to change how we view ourselves in this system cause right now, it isn't working; we do not have a place in it.

Organization 4 argues that the immediacy and scale of the risks facing society requires a new government structure, one that realigns its priorities towards societal betterment, asserting:

Sadly, our government, who are supposed to represent us, put themselves first, put their interests above the people. Let the organizations with no ulterior motives in, those who look for the commonwealth, the environment, the minorities, people over capital, people first. Until we do that, change will never occur. (In Pakistan) The regime is not structured to advance the people first; it is profit over people, the environment, and everything. We are facing immediate crises on every front, crises that are larger than one singular government, crises that impede the progress of humanity. To save humanity, we need to put humans first.

All four Organizations address the inherent relation between the system (macro) and the negative externalities affecting the micro and meso stratum. While all four continue the fight for sociopolitical-environmental justice, there remains an atmosphere of anger towards the institutions meant to protect them. Hence, the following categorical construct: 'Justice as a (defunct) paradigm'.

### ***Justice as a (Defunct) Paradigm***

Further into the interviews, core themes of resentment and vindication towards the supposed 'paradigm of justice' arose. Participants fluctuated between feelings of betrayal, pessimism, and helplessness while simultaneously discussing how they operationalized these negative feelings into the justification for their actions. Bolstered by this lack of distributive justice, they overtly felt more in power due to the institutions' 'judicious' impotency.

As a result of one of our roundtable discussions, Organization 1 rhetorically questions the existence of justice, of societal care, and the nature of truth. They exclaim:

This is egregious, out of control; something in the universe has to give ... the (U.S.) Supreme Court are not going to stop, they are an activist court, they have an agenda, they are not planning for the people, they are planning for whatever the Republicans want them to do. It is a colonial, sexist, racist, and bigoted agenda. We are in the fight against truth, there is no acknowledgment of the truth, the actual truth, there is a narrative war, an education war ... and it is hard, as our vote is equal, and in some areas, our vote is less, how is this democracy? As far as I am concerned, the social contract is dead.

Organization 2 laments the injustices of the capitalist system, articulating:

I think the topic that keeps coming up repeatedly is racial injustice and inequality, and it depends on how an individual views a problem. You can be very specific in terms of the cause. For example, the immediate cause of climate change is the burning of fossil fuels, but you can also look at it from a macro scale, where capitalism is actually driving this and results in the climate crisis and racial inequalities. There are systems at play.

Organization 3 notes that there must be a strict, systematic overhaul, stressing:

I think because of that, and because a lot of us recognize that it is the marginalized communities that end up getting harmed the most, this also makes the way we go about tackling the issue very challenging because solving one specific problem may worsen a situation for a different population ... for better or for worse, everything is connected, we need to overhaul our perspective, our system, our intentions in order to effect *real* change.

Organization 4 discusses the privilege of travelling to Europe, not only for the experience but for the opportunity to see that there are other ways to govern society, noting:

Having this broadening of my horizons, coming back and saying, ‘Like now what, why aren’t we doing anything, why aren’t we moving forward ...’ the fact that our people are putting obstacles in front of ourselves, it got me frustrated; I need to do something, I’m tired of drifting, I’m starting to make myself a problem ... My dad asks, ‘Why are you doing it’, and I say, ‘If I don’t, no one else will’.

In our roundtable overview, Organization 4 discusses the systemic issues with the transition to sustainable energy, emphasizing:

In Mexico, there is a lot of classism, putting capital over people ... before, Mexico was focusing on green technology, a leader, being one of the largest expanding green energies and making smart green investments, but because it wasn’t faring good for the oil companies/industry, our government took a step back and started putting hoops in order to invest in green energy. This can change fast if we realize the world is for the people, not the money—once we put people over everything else, we can start to change to make our lives better, not easier, but better, because change is not easy.

All Organizations were highly conscious of the intrinsic interconnectedness between the macro and meso structures of society. While their organizations strive to work on macro-meso-micro levels, they understand a shift in discourse must be discovered amongst civil society before *actual* change may occur. It is within this macro-meso-micro engagement that spurs the *shift in discourse* through a *connective*, evolutionary recognition of *the self* and is thus representative of the next category: ‘The metamorphosis of the activist’.

### ***The Metamorphosis of the Activist***

In this construct, a core theme of a ‘change occurring’, not only in society and within organizations, but more distinctly, in the independent activist, or *the self*.

Organization 1 (U.S.) urges citizens to embrace the differences between subgroups, observing that even those who seemed *untouchable* (white women) were now in the crosshairs of the agenda-setting Supreme Court,<sup>2</sup> arguing:

Nationally, it feels like dark times, especially with the overturning of *Roe v. Wade*. I think there is more understanding between different subgroups, especially for white women, that they are now a part of this group too and are also being discriminated against, sadly. It has become clear that we can no longer turn a blind eye towards each other, but must be in constant communication with one another, we must listen to all subgroups and communities and be able to leverage one other towards progress and success. That, that right there is bringing people together.

Organization 1 continues, arguing that while society is creating common enemies, some ‘good’ may come out of it. For example, they discuss how their Organization is witnessing and harnessing the *fringe* populations and their united front of inequality as a means to effectuate systemic change. They stress:



People are more organized and more connected because there is a common enemy (the system); common enemies bring people together, and the common enemy is obvious ... the threat is our freedoms and rights. I believe people will fight for it, and I know that people will think it is too big of a problem, the enemy too strong, but I am hopeful that people will fight, they will vote, and try and make it better for all. That's what our Organization does, we put people in the right place to fight the good fight. Educating, enlisting, activating these fringe populations to 'fight' through their vote.

Organization 2 discusses the change in demographics within their subgroups divisions, articulating:

I go back to Citizen's Assembly a lot; I spend a lot of time asking myself how to effect real change, and I always come back to a change needed in the political system. If you look at the overall change in demographics just within our small subset of activism, you notice less homogeneity. Before, when we first started, the group was primarily affluent members (White) and college students, or retired folk. Now, with the crisis becoming more and more visceral, more tangible, more real, we have people of all classes, of all genders, of all races, working *together*, working for each other, for past and future generations. If this is the change we see daily, imagine the change in 10, 20 years!

In another of our roundtable discussions, Organization 3 focuses on the intersecting nature of identities, noting:

Identities are melding, causes are intersecting, a change is on the horizon, I can feel it! The opposition resides in one common factor, society's inability, or worse, unwillingness, to address systemic environmental justice. There is a societal sickness creeping into the everyday consciousness, the tide is turning, and with each wave (person), the wave grows stronger. Our organization brings these waves together, harnessing their individual power to effect change. We are that change!

As a core theme of identity arose throughout the roundtable discussions, I repackaged Organization 3's discussion of the *melding of identities* and inquired what Organization 4 thought. They state:

We can always go into identity, what it defines, or what is a part of your identity, that changes through time, we are not black and white, it is more of a spectrum ... the more interconnected we are, the wider our sight expands, we stop seeing black and white, and see shades ... you are never done changing, and so we need to be able to be that change, be that evolution, involve it in our goals, our policies, our Organization, our society.

Furthermore, in concluding our roundtable discussion, Organization 4 discusses the changes that occur on the meso level, when macro forces influence change on the individual (micro) level, asserting:

We are trying to bring younger people into the team, different organizations fighting their social justice fight, to give us a fresh perspective. Change is a part of everything; we would be foolish not to think we are of the same nature. Youth and difference help us attack the issue with fluidity, as it allows us to adapt new identities, new people, new ideas, new situations with an open heart, open ears, open eyes, and open mind. You're able to take in more, to bring in a wider point of view; if you don't learn from the youth and give them their space to allow adaptation to occur, change will never happen.

Taking inspiration from Organization 4, I opened my heart, ears, eyes, and mind when constructing the three distinct yet reinforcing categorical constructs, radically listening to the stories, emotions, and plight these individuals and Organizations represented. And

while it indeed posed a challenge, within these constructs hid the ‘epistemologies of the heart’ awaiting to be uncovered (Intzín, n.d.). Within this *epistemological heart* resides the crux of our discussion – a theory-driven, meta-analysis arguing that the emergence of intersectional social capital is not a haphazard accident but a retort to the Risk Society’s vicelike hold over the five capacities.

## Discussion

While a plethora of studies thoroughly discusses the evolution of social movements during the COVID-19 Pandemic (Chenoweth et al., 2020; Pleyers, 2020), to social movements as a ‘counter practice imbuing everyday resistance’ (Johansson & Vinthagen, 2019), to a ‘gendered focus on the substantive representation of women’ (Chaney, 2016; Eto, 2012), there has yet to be a study theorizing the systematic emergence of the Intersectional Activist as a byproduct of the neoliberal system, otherwise known as ‘The Risk Society’ (Beck, 1992).

Therefore, the subsequent sections analyze the main themes established in the semi-structured interviews, with a keen focus on the nexus between risk governance, the ‘Precarious’ ‘Risk Society’, and the consequential arrival of intersectional-social capital as a manifestation of ‘Emancipatory Catastrophism’ (Beck, 1992; Beck, 2015; Gill & Pratt, 2008). Invoking and meta-analyzing these paradigms provides the theoretical latitude to answer the two research questions:

- (1) How has civil society evolved in response to the advent and preponderance of the Risk Society?
- (2) What part does intersectionality play in this metamorphosis, if any?

## Society’s Existential Crisis

On the precipice of every societal revolution, the confluence of an activated sense of *self*, knowledge, processes, agency, and power can beget, if not presuppose, systematic change. Whether that be through the Marxist class struggles of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, Foucault’s ‘political power found in the economy’, or Beck’s power of ‘individualization’, there is no mistaking that the five capacities have unimpeded influence within paradigmatic-societal change (Beck, 1992, p. 153; Foucault, 1980, p. 89).

Still, the concept of an institutional-sovereign power, *purely* realized within a government entity, is on the cusp of its demise, with globalization as the culprit and the ‘reflexive’ ‘translocational’ Intersectional Activist as its offspring (Anthias, 2012; Beck, 2005, p. 54; Beck, 2015; Davis, 2008; Foucault, 1980, pp. 119–122; Sørensen, 2014). Within this transition, this existential realization, the public sphere of yesteryear is confronted by *the self’s* reflexivity, acting as a two-way mirror into society’s risk-consciousness – that is, the Precariousness of the Risk Society.

## The Precarious Risk Society

Indicated by globalization’s contemporaneous hold on societies, globalization unveils itself as a transnational *systemic risk*, altering the consciousness and *space* of the public

sphere, thus spurring the inception of the Risk Society (Beck, 2006; Clark & Short, 1993; Renn, 2016). The Risk Society is an inextricable result of the invasive ubiquity of systemic risks, further entrenching the social arena into a turbulent state of ‘glocalized’ uncertainties, thereby forming the ‘individualised citizen’ (Beck, 2005, pp. 136–137).

This cosmopolitan turn towards the Risk Society has drastically altered the concept of government, social capital, and civil society, where the focus resides on profit over people, restricting the institutional willingness to enact policies toward the betterment of society (Beck, 2005, 2009a). Organizations echoed these sentiments, viewing this complex through the macro-meso lens, noting the detrimental effects of systemic injustice on the public sphere. As Beck (2005) states, ‘It is not (necessarily) that nation-states boundaries have become more permeable, but rather that the concept of space is being revolutionized’ (p. 138). With the revolution of space comes a revolution of civil society, and as per the *ipso facto paradox of existence*, society is not but a reflection of the individuals’ (group) consciousness and, therefore, reacts in line with the ebbs and flow of knowledge constructs (Alba, 2021). Ironically, Habermas’ utopian conception of the ‘public sphere’, that which has been rightfully argued against on the demerits of its restrictive, classist, and sexist ‘homophily’ principle, finds itself resurrected due to the extreme polarization of the Risk Society (Alexander, 2006; Fraser, 1990; Mansbridge, 2012; McPherson et al., 2001).

In other words, the five capacities, and by proxy, social capital, are redefined and straight-jacketed due to the existential-systemic risks of modernity. More explicitly, this revolutionizing reconstitution occurs at the onset and prevalence of the Risk Society. All Organizations discussed that without a government working towards human betterment, the existential realization of the ‘impending crises’ insurrects the individual against its counterpart, a regression back to the fight-or-flight instincts, otherwise known as System 1 thinking (Kahneman, 2012).

Thus, the Risk Society is both a prerequisite and a byproduct of its Precarious inception, in that ‘Precarity signifies both the multiplication of ... unstable, insecure forms of living, and simultaneously, new forms of political struggle and solidarity that reach beyond the traditional models of the political party’ (Gill & Pratt, 2008, p. 3). The Precarious Risk Society does not allow anyone to live in a risk-free vacuum. Risks are realized at the forefront of societal consciousness and are consequently influenced by those who perceive risks through the veil of their indirect or direct experiences (Slovic, 1993). These ‘realities’ experienced by the various political silos impress upon the individuals’ *tabula rasa*, further curating and reaffirming the ‘narratives’ fabricated by these polarizing factions. As such, these insulated public spheres have *reached beyond the traditional models of the political parties*, and as Organization 3 states, *there seems to be a societal change occurring beyond the capabilities of the current regime*.

However, acknowledging the inherent power imbalances of the Precarious Risk Society is only one part of the problem. To effectively combat the Precarious Risk Society, one must understand how these power imbalances originate and, more so, are preserved. Hence the introduction into the paradigmatic nexus of the ‘Uncertainty Paradox’, ‘Organized Irresponsibility’, and the ‘Matrix of Domination’ (Beck, 2015; Collins, 1990; van Asselt & Vos, 2006). While our Organizations are not necessarily knowledgeable of these *specific* paradoxes and paradigms, they are acutely aware and currently fighting against the adverse effects of these coexisting-maladaptive societal

externalities. As Organization 3 states, *the opposition resides in one common factor, society's inability, or worse, unwillingness, to address systemic environmental justice* – it is within this keen recognition of the coexisting-maladaptive systems that supports the invocation of our next section: Justice as a (defunct) paradigm.

### ***Justice as a (Defunct) Paradigm***

While justice has many faces, one could argue oppression has just as many; and while justice *should* manifest as a counterweight to societal oppression, if not presuppose it, civil society continues its laboured efforts to mitigate the extensive reach of the Precarious Risk Society (Young, 1990). However, one must inquire: Does justice reside in society's democratic institutions, or is it actively practiced by its citizens, thereby establishing the foundation for justice to be institutionalized? Perhaps, one cannot exist without the other? In an attempt to address this philosophical conundrum, I invoke three constructs: The Uncertainty Paradox, Organized Irresponsibility, and the Matrix of Domination to theoretically convey the Organizations' experience within these intersecting systems.

### ***Paradoxes, Paradigms & Precarity***

While all Organizations viewed justice as a macro-meso-micro concept imbued in the democratic institutions, they simultaneously viewed these same institutional constructs as both the architects and perpetrators of social injustices. The Organizations argue that the social justice paradigms have failed marginalized communities and society, restricting social capital through a negation of the five capacities (*the self*, knowledge, processes, agency, and power). This failure begs the question: Did the Risk Society's Precarious nature eradicate the efficaciousness of judicial paradigms, or has the system always been set up to fail?

Indeed, this challenging affront to the justice paradigm creates an 'incommensurability' between paradigms (Kuhn, 1962). While one paradigm may rise from the ashes of the other, it does not necessarily mean that such transposition occurs at a natural rate of exposition. Kuhn (1962) explicates, 'Within the new paradigm, old terms, concepts, and experiments fall into new relationships one with the other ... Communication across the revolutionary divide is inevitably partial' (p. 148). Such incommensurability may be extrapolated to what Beck (2009b) deems to be Organized Irresponsibility, stating, 'The challenges of the ... twenty-first century are being negotiated in terms of concepts ... drawn from early industrial society ... The threats to which we are exposed and the security promises we seek to contain them stem from different centuries' (p. 28). This paradoxical chasm between existential-systemic risks and the implemented policies that are only partially acceptable to the risks themselves ultimately leads to the 'Uncertainty Paradox' (van Asselt & Vos, 2006).

Describing the 'Uncertainty Paradox', van Asselt and Vos (2006) explain how mismanaged policies are implemented due to the inherent uncertainty of risks. Phrased differently, the incommensurability between paradigmatic understandings of risks and their consequences leads to the Organized Irresponsibility of policymaking, straining societal conceptions of justice. They argue, 'On the one hand, it is increasingly recognised that science cannot provide decisive evidence on uncertain risks, while on the other hand,

policymakers and authorities increasingly resort to science for more certainty and conclusive evidence' (van Asselt & Vos, 2006, p. 317). Hence, as systemic risks become increasingly pronounced, the public becomes further estranged from their perception of safety, as experts and scientists continue to utilize the same methods as in the previous paradigm, leading to mismanaged policies (Beck, 2009b; Slovic, 1993). Therefore, due to systematic uncertainty, citizens rely on System 1 thinking, further retreating into their divided silos (public spheres) and manufactured realities, exacerbating sociopolitical polarization. The Organized Irresponsibility of policymaking furthers the gap between risk perception and risk management (Uncertainty Paradox), solidifying ambivalence towards the Risk Society and, by proxy, risks themselves.

Consequently, a negative feedback loop occurs: The ambivalence of the Risk Society, exacerbated by Organized Irresponsibility and the Uncertainty Paradox, fuels the polarization of the insulated public spheres. In attempting to re-establish a form of social capital, civil society retreats further into their insulated public spheres, or in this case, single-issue causes, thereby restricting the *Other's* five capacities through a negation of political saliency. That is, due to the polarization of the Precarious Risk Society, single-issue organizations and civil groups become entangled in a battle against themselves, where an 'Oppression Olympics' of 'Who is Worse Off' becomes the focal point (Davis & Martínez, 1993). As a result, neither of the organization's goals are realized, as the motivation turns towards becoming the most salient oppression, thereby restricting social capital to a 'race to the bottom' (Carbado, 2002).

Ultimately, we arrive at the peak of the Precarious Risk Society. Buttressed by Organized Irresponsibility, power imbalances are reinforced through a system hellbent on maintaining hegemonic control over the five capacities and social capital via a race to the bottom. These intersecting institutional structures are both a symptom and prerequisite of the Risk Society's existence – to wit, they are a Matrix of Domination.

### **Matrix of Domination**

ASTOUNDINGLY, no research has investigated the paradigmatic nexus with which Organized Irresponsibility, the Uncertainty Paradox, and Precarious Risk Society intersect to impact society. Moreover, this paradigmatic nexus of injustice has yet to be assessed through an intersectional lens. To that end, I argue that the intersection and buttressing of these paradigms invariably lead to constructing, reproducing, and bolstering the Matrix of Domination's inextricable hold over marginalized communities.

Addressing the matrix, Collins (1990) states, 'The overarching matrix ... houses multiple groups, each with varying experiences of penalty and privilege that produce corresponding ... situated knowledges' (pp. 234–235). Similarly, Beck (2015), while discussing structures of oppression, argues that we must '... recognize the persistence of colonial historical patterns and the dense intimacy of their linkages and dynamics with law's constitution of both its subject ... and the environment' (p. 82). These situated knowledges (insulated public spheres) form through oppressive institutional structures that construct the Matrix of Domination. Akin to refracted light, each situated knowledge is produced based on the kaleidoscopic nature of the intersection of these oppressive institutions; more explicitly, for the marginalized individual ('situated' knowledge), the entropic force of these oppressive structures (power) occurs as a result of their overlapping

intersections (processes), thus stifling *the self's* social capital (agency) (Carby, 1992; Harding, 1992; Hulko, 2009).

So, once again, the *ipso facto paradox of existence* emerges: The Risk Society begets the individualization of the citizen through its inextricable linkage to systemic risks, inducing a decision-making paralysis. This paralysis (Uncertainty Paradox) further erodes the public's trust in the decision-makers and experts through Organized Irresponsibility (mismanaged policies), perpetuating continual internment within the Precarious Risk Society. This internment then solidifies the marginalized's 'social location' (public spheres) in which their social capital, or lack thereof, is determined through socially imposed identity constructs, imposing an interlocking nexus of subjectivity over the individual (Matrix of Domination) (Hulko, 2009; Weldon, 2019). In essence, a reconstitution and bastardization of the five capacities occur over the marginalized individual through the Matrix of Domination, reaffirming patriarchal, colonial, and racist paradigms long engrained in the societal structures of oppression.

However, this is not to say there is not yet a glimmer of hope! Quite the contrary, indeed; from this cacophony of systemic oppression arises the Intersectional Activist, a byproduct of Emancipatory Catastrophism, a resounding retort to the defunct paradigm of justice! In order to realize the 'Rise of the Intersectional Activist', it is befitting to investigate the juncture these paradigms concomitantly intersect with that of civil society.

### ***The Rise of the Intersectional Activist***

And so, we arrive at the crux of the argument, where the Precarious Risk Society constructs and perpetrates the Organized Irresponsibility of policymaking, thereby bolstering the Matrix of Domination behind the façade of a 'just' *laissez-faire* politique. However, as stated in the interviews, there is a change occurring within, beyond, and because of these societal injustices – a reorganizing of thought, of grassroots civil society, of the five capacities and social capital, a reorganizing of *purpose*. It is within this reaction to the Precarious Risk Society and the Matrix of Domination that we arrive at 'Emancipatory Catastrophism' (Beck, 2015).

Beck (2015) articulates:

... it is not about the negative side effects of goods but the positive side effects of bads. They are producing normative horizons of common goods. Metamorphosis is about the transfiguration of the social and political order ... metamorphosis is more, and bigger than evolution ... it is a side effect of the everyday practices on all levels, institutions, organizations and everyday life. Its power is the power of side effects ... (pp. 75–77).

The overlapping paradigms of Organized Irresponsibility, Uncertainty Paradox, and Matrix of Domination catalyze with one another to spark a *Verwandlung*, or metamorphosis, in response to the Precarious Risk Society (Beck, 2015, p. 81). In our dimension, this *Verwandlung*, this *positive side effect of bads*, manifests in the transition of the one-dimensional activist into the Intersectional Activist – an activist with a *better understanding between subgroups* due to a *melding of identities*, as *youth and difference helps us attack the issue with fluidity, adapting new identities, and new people*, thereby creating this *horizon of common goods*. This metamorphosis does not simply reside in the individual-Intersectional Activist but, more so, establishes webs of association

through the newly activated ‘connective’ tissue developing between subgroups (Bennet & Segerberg, 2012).

Explicitly, connective action arises as ‘... formal organizations are losing their grip on individuals, and group ties are being replaced by large-scale, fluid social networks’ (Bennet & Segerberg, 2012, p. 748). This fluidity is further bolstered by the theory of ‘emplacement’, in which *the self* is altered due to these systemic ‘place-events’, or, in our terminology, existential risks (Pink, 2011). Hence, the Intersectional Activist is birthed and moulded through the contours of the Precarious Risk Society’s existential risks (*place-events*), thereby requiring a new connective action frame (*fluid social networks*). Reiterating through sociological vernacular, Beisel and Kay (2004) note, ‘Social change happens when people transpose cultural schemas onto different resource sets, which is possible ... because humans live in multiple and overlapping social structures’ (p. 503). Thus, when bridging new interaction routes due to the overlapping schemas and ‘place-events’, an inversion occurs, where difference-through-inequality now unites the intersectional coalition as a form of social capital – or, in other words, as a *resource set*.

Broadening this notion, Sewell (1992) notes, ‘... structures, then, are sets of mutually sustaining schemas and resources that empower and constrain social action and that tend to be reproduced by that social action ...’ (p. 19). So, while the Matrix of Domination is inherently a ‘bad’ symptom of the Risk Society, utilizing Emancipatory Catastrophism logic, there yet occurs a *positive side effect from bads, a melding of identities* due to the intersection of structures and schemas. This meta-effect within the macro-meso-micro stratum imbues the Intersectional Activist with the socio-political-historical tragedies of other subgroups, a form of social capital, per se, thus providing them with a connective empowerment through inequality-inspired social action. This meta-effect may also be understood through Organization 1’s eyes, stating, *People are more organized and more connected because there is a common enemy* – thus, *the positive side effect from bads* results in the meta-association of transhistorical injustices amongst subgroups.

Therefore, as a riposte to the *Hydra* of societal injustice (Precarious Risk Society, Organized Irresponsibility, and the Matrix of Domination), the Intersectional Activist arises as a manifestation of these systemic injustices, incorporating the webs of association through difference to activate their individual-connective resources. In what was once perceived as their weaknesses, these socially-imposed inequalities are now being utilized as a newly realized form of social capital to effectuate change. As Sandoval (2003) so eloquently articulates, the oppositional consciousness between subgroups ‘... provide repositories within which subjugated citizens can either occupy or throw off subjectivities in a process that at once both enacts and yet decolonizes their various relations to their relations to their real conditions of existence’ (p. 85). I therefore interpret this oppositional consciousness as a unification between differences, creating a reinforcing, kaleidoscopic *Matrix of Power* rather than domination. Within this unification, within *these repositories of subjugated citizens*, occurs a de-bastardization, or reclaiming of the five capacities through an activation of difference. As such, the oppositional consciousness and the newly inversed *Matrix of Power* bolster MacKinnon and Derickson’s (2012) concept of capacity-driven ‘resourcefulness’.

In building a model from resilience to resourcefulness, MacKinnon and Derickson (2012) echo the sentiments raised by the Organizations, stating:

It requires the cultivation of links with community groups and social movements as part of an expansive spatial politics that aims to both foster translocal relations between particular sites and exemplars and challenge the national and supranational institutions that support the operation of global capitalism (p. 267).

So, new-age, *translocal*, intersectional activism arises as a response to the fractured state; employing connective tactics, the marginalized citizen establishes webs of association built on related notions of ‘... empathy, not sympathy,’ thereby becoming ‘the basis of coalition’ (Collins, 2010, p. 934). A transversal dialogue, birthed through empathetic understandings of the interrelatedness between societal transgressions, sparks a new coalitional (intersectional) social capital (Yuval-Davis, 1997, p. 88).

Akin to the Japanese art of Kintsugi, where artists repair broken ceramics with gold powder highlighting their vulnerability, intersectional activism embraces the quirks, differences, and the vulnerable and fragmented nature of the Risk Society individual. Embracing the ethos of Kintsugi, Organization 1 states that *we must listen to all subgroups and communities and be able to leverage one another toward progress and success*. Furthermore, Organization 4 stresses:

One of our main goals is to be a safe space for all. We want to make it a point in making sure everyone’s difference is embraced ... there is a core connection between everything and everyone ... you see forests, but you don’t see the roots, they are all intertwined, and just like the forests, we are all intertwined. We are not only fighting for climate justice, we’re fighting for social justice.

This intersectional renaissance imbues societal movements with a newfound sense of purpose, social capital, and a ‘translocational’ frame of reference (Anthias, 2012). The Intersectional Activist has evolved into the human manifestation of institutionalized criticism, whereby ‘... conflict awakens and impresses upon consciousness that a “misconception of the century” has crept into the relation between global risks and the institutional arrangements ... which are supposed to control them’ (Beck, 2009a, p. 9). Organizations have *woken up*, fuelled by the Precarious Risk Society’s malfeasance, a new arrangement is being brokered between subgroups. The success of these movements, and by proxy, intersectional social capital, however, depends on the activation of the five capacities: A metamorphosis of *the self*, from ‘standpoint knowledges’, to activated *knowledges*; an activation of difference as a *process* to organize a ‘resourceful’ network of ‘oppositional consciousnesses’, thus spurring the *agency* to unite under the umbrella of injustice, thereby effectuating systemic change (*power*).

Intersectional activism arises from the ashes of the past, beyond the individual, beyond the singular cause; a new ‘rainbow coalition’ embraces the difference of individuality, forming the transversal activist (Alonso, 2012, p. 614). Within this transversal activist, we unearth intersectionality *incarnate* – the Emancipatory Catastrophism offspring of the interlocking nexus of the Precarious Risk Society, Organized Irresponsibility, and Matrix of Domination.

## Conclusion

This paper sets out to demarcate a new activist, a new civil society, a new prospect towards systemic change through a reformulation of social capital via the five capacities:



*the self*, knowledge, processes, agency, and power. Moulded by the Precarious Risk Society landscape, the Intersectional Activist is a melding of identities, of causes, and of systemic injustice. The de-bastardization of the five capacities through an oppositional consciousness and an association of difference through resourcefulness becomes their Matrix of Power; that is, the *intersectional* social capital to effectuate change. The cosmopolitan turn of civil society has thus sparked a cosmopolitan turn within the individual, intrinsically affecting the mobilization of subgroups. Within this macro-meso-micro-meta metamorphosis, the Intersectional Activist realizes themselves in a new frontier of activism: They are transnational, consciously free, yet interconnected by the injustices of yesteryear, today, and tomorrow; mobilizing towards societal redistributive justice, they are intersectionality *incarnate*.

## Notes

1. Interview questions available by request.
2. For context, in June 2022, the United States Supreme Court overturned *Roe v. Wade*, ruling that there is no constitutional right to abortion.

## Data Availability Statement

Due to the nature of this research, participants of this study did not agree for their data to be shared publicly, so supporting data is not available.

## Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

## ORCID

Joel Tyler Alba  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6247-9585>

## References

- Alba, J. (2021). *A new approach for the prioritization of information overload: A risk-informed systemization for communication (R.I.S.C.) to assess COVID-19 publications* [Unpublished Master's Thesis]. UiS.
- Alexander, J. C. (2006). *The civil sphere*. Oxford University Press.
- Alonso, A. (2012). Intersectionality by other means? New equality policies in Portugal. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 19(4), 596–621. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sp/jxs017>
- Anthias, F. (2012). Hierarchies of social location, class and intersectionality: Towards a translocational frame. *International Sociology*, 28(1), 121–138. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0268580912463155>
- Beck, U. (1992). *Risk society: Towards a new modernity*. Sage. <http://www.riversimulator.org/Resources/Anthropology/RiskSociety/RiskSocietyTowardsANewModernity1992Beck.pdf>
- Beck, U. (2005). *Power in the global age*. Polity Press.
- Beck, U. (2006). Living in the world risk society. *Economy and Society*, 35(3), 329–345. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03085140600844902>

- Beck, U. (2009a). Critical theory of world risk society: A cosmopolitan vision. *Constellations (Oxford, England)*, 16(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8675.2009.00534.x>
- Beck, U. (2009b). *World at risk*. Polity Press.
- Beck, U. (2015). Emancipatory Catastrophism: What does it mean to climate change and risk society? *Current Sociology*, 63(1), 75–88. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392114559951>
- Beisel, N., & Kay, T. (2004). Abortion, race, and gender in nineteenth-century America. *American Sociological Review*, 69(4), 498–518. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240406900402>
- Bennet, W., & Segerberg, A. (2012). The logic of connective action: Digital media and the personalification of contentious politics. *Information, Communication & Society*, 15(5), 739–768. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2012.670661>
- Carbado, D. W. (2002). Race to the bottom. *UCLA Law Review*, 49(5), 1283–1312. [https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/uclalr49&div=37&g\\_sent=1&casa\\_token=4E1N151rRYQAAAAA:fh182HAt8q3GglcUWwm7HjmNvLbzGn4qhgRj5e-cGm33\\_pAkYe6G\\_hcVWwgnArSalzE4oYrJVI&collection=journals](https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/uclalr49&div=37&g_sent=1&casa_token=4E1N151rRYQAAAAA:fh182HAt8q3GglcUWwm7HjmNvLbzGn4qhgRj5e-cGm33_pAkYe6G_hcVWwgnArSalzE4oYrJVI&collection=journals)
- Carby, H. (1992). The multicultural wars. *Radical History Review*, 10(54), 1–12. <https://ur.booksc.eu/book/52958874/5029fc>
- Chaney, P. (2016). Gendered political space: Civil society, contingency theory, and the substantive representation of women. *Journal of Civil Society*, 12(2), 198–223. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17448689.2016.1178964>
- Chenoweth, E., Smith, M., & Shetty, S. (2020). Reimagining social movements and civil resistance during the global pandemic. *Harvard: Carr Center Covid-19 Discussion Series*, (4), 1–6. [https://carrcenter.hks.harvard.edu/files/cchr/files/200416\\_covid\\_discussion\\_paper.pdf](https://carrcenter.hks.harvard.edu/files/cchr/files/200416_covid_discussion_paper.pdf)
- Chughtai, H., Young, A. G., Cardo, V., Morgan, C., Prior, C., Young, E., Myers, M., Borsa, T., Demirkol, O., Morton, S., Wilkin, J., & Özkula, S. M. (2020). Demarginalizing interdisciplinarity in IS research: Interdisciplinary research in marginalization. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 46(1), 296–315. <https://doi.org/10.17705/1CAIS.04613>
- Clark, L., & Short, J. (1993). Social organization and risk: Some current controversies. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 19(1), 375–399. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.19.080193.002111>
- Cole, E. (2008). Coalitions as a model for intersectionality: From practice to theory. *Sex Roles*, 59(5–6), 443–453. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9419-1>
- Collins, P. H. (1990). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. Routledge.
- Collins, P. H. (2010). The tie that binds: Race, gender and US violence. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 21(5), 917–938. <https://doi.org/10.1080/014198798329720>
- Collins, P. H. (2015). Intersectionality's definitional dilemmas. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 41(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-073014-112142>
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and Sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 1989(8), 139–167. <https://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/uclf/vol1989/iss1/8>
- Crenshaw, K. (1993). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241–1299. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039>
- CRIAW-ICREF. (2006). *Intersectional feminist frameworks: An emerging vision*. Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women, 1–19. [http://www.oaith.ca/assets/files/Publications/Intersectional%20Feminist%20Frameworks\\_CRIAW\\_e.pdf](http://www.oaith.ca/assets/files/Publications/Intersectional%20Feminist%20Frameworks_CRIAW_e.pdf)
- Cuadraz, G., & Uttal, L. (1999). Intersectionality and in-depth interviews: Methodological strategies for analyzing race, class, and gender. *Race, Gender & Class*, 6(3), 156–186. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41674900>
- Daniel, T., & Dolan, M. (2020). Intersectionality and collective action: Visioning a feminist green new deal in the US. *Gender & Development*, 28(3), 515–533. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13552074.2020.1843829>
- Davey, M. K., & Liefvooghe, A. (2004). Critical research and analysis in organizations. In C. Cassel & G. Symon (Eds.), *Essential guide to qualitative methods in organizational research* (pp. 180–190). Sage.

- Davis, A. Y., & Martínez, E. (1993). *Coalition building among people of color*. A discussion with Angela Y. Davis and Elizabeth Martínez. UCSD.
- Davis, K. (2008). Intersectionality as buzzword: A sociology of science perspective on what makes a feminist theory successful. *Feminist Theory*, 9(1), 67–85. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464700108086364>
- Eto, M. (2012). Reframing civil society from gender perspectives: A model of a multi-layered seamless world. *Journal of Civil Society*, 8(2), 101–121. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17448689.2012.686738>
- Ewert, G. D. (1991). Habermas and education: A comprehensive overview of the influence of habermas in educational literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 61(3), 345–378. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543061003345>
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews & other writings 1972–1977* (C. Gordon, Ed., C. Gordon, L. Marshall, J. Mepham, & K. Soper, Trans.). Pantheon Books. [https://monoskop.org/images/5/5d/Foucault\\_Michel\\_Power\\_Knowledge\\_Selected\\_Interviews\\_and\\_Other\\_Writings\\_1972-1977.pdf](https://monoskop.org/images/5/5d/Foucault_Michel_Power_Knowledge_Selected_Interviews_and_Other_Writings_1972-1977.pdf)
- Fraser, N. (1990). Rethinking the public sphere: A contribution to the critique of actually existing democracy. *Social Text*, 25(26), 56–80. <https://doi.org/10.2307/466240>
- Gil, P., Stewart, K., Treasure, E., & Chadwick, B. (2008). Methods of data collection in qualitative research: Interviews and focus groups. *British Dental Journal*, 204(6), 291–295. <https://doi.org/10.1038/bdj.2008.192>
- Gill, R., & Pratt, A. (2008). Precarity and cultural work in the social factory? Immaterial labour, precariousness and cultural work. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 25(16), 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276408097794>
- Habermas, J. (1987). *The theory of communicative action: Lifeworld and system: Critique of functionalist reason* (Vol. 2). Beacon Press.
- Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (1995). *Ethnography: Principles in practice* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Hankivsky, O., Grace, D., Hunting, G., Giesbrecht, M., Fridkin, A., Rudrum, S., Olivier, F., & Clark, N. (2014). An intersectionality-based policy analysis framework: Critical reflections on a methodology for advancing equity. *International Journal for Equity in Health*, 13(119), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12939-014-0119-x>
- Haraway, D. (1988). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies*, 14(3), 575–599. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3178066>
- Harding, S. (1992). Rethinking standpoint epistemology: What is “strong objectivity?”. *The Centennial Review*, 36(3), 437–470. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23739232>
- Held, M. B. (2019). Decolonizing research paradigms in the context of settler colonialism: An unsettling, mutual, and collaborative effort. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 18, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406918821574>
- Hulko, W. (2009). The time- and context-contingent nature of intersectionality and interlocking oppressions. *Affilia*, 24(1), 44–55. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886109908326814>
- Intzín, J. L. (n.d.). *Sp’ijjal O’tan: Knowledges or epistemologies of the heart* (M. Ramírez-Cancio & M. Olavarria, Trans.). Retrieved April 26, 2023, from Resistant Strategies: <https://resistantstrategies.hemi.press/spijjal-otan-knowledges-or-epistemologies-of-the-heart/>
- Johansson, A., & Vinthagen, S. (2019). *Conceptualizing ‘everyday resistance’*. Taylor & Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315150154>
- Kahneman, D. (2012). *Thinking fast and slow*. Penguin Random House UK.
- Kuczynski, L., & Daly, K. (2003). Qualitative methods for inductive (theory-generating) research. In L. Kuczynski (Ed.), *Handbook of dynamics in parent-child relations* (pp. 373–392). Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452229645.n18>
- Kuhn, T. S. (1962). The structure of scientific revolutions. In T. S. Kuhn (Ed.), *Revolutions as changes of world view* (4th ed.). The University of Chicago Press.
- Macé, E. (2018). From patriarchy to composite gender arrangements? Theorizing the historicity of social relations of gender. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 25(3), 317–336. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sp/jxy018>

- MacKinnon, D., & Derickson, K. D. (2012). From resilience to resourcefulness. *Progress in Human Geography*, 37(2), 253–270. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132512454775>
- Mansbridge, J. (2012). Conflict and commonality in habermas's structural transformation of the public sphere. *Political Theory*, 40(6), 789–801. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0090591712457661>
- Marks, E., Hickman, C., Pihkala, P., Clayton, S., Lewandowski, E. R., Mayall, E. E., Britt, W., Catriona, M., & van Susteren, L. (2021). Young people's voices on climate anxiety, government betrayal and moral injury: A global phenomenon. *The Lancet*, 5, e863–e873. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3918955>
- Massey, D. (2005). *For space*. Sage.
- May, V. (2015). *Pursuing intersectionality: Unsettling dominant imaginaries*. Routledge.
- McAuley, J. (2004). Hermeneutic understanding. In C. Cassel & G. Symon (Eds.), *Essential guide to qualitative methods in organizational research* (pp. 1–388). Sage. Retrieved March 31, 2021, from <https://smpncilebak2011.files.wordpress.com/2011/11/essential-guide-to-qualitative-in-organizational-research.pdf>
- McPherson, M., Smith-Lovin, L., & Cook, J. M. (2001). Birds of a feather: Homophily in social networks. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27(1), 415–444. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.27.1.415>
- Munro, E., Cartwright, N., Hardie, J., & Montuschi, E. (2016). *Improving child safety: Deliberation, judgement and empirical research*. Centre for Humanities Engaging Science and Society.
- Nash, J. (2008). Re-thinking intersectionality. *Feminist Review*, 89(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1057/fr.2008.4>
- Pink, S. (2011). From embodiment to emplacement: Re-thinking competing bodies, senses and spatialities. *Sport, Education and Society*, 16(3), 343–355. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2011.565965>
- Pleyers, G. (2020). The pandemic is a battlefield. Social movements in the COVID-19 lockdown. *Journal of Civil Society*, 16(4), 295–312. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17448689.2020.1794398>
- Renn, O. (2016). Systemic risks: The new kid on the block. *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development*, 58(2), 26–36. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00139157.2016.1134019>
- Robison, L. J., Schmid, A. A., & Siles, M. E. (2010). Is social capital really capital? *Review of Social Economy*, 60(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00346760110127074>
- Sandoval, C. (2003). US third-world feminism: The theory and method of oppositional consciousness in the postmodern world. In R. Lewis & S. Mills (Eds.), *Feminist postcolonial theory: A reader* (pp. 75–102). Routledge.
- Serpa, S., & Ferreira, C. M. (2019). Micro, meso and macro levels of social analysis. *International Journal of Social Science Studies*, 7(3), 120–124. <https://doi.org/10.11114/ijsss.v7i3.4223>
- Sewell, W. H., Jr. (1992). A theory of structure: Duality, agency, and transformation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 98(1), 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1086/229967>
- Slovic, P. (1993). Perceived risk, trust, and democracy. *Risk Analysis*, 13(6), 675–682. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6924.1993.tb01329.x>
- Sørensen, E. (2002). Democratic theory and network governance. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 24(4), 693–720. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10841806.2002.11029383>
- Terriquez, V., Brenes, T., & Lopez, A. (2018). Intersectionality as a multipurpose collective action frame: The case of the undocumented youth movement. *Ethnicities*, 18(2), 260–276. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796817752558>
- Thomas, D. R. (2006). A general inductive approach for analyzing qualitative evaluation data. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 27(2), 237–246. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214005283748>
- Tobin, K. (2009). Tuning into others' voices: Radical listening, learning from difference, and escaping oppression. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*, 4(3), 505–511. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-009-9218-1>
- Vallet, A., Locatelli, B., Barnaud, C., Makowski, D., & Conde, Y. Q. (2020). Power asymmetries in social networks of ecosystem services governance. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 114, 329–340. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2020.08.020>
- van Asselt, M. B., & Vos, E. (2006). The precautionary principle and the uncertainty paradox. *Journal of Risk Research*, 9(4), 313–336. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13669870500175063>

- Ward, V. W., House, A., & Hamer, S. (2009). Developing a framework for transferring knowledge into action: A thematic analysis of the literature. *Journal of Health Services Research & Policy*, 14 (3), 156–164. <https://doi.org/10.1258/jhsrp.2009.008120>
- Weldon, S. L. (2019). Power, exclusion and empowerment: Feminist innovation in political science. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 72, 127–136. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2018.05.014>
- Young, I. M. (1990). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton University Press.
- Yuval-Davis, N. (1997). *Gender & nation*. Sage.