Intersectionality and research: educational inequality from the critical interculturality-health-corporeity triad

Luis Enrique Pincheira Muñoz

Centre for Latin American Studies of Inclusive Education (CELEI), Chile.

Marco Antonio Navarrete Ávila

Centre for Latin American Studies of Inclusive Education (CELEI), Chile.

Abstract

This article has as its objective a revision of the intersectionality concept in order to acknowledge the possibilities offered by it in the construction of new knowledge. This will be done under the critical triad interculturality-health-corporeity, associated with the educational field. The research method used is a literature review, using a critical method and reviewing updated databases. Contemporary research approaches that use as an analytical basis the principles of intersectionality allow the formulation of proposals, projects, and other relevant devices. These elements enable, at the same time, the transit of the research process on human singularity, evidencing the critical potentiality of communities and territories. Intersectionality as an analysis tool allows a jump from the categories to the concept of multiple singularities, since from this Latin-American perspective, the deconstruction of exclusion devices transmitted and reproduced through the discourse is approved, along with the community practice and its own singular symbolisation.

The contribution of intersectional theory is to overcome the vision of hegemonic categorisation, especially when the intercultural perspective and essentialist views are used in front of realities such as health, illness or disability, and also the way in which, until now, some categories have

been defined in the dominant discourse about the body experience in relation with the enjoyment of fundamental human rights.

Keywords: *corporeity, inclusive education, interculturality, intersectionality, health*

Introduction

The present article emerges as a critical revision of the *intersectionality* concept and the possibilities offered by it in the construction of new knowledge. Guiso (2006) states that knowledge construction is a social practice developed from life and includes emotions, options and human reactions. Research practice mobilizes questions and problems, transforming the ways in which understandings, explanations, expressions and constructions are made based on "the social from a human perspective" (Ghiso, 2006, 353). With this, the objective is to "configure the us" (Guiso, 2006, 354), where the subjects of the territorial community researched are configured as constitutive elements of the participation, based on effective communication and the critical dialogue production, recognising and valuing their singularity. This requires the understanding that this singularity is complex and a part of the ontological world of multiplicity (Ocampo,2020). Therefore, the communities are not considered a *study object,* instead they must be empowered as *knowledge bearer subjects.*

In this way, through intersectional analysis, the recuperation, description and textualization of experiences and practices of coexistence can promote the resolution of socio-political conflicts associated with the human corporeity problematization –such as the interculturality and/or health condition– offering diverse answers to joint and specific problems, in a creative, solidaristic way, creating methodologies and instituting knowledge that is founded, appropriated,

pertinent, assimilated and usable (Ghiso, 2006). As a consequence of the above, contemporary research approaches that take into account as an analytical basis the *intersectionality principles* (according to Dhamoon (2011) are included: social identities, sociodemographic categories, social processes and social systems), allow the formulation of proposals, projects and design of pertinent strategies. All these promote the transit between research territories and *complex singularities*, evidencing the critical potentialities of each experience, reconfiguring in this way the "social solidary subjects (…) capable to open real solidary pathways", allowing as well the "construction of alternatives identities" (Guiso, 2006, 375) and the recognition of the power discourses that up to today, have kept colonising the subjectivity and neglecting the complexity of the symbolic construction of the subjects' own singularity. In this sense, rather than just thinking of categories within the intersectional dynamic, there is a need to talk about multiple or *complex singularities* (Ocampo, 2020). From this point of view, understanding the importance of the knowledge produced in situated territories can contribute in some way to overcome the exclusion devices and mechanisms that have been denounced and evidenced by intersectionality theory.

Method

The research method used is an updated literature review, a critical method reviewing Dialnet, Redalyc, Scielo, Elsevier, UNESDOC, Web of Science and Google Academic databases. A search was conducted of the following categories: *intersectionality, critical intersectionality, interculturality, critical interculturality, research categories, body, corporeity, education, inclusive education, health, hospitality pedagogy* and other related concepts. The research process was structured into three stages: a) problem definition and information

search; b) information organisation; and c) information analysis, prioritising a critical thinking of the reviewed articles.

In addition, a digital socialisation of the researched information was done during the conference "Intersectionality, interculturality, education and health" (Pincheira, Monsalve and Navarrete, 2021), for the virtual panel "Intersectionality and educational research: how to study the educational inequality from its complexity", organised by the Institute of Research for Education Development (Instituto de Investigaciones para el Desarrollo de la Educación, INIDE) at the Ibero-American University of Mexico, on January 15, 2021.

Intersectionality, to question the research categories.

Intersectionality cannot be considered a neutral concept, as it refers to diverse identity categories. Even as an analytical category, it has contributed to how the structures of power directly influence the subjective configuration of the human being. In the same way, "its contextual and practical use is to analyse legal omissions and concrete inequalities" (Viveros, 2016, 5).

The thesis that arises in the following reflection is that intersectionality theory must be observed on a deconstructive basis of the identity categories, and also from a Latino American point of view. Therefore, instead of talking about categories that go through and interfere in the subjective construction of singularity, it would be interesting to think in *complex singularities* or multiple singularities (Ocampo, 2020).

Thus, this reflection about intersectionality starts from the assumption that the identity categories are intertwined and developed within a complex network. To deconstruct these implies an understanding that nature, as the identity product,

is developed within diverse networks of social life, and impacted by power discourses that to a greater or lesser extent colonise the subjectivity (Rauber, 2018), making its construction complex. Notably, the subjective construction of singularity is an act that impacts the structures of general knowledge, local and global, in the human interaction, its intelligence, its reasoning and its emotionality. In short, the multiple singularities equally impact the development of knowledge structures as complex as the ones underlying the subject. Thus, the discursive categories that are discovered from the intersectional analysis play an *ambivalent role*, namely, of double interaction and affectation in different levels of reality and help to reveal the importance to overcome the fragmented knowledge noted by Morín (2016, 21), in which "according to the disciplines, often prevents making a link between the parts and the totalities and must give way to a form of knowledge capable of apprehending objects within their contexts, complexity and integration".

When talking about identity, intersectionality theory allows an understanding of the limits imposed on diverse groups. It also allows entering within these categories that define, limit and exercise dominance over others, as they are built on foundations that reproduce inequality; for instance, the apprehended discourse about health and illness, the limits of sick people in relation with the person and health, the establishment of categories of being that transit between completeness and incompleteness, between perfection and imperfection, normality and abnormality, between the national and the immigrant, which define possibilities of participation and levels and limits within that possible participation. This reflection seeks to reveal the relevance of a deconstructive view that calls into question all those traditionally established categories that contribute to *subjectivity colonisation.*

Considering Rauber's (2018) analytic proposal, an understanding of the scope of the death culture imposed from the western epistemological view is needed, the fight between the *systems of the life world* and *systems of the death world.* Within these views, groups of subjects are cancelled by means of categories of being and participation that do not allow their full development, resulting in a fragmented knowledge since the complexity of the realities and subjects are not understood. This also impacts maintaining exclusion and self-exclusion, as the subjective construction of the singularity, within such systems, keeps affecting the general knowledge matrix that, ultimately, does not overcome these imaginary lines between being and not-being, reproducing the same exclusion devices and leading the subject to his *own denial*.

The power discourse results in the facilitation of domination and reproduction of inequality, as this categorical discourse becomes a *self-reification process.* Thus, the intersectionality must go beyond these categories, must deconstruct and understand how their forms of reproduction operate; moreover, when they lead subjects to *deny their own humanity* (Rauber, 2018), even in the symbolic construction of their subjectivity.

Starting from these premises, it is important to understand that the focus of intersectionality analysis considers the multiple forms of oppression and the diversity of sociocultural categorisations that take place, as well as the connections amongst them and the contextual dependence with which they operate. This form of analysis gives room to deconstructive processes where the starting point must be the complexity of the subjects' identity development, given the impact of the social interaction and the intersubjectivity in such development.

Contextually, considering some historical data, it is important to note that the intersectionality approach emerges in the late 1980s in the field of feminist activism as a critique of the unidimensional analysis of inequalities (Crenshaw, 1989). It appeared as an analytical resource to understand and face social inequalities. Its contribution to the generation of knowledge and social transformation has been across multiple disciplines. In relation to the knowledge generation and social transformation from intersectional analysis, it can be stated that its aim is to study the social categorisations of *privilege* and *oppression* and their interrelations. Within the analysis, such categories are seen as suspicious as they simplify the complexity of the social and cultural reality that results in exclusion and inequality.

Therefore, the intersectionality is positioned as a theoretic-methodological approach of transdisciplinary character, aimed at the apprehension of the analysis to interrogate the human being's dynamic and complexity within the social, cultural, institutional and structural levels. With this, intersectionality questions the rigid disciplinary frontiers, to the extent that it builds bridges for atheoretical-methodological debate, for example, Rodríguez *et al.* (2016) cite sources referring to intersectionality as a metaphor (Acker, 2001), a concept (Knapp, 2005), a research paradigm (Dhamoon, 2001), an analytical sensibility (Crenshaw, 2015), an ideograph (Alexander-Floyd, 2012), and a knowledge project (Collins, 2015).

To build such bridges demands, as was stated before, a critical and deconstructive view of the *categories* that define the *subjectivity* and its possibilities of realization and participation. Consequently, it is considered indispensable that, from the intersectional point of view, a continuous reflexive process be considered as putting into constant tension such possibilities that can

emerge from an emancipatory discourse, in its relation to a hegemonic and reductionist discourse. This is an arduous and complex task, if we are determined within dominant epistemic matrices, so it is necessary to investigate the different forms of human activity (from to do and to say). Also, it is essential to safeguard the *reproduction of limits that we seek to overcome* in the exploration of more complex emancipatory responses about humanity and the subjective construction of the identity of the human being.

As stated by Viveros (2016), both emancipatory and hegemonic discourses are sources that generate fields of knowledge-power. Therefore, the discursive transformation and the resignification of some categories can serve as support for this transformation, or contraposition between emancipatory discourses versus those hegemonic.

From that perspective, it is hoped to transform that space limited by categories that determine the subjectivity or subjectivities and, from that deconstructive proposal, to talk about *multiplicity of singularities*[1], or *complex singularities*[2]. Such a deconstructive view allows, in the first place, to break the traditional ontological vision that defines categories between the Being-Not Being (Sousa, 2015), where it is stated that "the hierarchy of bodies within superiority or inferiority zones (…) the dialectic between the s*elf* (understood as elites-companies) and the *other* (understood as the population, the total exclusion) does not recognise the *others'* humanity" (Pincheira, Monsalve and Navarrete, 2020, 80). This coincides with the arguments given by Salem (2016) who advocates a turn towards the theory of the Global South (Sousa, 2015) for greater understanding due to the experience of this region in the face of the role of the State and its relationship with nationalism or imperialism, basing that intersectionality offers the terminology and knowledge to promote change and

social justice through the awareness of privileges and the promotion of the behavior of the allies (Atewologun, 2018).

The above generates an imaginary dividing line between the human and the sub-human, that from the discourse obeys to new forms of *racialisation of the bodies* that go beyond the traditionally known forms of this concept that are related to skin colour, but also with ethnic groups, religion and other categories. Although this imaginary line between the human and sub-human obviously takes into account traditional categories associated with race, sex, age, among others, it also involves archetypic conceptions. From the *collective imaginary* it involves even more subtle categories that interfere with the subject's categorisation and with the *power relationships* that can be established. For instance, categories such as the master-slave, victim-perpetrator, victim-saviour, worker-patron, boss-employee, educator-learner, immigrant-receptor country, doctor-patient, can become equally limiting for the development of capabilities of the human potential as they interfere in this kind of relational network. This depends on the symbolisations of what makes us humans, which can lead to certain singularities that are related from an infra-humanity condition, as a result of power games and exclusion devices.

Therefore, the discourses state that all those within society, who are part of categorical spaces, when they are not in agreement with the *Being* criteria, become part of that divisional line from the group of sub-humans, or as stated by Sousa (2015), those that live in the *Not-Being Zone* (as the author explains in the metaphor of the globalised south). Following West and Fenstermarker (2010), within the social reality several variants of such relationships are presented, accordingly, with the intersection in which persons or groups are situated in a moment, functioning as *interrelated rings*.

In other words, following Gil (2008, 10) it is fundamental "to recognise at the same time the value of differentiation, [which] help us in our first approach to reality and, in fact, is the way in which we are situated in front of the world, to be prevented from the simplification that such previous categorisation brings. To be aware of the hierarchy processes of differences, by those that *value the things as we are, not as they are (…)* to anticipate and to prevent the pervasive effects of the categorisation and the valorisation of diversity, that can essentialise and detract features that, in several cases are not that relevant, and to hide others that are".

To sum up, starting from these ideas it is possible to establish some ways that work as a guiding point in order to think of intersectionality topics such as health, illness, interculturality and as a transversal concept, the body, its corporeity within educational, social, territorial and political contexts in the Latin American region, attempting to look beyond the categories and, as the cited author states, *up supra,* being conscious about the hierarchy process of differences.

Intersectionality and interculturality

As has been stated above, it can be mentioned that the *intersectionality* contributes to a concrete point for the transformative objective of the *interculturality* concept; as it widens the focus, increasing its complexity. Following Walsh (2010), this view synthetizes the interculturality approaches, identifying three perspectives. The first one is *relational* in reference to the contact and interchange between cultures, whose problem may lay in minimising and hiding the domination within the relationship made. The second one is *functional,* rooted in the diversity of knowledge and cultural difference, with inclusive aims within the established social structure, therefore, it is perfectly compatible with neoliberal globalisation. On the other hand, the third

and last approach corresponds to *critical interculturality* that takes as a starting point the social recognition of the difference constructed within a structure and colonial matrix of racialized and hierarchic power. To understand these relations on interculturality raised by Walsh (2010), it is essential to move towards an understanding of the world and its relations (individual and collective) in the face of the neoliberal globalization pattern installed in Latin America. That is why, why theorizing intersectionality, it is necessary to commit to conceptualize problems of multiple positionality and intertwined oppressions, and then build social explanations to provide suitable solutions to territorial needs (Clarke and McCall, 2013).

In addition, Walsh (2010, 78-79) states that "it is understood as a strategic, permanent action and process of relationship and negotiation *between,* within conditions of respect, legitimacy, symmetry, equity and equality, becoming a political, social, ethical and epistemological project".

Therefore, from the opportunity of knowledge production and social transformation, the critical interculturality agrees with the *critical pedagogy,* that focuses the interest on developing the individual critical consciousness in order to account for the unfair social conditions, from a collective fight view and political compromise with the knowledge production and transformations within these realities. The objective is to create or to build a society from which new parameters of *justice* are defined and practiced, where equality of access is offered, both for the tools and also for the opportunities, for a life humanly lived.

The development of the individual critical consciousness is considered a prior stage to the collective action of social transformation. Within the interculturality

view, it is essential to overcome the vision of difference and inequality as a private and individual matter, that blames the victim for the social injustices suffered (Gil, 2008). Therefore, within the *multicultural* approach that organises the group differences with an emphasis on categorising, the *critical interculturality* approach intends to destabilise the homogeneous and static idea of diversity and difference, a proposal that results in educational opportunities such as cultural, ethnic, racial and ideological differences, as they increase the possibilities of dialogue, trust and solidarity (Giroux, 1992). The critical interculturality means a return to the original idea of *diversity* (understood as *norm),* abstracting ourselves from the pre-established difference categories that position us in front of the reality in a prejudiced way.

As synthesis, the *interculturality* and *intersectionality* approaches complement each other in knowledge production and generation, as both approaches agree with the deconstruction of categories. However, the c*ritical interculturality* "recognises the cultural diversity, as it implies recognising a different other, escaping from previous and fixed secondments" (Aguado, 2009, 17). Meanwhile, the *intersectionality* widens the analytical focus of the knowledge production, as it widens the object of study complexity from the different points of view that interact between persons or social groups.

Due to the progressive *anticategorical approach,* there is a need to deconstruct the multiple categories within the social, educational, cultural and political fields, to break free from the omnipresence of the categories paradigm. Thus, itis necessary –by using the depth given by the intersectional analysis and the critical interculturality– to improve the understanding capacity of differentiation and inequality mechanisms from the complexity of the sociocultural networks of knowledge production and territorial research.

Health, education, and intersectionality

The relevance of the *anticategorical approach* that has been exposed in the intersectional analysis, implies a recognition of diversity not only in the interculturality field; since in the framework of intercultural complexity other complex analysis focuses have to be incorporated, such as the body, health and illness, especially when the aim is to understand the inequalities within the educational field. As stated by Couto et al., (2019, 2), "both from the perspective of social determinants of health as well as from the socio anthropological perspective of health, illness and also in the field of public health and collective health, social class bookmarks such as class, gender and race/ethnicity have been long considered as important references for differentiator analysis and health inequalities".

From this analysis, it is not only important to create interaction between the health field and these differentiating referents or social class markers, but also to build a relationship line between *health-education-interculturality,* and other rights, as a few times the force of the interaction between these sectors is included. This is especially relevant when the concrete health condition of each one of the subjects that interfere in the educational situation act as relevant differentiating axis within the teaching and learning processes. As stated by Monsalve (2017) the school dropout indicators from UNESCO highlight that on several occasions it is possible to find within the international reports multiple reasons for school dropout. Among these reasons appears the differentiating axis *disability.* However, the *health-illness axis* or *health condition* only appears if the cause of school dropout is student pregnancy or HIV-AIDS. Interesting data appears associated with culture and the incidence of these realities in some countries, or in some cultures immersed in other localities with respect to their nationalities. However, other illnesses –transmissible or not-, do not generally

appear within the possibilities of school dropout or school absence. The same is true for the so called *orphan diseases*[3], which are potentially ignored or accounted for within the wider category called *disability,* that works as a dominating and hegemonic differentiator axis. Consequently, this limits the understanding and an inclusive approach towards the multiple singularities that diverse health conditions possess. What emerges from this, is that by establishing differentiating categories that do not go in depth on the complexity of human reality, the understanding of their world system is limited and also the real possibilities of the individual participating in society and overcoming the *systemic exclusion* phenomenon.

The transit towards the understanding of the complexities in the participation and the educative trajectories of several students in the educational system, need to be based on the understanding of community health factors (where it is important to consider the *critical intercultural* approach) -as well as other indicators and markers from the health field- as they affect the enjoyment of this right and have an impact on other areas of social life. For that reason, the intersectionality as an analytical tool between health and education, plays such an important role, as it allows an understanding of the differentiating categories that emanate from the dominant biomedical discourse about persons in illness situations; likewise, for the conditions, characteristics, possibilities and barriers that arise from those different health situations.

Therefore, it must be highlighted that the dominant biomedical discourse from western epistemology not only conveys an ideal of health that is socially aspired, but also defines and imposes conditions and characteristics of health that make it difficult (because of its essentialist view of human complexity) to enjoy economic, social and cultural rights, such as *education.* If this is also associated with other perspectives or social determinants, the idea of

understanding the *complex singularities* or the *multiple singularities* marked by health conditions can be highlighted. This is because some subjects possess discontinuous trajectories of learning, dropping out from the educational system on several occasions and even remaining isolated from the social system or family institution, culture and recreation, among others. Couto et al. (2019, 2) stated that "other social markers such as sexual orientation and gender have been incorporated as important empirical and conceptual references, both in studies related to health disparities among social segments, as well as in those focused on sociocultural processes, illness, death and care of specific or minority social groups".

From this point of view, the biggest opportunity of knowledge production given by the intersectional approach is based on knowing and showing the elements that, from the health conditions perspective, have an impact on the subjective construction of singularity and its complexity. As evidence, it is proposed that the power of intersectionality is structured as a framework for organizational studies in its potential to take advantage of the theoretical, applied and lived experiences of the communities investigated (Brewer *et al.*, 2002), as well as to situate the multiplicity of positions of individuals and human groups at the micro (individual) and macro (socioestructural) level (Atewologun, 2018). However, from a critical-inclusion point of view, this process offers spaces for development and for overcoming hegemonic power discourses, in order to move onto new interpretations of reality and subjectivity. Thus, new forms of participation, education and experience of certain values that respect the singularities, allowing to share and to construct political and cultural spaces, enriched from the symbolisations that emerge from the community and social spaces within the researched territories, can be obtained. This will be further explored in the following section.

Intersectional analysis as a liberating strategy of educational and social research

Intersectionality as a means to generate new knowledge -or also understood as a means to understand the reality- undoubtedly proposes an understanding of diverse forms of education and social participation, which allow the inclusion of other forms to appreciate the system-world *reality.* Therefore, intersectional analysis arises as a liberating strategy for the discourse, categories and identities on the *geographical territory,* on the *bodies territory,* and also on the *words territory,* which are called by us researchers as: *situated territories.* Currently, it is crucial to re-think education within the Latin American society through emergent and social-community research in order to make visible the problems associated with regional socio-political realities. This should be done through community discourses. Therefore, intersectionality theory results in an important analytical tool that dissembles and deepens such discourses and the power and exclusion previously exposed. Finally, the contribution of intersectionality from a deconstructive point of view must be achieved within *situated territories* and also through the development of social research that finally contributes to the transformation of reality.

From this perspective, an important and transversal category to consider is the one associated with the *body* and *corporeity* in current educational and social contexts. The body is understood as a polysemic and complex concept, which is strongly influenced by "culture and personal experience" (Águila and López, 2019, 143). Likewise, the concept is provided by a symbolic construction due to the plurality of definitions created by the human being itself (Le Breton, 2002). Within the contexts, systems and educational devices from the Latin American region, it has been evident the emphasis is on empowering only the cognitive development of the human being. This is because students have been assessed through standardised tests –frequently outside the real context of the

communities and territories- which generate *body labels* that prompt the inhibition of the body expression, and with that, a *silenced body* (Foucault, 1986; Le Breton, 2002). These labels limit the comprehension of the impact of a *body inter-sectioned* by multiple factors associated with the hegemonic power formats of the dominant culture. Consequently, following Lugones (2008), intersectionality "is a key notion in order to understand that the domination and exclusion processes always imply the social hierarchy between sex, race and class" (cited by Hernández, 2018, 2).

It is key as well as make visible the impact of these *intersections* in the community corporeity exposed to a research process in the educational, social and political fields.

Notably, the social and community research must transit vital situations of the subjects in order to construct knowledge. This is configured from the emotions, interests and motivations of the human chore, without forgetting the potential transformative human action on one's own reality. Accordingly, the language – and its configuration *on* the body– is positioned as a collective and transformative structure, where *to be* for the *other* from the language, is proposed.

At the same time, in order to reconstruct *the educational* for *the social* it is imperative to ask: is it possible to mediate the *new knowledge* production from the communities? From a contemporary point of view, the social community research is positioned as a participatory and implicative methodology, that proposes the de-patriarchalisation and decolonisation of the knowledge construction by means of a political work. This work must promote spaces that explore the professional action power as a transformative process engine.

Besides, this work should encourage researching and *inhabiting the discomfort* of the researched communities (Mara, 2020). In this way, the categories imposed on the body, corporeity, nationality, health or illness can be disassembled.

When thinking about education, it is conclusive to question the research methods and pedagogies associated with *cruelty, systematic exclusion* or *power-subordination logics.* It is also pertinent to value the corporal experience of the human being in their educational, social and research process, deepening perspectives about corporal and territorial reality (where important criteria coming from the critical intercultural theory are incorporated). Likewise, it is pertinent to consider the dissatisfaction value in front of *reality*. In fact, the intersectional analysis present in research based on social emancipation and cognitive justice is an invitation to dimension the human complexity with the presence of the *other.* Furthermore, that each human being is understood asa social and complex subject, implies *to be* subjects with agency in order to transform the society (Bourdieu, 2005). Thus, the society transformation will occur only through new ways of community resistance (Tuhiwai, 2013) and also through their own ecology of knowledge (Sousa, 2015).

Therefore, to question the social, educational and political image of the *body* and the human *corporeity* –created from the discursive hegemonic of the masculine- and to include critical theory from feminist, *queer* or gender perspectives of knowledge production, allows consideration of the possibility of implanting the dominant *universality* of the patriarchal culture over the Latin American territory. Consequently, socio-educational and research methodologies with an intersectional approach give room to the social and cultural reproduction, production, recuperation and creation of knowledge, where "life, actions and social relations are configured as

ecological/gnoseological spaces, for excellence, for social community research" (Ghiso, 2006, 349-350).

In the same way, it is transcendental to dimension how the neoliberal capitalism implanted in the Latin American territory violates the *social bond* of its communities and societies (Rousseau, 2004), and how through that process, the human being d*iversity* concept is distorted, creating collective imaginaries directed towards deliberated consumption and the expulsion of the different (Han, 2017). Even the knowledge generalisation praxis in the Latin American territory requires a dialectical problematizing movement of action-reflexion-action, in which the subjects have agency in their own problematics in order to rescue, discover and re-create the context and their lived reality. Besides, it allows the socio-community participation in construction of the system-world from emotions and theoretical, extra-theoretical, methodological and pragmatic interests. Consequently, intersectionality recognizes existing power relations and how these play a fundamental role in the construction of thought, experience and knowledge (Atewologun, 2018), as well as better aligns with the epistemologies of the constructionist and feminist social point of view (Else-Quest and Hyde, 2016). Following Foucault (2012, 41) "it is an analysis of the things insofar as they are things", where the problem "is the one of the position and the function of the language within a regular and normative language itself" (Foucault, 2012, 67). Similarly, de Vries (2015) advocates the development of an intersectional narrative that places the researcher in several facets, which allow identifying strengths and limitations in the context, content, approach and design of the research, which finally proposes to cultivate intersectional reflexivity in the face of emotions, knowledge and experiences associated with a greater awareness-problematization of human being (Atewologun, 2018).

For this, it is fundamental to analyse the nature of the social emancipatory knowledge and how, from a micro political substantive perspective of the production and reproduction of language, the *psychical territories* of the human being are also affected.

Faced with these messy categories, it is important to start asking: in which ways are *education* and *knowledge* produced -and reproduced- in Latin American society? How have the socio-territorial communities been imagined? What research methodologies have been applied to construct socio-political discourses in the region? Or even, how can the Latin American territory re-think the *educational* for *the social* in the present time?

Conclusion

Intersectionality, as an analysis tool, has allowed the writers of this article to pose and jump from the categories to the concept of *multiple singularities,* as proposed by Ocampo (2020). From this initial view it is possible to propose a Latin American perspective that allows for deconstructing the exclusion devices that are transmitted and reproduced from the discourse, the community practice and even from the singularity symbolisation. Understanding the main contribution given by *intersectional theory,* it is important to overcome the vision of categorisation when it does not take into account the deepness of human complexity. This is because in some way, it contributes to the reproduction of unfair realities that want to be overcome and changed. This happens especially when speaking from the *intercultural perspective* and the essential view in front of realities such as health, illness, disability and, within them, how until now the *body* experience has been defined from the discourse in its relation to the enjoyment of fundamental rights, such as education.
The *intersectional perspective* allows for understanding that current research praxis evidence in both, techniques and broader social research "advance with

their own movements" (Villasante, 2006, 379). This indicates the imperative of updating the knowledge and methodologies due the emergent-urgent socio-political problems within Latin American. Therefore, questioning the research categories through an intersectional analysis allows the potentialities of what remains hidden – or simply ignored by the official, political and cultural structures– to be found, providing a deeper understanding of the human being (Zemelman, 1992).

When dimensioning the complexity of the topics covered in this article, and involving the *intersectional view* with the *intercultural critical approach,* the following can be stated:

- Both positions complement each other in the production and generation of knowledge. Although these approaches agree in the deconstruction of categories, they can possess a rectifying and essentializing tendency of differences if they are not presented through a deconstructive view.
- Meanwhile, the critical interculturality recognises the cultural diversity, since it implies recognising a different *other,* escaping from previous, fixedand categorised labels. On the other hand, the intersectionality widens the analysis in the production of knowledge, since it deepens the study's complexity from different points of view that interact between the persons or social groups.
- Due to the progressive *anti-categorical movement,* there is a need to deconstruct the multiple categories in the educational field, considering the omnipresence of the categories paradigm. Therefore, there is a need from the interculturality and the intersectional analysis, to be able to understand the differentiation mechanisms and inequality from the sociocultural complexity, assuming more than pre-established categories,with the recognition that each human being represents a

multiple and complex singularity.

On the other hand, addressing the critical intersectionality-health-corporeity triad, it is possible to conclude that:

- In the intersectional analysis as a liberating strategy of educational and social research, it is fundamental to remark that one of the possible causes of *social inequality* in the Latin American geographical territory, is the implication of the *power* category in the social, educational, cultural and political production; and with this, the imminent capacity of its own language to create *oppression and discomfort* in the body and in the corporeity of its communities especially when the singularities are signed by illness and different health conditions. Currently, the academy, its institutions and its forms of educational reproduction, inhibit the concerns, motivations and urgencies of the *inter-sectioned bodies.* Besides, they transmute socio-community theories into canonical-systemic ones, funded by the geopolitical and hegemonic construction of knowledge that, in turn, is marked by the epistemologies from the global north (Sousa, 2015).

Consequently, it can be detected how neoliberal capitalism implanted in the Latin American territory violates the *social bond* of its communities and societies through the reproduction of hegemonic and dogmatic knowledge and methodologies. Along with it, it must be noted that historically, the education of the communities in the region *re-produces* a subject willing to consume under a capitalist and neoliberal logic (Mara, 2020). Eventually and logically, this is inscribed in the *corporal territory,* in the *social territory,* in the *word territory* and also in the *psychic territory* of every human being. This prompts the denial of the human being's own humanity by recognising to what extent they are able to participate or feel complete within this imposed matrix of knowledge.

Therefore, if the structures transmitted by the discourse are not dissembled, the subjects themselves will reproduce the exclusion devices both in their social and personal experience.

As a concluding suggestion and following Hernández (2018), social researchers, under a deconstructive view of the imposed categories, must give room to the possibility of the appearance of the human singularity, and even pose "other justice and restitution criteria for the victims, with a gender de-colonial perspective, that allows an adequate fight against the high-intensity patriarchy of modernity" (Hernández, 2018, 16). Social researchers must also question "the persistent colonial elements in the sovereignty of the republican states of Latin America" (Hernández, 2018, 17). For this, Villasante (2006) reinforces the idea that the praxis founds theory, which is a fervent invitation to systematise the action-reflexion-action research process, in order to deepen *popular knowledge,* understood as a *popular and organic knowledge* (Fals and Rodrigues, 1986) against an "erudite or traditional popular knowledge" (Villasante, 2006, 382). This proposal intends to deepen and to understand the difference and diversity of the *multiplicity of singularities* of the human being's nature, through auto critical and critical processes that produce collective truths that be creative and operative in order "to answer to an episteme that makes sense" (Villasante*,* 2006, 382).

Therefore, it is important to remember that social community research –as well as the application of intersectional analysis– following Villasante (2006, 396) "requires *four jumps* in the paths that are being opened", which can be interpreted as four *research paths* for the transformation of the present knowledge:

- **Path 1 – from *solidarity* to the *social creativity styles,*** where the aim is to combine the researcher's ethic with methodology and also to question the aspects associated with the neutrality of the technical categories, or the experts' criteria "limiting the possible effects of prejudices, ideologies and preventions" (Villasante, 2006, 369). This is based on the social creativity, which allows a collective-created reality that overflows its own construction of the *reality* concept and also incorporates "a principle of open and dialogical ethic, that limits the prejudices within different subjects and at the same time, respect their starting points of view" (Villasante,2006, 397).

- **Path 2 – from *subjects-subjects* to *action sets*,** which allows the collective construction from potency and collaboration. In this regard, the community evidence that has external and internal conflicts and, along with that, identifications in the process of informal and formal networks that are constructed. Likewise, these assist in being "more auto critical and reflexive to themselves and more realistic about the action sets" (Villasante,2006, 400).

- **Path 3 – from the *subjects-praxis* to *second grade reflexivities,*** where through the resolution of concrete problems "those who agree and dissent are interested" (Villasante, 2006, 401). This facilitates the social creativity through *force-ideas* in order to unlock educational, social, cultural and political issues, such as the ones created when the complex realities associated with corporeity, health, illness and interculturality are made invisible.

- **Path 4 – from sustainability to *integral programs,*** where the author proposes "building the criteria that this generation thinks for itself and its descendants about what is *quality of life* and promoting within the population its values and sustainability" (Villasante, 2006, 402-403). This highlights the need for participatory and inter generationally-

created criteria with "the implication of those that define some values of an ecological future for humankind" (Villasante, 2006, 403), understanding it as a collective network of encounters and workshops capable of monitoring and self-organisation of a democratic-operative-network structure, for the integral human and territorial communities' wellbeing.

Finally, from these research pathways it is possible to consider the *multiple singularities* outside of essentialisms, helping to overcome categories that keep being imposed from the western research field, that prevent social injustice realities from being overcome that diverse collective keeps experiencing before the dominant knowledge and power of the present time.

Notes

[1]Part of the theoretical proposal developed by Ocampo (2020), addresses the concept of *multiplicity of singularities,* in which an ontological vision of the multiplicity is presented in contraposition with the ontological view of the closed being. Limiting categories pass from this ontological conception to be reflected within the social and community life spaces, namely, this notion of being that defines being categories of being-not being, influences the subjective construction of the singularity.

[2]In the complex *singularities* concept emerges the ontological scope in order to move to the existential where, taking into account of Morin's (2016) ideas, it is then understood that the subject is not simply a category of being but a complex existentiality influenced by many categories, some of those promoting potential development and others limiting the same.

[3]Following the World Health Organisation (WHO, 2012), orphan diseases are those that affect fewer than 5 people for each 10,000 nationwide, which is considered rare or infrequent.

References

Acker, Joan. 2009. From glass ceiling to inequality regimes. *Sociologie du travail*, *51*(2), 199-217. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soctra.2009.03.004

Aguado Odina, Teresa., 2009. El enfoque intercultural como metáfora de la diversidad en educación. *Educación Intercultural perspectivas y propuestas*, 13-27.

Águila Soto, Cornelio, López Vargas, Juan José. 2019. Cuerpo, corporeidad y educación: una mirada reflexiva desde la Educación Física. *Retos: nuevas tendencias en educación física, deporte y recreación*, (35), 413-421.https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=6761710

Atewologun, Doyin. 2018. Intersectionality theory and practice. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Business and Management*. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190224851.013.48

Bourdieu, Pierre. 2005. *Las estructuras sociales de la economía.* Buenos Aires: Ediciones Manantial.

Brewer, Rose M., Conrad, Cecilia A., King, Mary C. 2002. The complexities and potential of theorizing gender, caste, race, and class. *Feminist Economics*, *8* (2), 3-17. https://doi.org/10.1080/1354570022000019038

Clarke, Averil Y., McCall, Leslie. 2013. Intersectionality and social explanation in social science research. *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race, 10*(2), 349-363. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1742058X13000325

Collins, Patricia Hill. 2015. Intersectionality's definitional dilemmas. *Annual review of sociology*, *41*, 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-073014-112142

Couto, Marcia Thereza, Oliveira, Elda de, Alves Separavich, Marco Antônio, Carmo Luiz, Olinda do. 2019. La perspectiva feminista de la interseccionalidad en el campo de la salud pública: revisión narrativa de las producciones teórico-metodológicas. *Salud Colectiva*, *15*, 1-14. https://doi.org/10.18294/sc.2019.1994

Crenshaw, Kimberlé.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: Vol. 1989, 1(8), 139-148. http://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/uclf/vol1989/iss1/8

Crenshaw, Kimberlé. 2015, September 24. Why intersectionality can't wait. *The Washington Post, 24*(9), 1-2. https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/in-theory/wp/2015/09/24/why-intersectionality-cant-wait/

de Vries, Kylan Mattias. 2015. Transgender people of color at the center: Conceptualizing a new intersectional model. *Ethnicities, 15*(1), 3-27. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796814547058

Dhamoon, Rita Kaur. 2011. Considerations on mainstreaming intersectionality. *Political Research Quarterly*, 64 (1), 230-243. https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912910379227

Else-Quest, Nicole M. Hyde, Janet Shibley. 2016. Intersectionality in quantitative psychological research: II. Methods and techniques. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *40*(3), 319-336. https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684316647953

Fals-Borda, Orlando, Rodrigues Brandão, Carlos. 1986. *Investigación participativa.* Montevideo: Instituto del Hombre.

Foucault, Michel. 1986. *Vigilar y castigar. Nacimiento de la prisión*. Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI.

Foucault, Michel. 2012. *Un peligro que seduce. Entrevista con Claude Bonnefoy.* Madrid: cuatro ediciones.

Ghiso, Alfredo, 2006. Rescatar, descubrir, recrear. Metodologías participativas en investigación social comunitaria. In *Metodologías de investigación social*, ed. Canales Cerón, Manuel, 349-378. Santiago de Chile: LOM Ediciones.

GilJaurena, Inés. 2008. El enfoque intercultural en la educación primaria: una mirada a la práctica escolar. Doctoral Thesis, Universidad nacional de Educación a Distancia, Madrid.

Giroux, Henry A. 1994. La enseñanza, la alfabetización y la política de la diferencia. In *Igualdad educativa y diferencia cultural*, eds. Giroux, Henry A., Flecha, Ramón, 3-20. Barcelona: Editorial El Loure.http://www.terras.edu.ar/biblioteca/5/PDGA_Giroux_Unidad_7.pdf

Han, Byung-Chul.2017. *La expulsión de lo distinto*. Barcelona: Herder Editorial.

Hernández Castellanos, Donovan Adrian. 2018. "Hasta que la dignidad se haga costumbre": Performatividad, subalternidad y restauración en los casos de doña Jacinta, Teresa y Alberta. *Estudios del Discurso*, *4*(2), 1-20.http://esdi.uaem.mx/index.php/esdi/article/view/22

Knapp, Gudrun-Axeli. 2005. Race, class, gender: Reclaiming baggage in fast travelling theories. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, *12*(3), 249-265. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350506805054267

Le Breton, David.2002. *La Sociología del Cuerpo*. Buenos Aires: Ediciones Nueva Visión.

Lugones, María, 2008. Colonialidad y género. *Tabula rasa*, (09), 73-101.http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=39600906

Mara Danel, Paula.2020. Habitar la incomodidad desde las intervenciones del trabajo social. *Escenarios. Revista de Trabajo Social y Ciencias Sociales, (31)*, 1-13. https://revistas.unlp.edu.ar/escenarios/article/view/10042

Monsalve Labrador, Clargina. 2017.*La trascendencia de los Derechos Humanos durante la enfermedad crónica: invisibilidad de las personas con salud disminuida, necesidad de su reconocimiento en los marcos normativos.* s/l: Editorial Académica Española.

Morín, Edgar.2016.*Los siete saberes necesarios para la educación del futuro*. Buenos Aires: Paidós.

Ocampo González, Aldo.2020. Diálogos y aleaciones experimentales. Prácticas lectoras en clave interseccional y post-colonial: por el derecho a la diferencia y la reinvención de la ciudadanía cultural. In *Prácticas letradas en clave interseccional y post-colonial: por el derecho a la diferencia y la reinvención*, eds. Ocampo González, Aldo,& Sánchez Lara, Ricardo, 26-100. Santiago de Chile: Ediciones CELEI.

Pincheira Muñoz, Luis Enrique, Monsalve Labrador, Clargina, Navarrete Ávila, Marco Antonio.2020. Otredad, alteridad y corporeidad. *Laplage em Revista*, *6*(Especial), 88-97.http://dx.doi.org/10.24115/S2446-622020206Especial949p.88-97

_____. 2021. Interseccionalidad, interculturalidad, educación y salud. In Centro de Estudios Latinoamericanos de Educación Inclusiva, CELEI, 15th july 2021.https://youtu.be/6NbmBTcBjyY

Rauber, Isabel. 2018. Descolonizar la subjetividad. *Hacia una nueva razón utópica indo-afro-latinoamericana.* La Habana, Cuba: Editorial filosofi@. cu. Instituto de Filosofía.

Rodríguez, Jenny K., Holvino, Evangelina, Fletcher, Joyce K., Nkomo, Stella, M. 2016. The theory and praxis of intersectionality in work and organisations: Where do we go from here? *Gender, Work and Organization*, *23* (3), 201-222. https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12131

Rousseau, Juan Jacobo. 2004. El contrato social o Ensayo sobre la forma de la República [Manuscrito de Ginebra]. *Deus Mortalis, 3*, 549-608.

Salem, Sara. 2016. Intersectionality and its discontents: Intersectionality as traveling theory. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, *25*(4), 403-418. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350506816643999

Sousa Santos, Boaventura de. 2015. *Una Epistemología del Sur. La Reinvención del conocimiento y una emancipación social.* Buenos Aires: CLACSO-Coediciones.

Tuhiwai Smith, Linda.2016. *A descolonizar las metodologías. Investigación y pueblos indígenas.* Santiago de Chile: LOM ediciones.

Villasante, Tomás R. 2006. La socio-praxis: un acoplamiento de metodologías implicativas. In *Metodologías de investigación social*, ed. Canales Cerón, Manuel, 379-406*.* Santiago de Chile: LOM Ediciones.

Viveros Vigoya, Mara, 2016. La Interseccionalidad: una aproximación situada a la Dominación. *Debate Feminista*, 52, 1-17.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.df.2016.09.005

Walsh, Catherine. 2010. Interculturalidad crítica y educación intercultural. In *Construyendo interculturalidad crítica*, eds. Viaña, Jorge, Tapia, Luis, y Walsh, Catherine, 75-96. La Paz: Instituto Internacional de Integración.

West, Candace, Fenstermarker, Sarah. 2010. Haciendo la diferencia. In *Estudiar el racismo. Textos y Herramientas. Documento de Trabajo No. 8,* eds. Hoffmann, Odile, Quintero, Oscar. México: Proyecto AFRODESC/ EURESCL. https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-00691352/document

World Health Organisation, WHO. 2012. Boletín de la OMS. Unidos para combatir las enfermedades raras. https://www.who.int/bulletin/volumes/90/6/12-020612/es/

Zemelman, Hugo. 1992. *Los horizontes de la razón*. Barcelona: Editorial Anthropos.

Author Details

Luis Enrique Pincheira Muñoz is associated researcher in the Center for Latin American Studies of Inclusive Education, CELEI (Centro de Estudios Latinoamericanos de Educación Inclusiva), Chile.

Contact details:

- Address: Av. San Pedro de Atacama 1974, Huechuraba, Santiago, Chile.
- **Email**: luis.pincheira@celei.cl

Marco Antonio Navarrete Ávila is associated researcher in the Center for Latin American Studies of Inclusive Education, CELEI (Centro de Estudios Latinoamericanos de Educación Inclusiva), Chile.

Contact details:

- Address: Oscar Quiroz Morgado, 1870, Dept. 655, La Serena, Chile. Post Code: 1733617.
- **Email:** marco.navarrete@celei.cl