

Complicating My Research

When it comes to complicating my work, I used many tools to navigate different opinions and points of view to offer a more intriguing analysis.

The first tool I used was the **three-step process**. I read over a point of view from a new source many times, understood what maybe could not work with this logic, understood its limits, and then assessed my thoughts. I used this tool for the first source I found for this exercise, which argues that prejudice should not be looked at as a false set of beliefs that can cause irrational behavior towards a group. Reading this for the first time, one can already point out the faults within this statement. However, I read the author's opinion many times and read his rebuttal about why this thinking is counterproductive. Rupert Brown notes that to imply something as faulty, one has to account for "correctness". However, Brown notes that this does not happen often and that prejudiced statements are usually very vague and ambiguous. At first, this confused me. However, I understood his argument more when Brown wrote that two groups can have different perceptions of a subject and that neither is correct, but instead value other things. So, when forming my argument, I understood Brown's a little more with his second input. In my opinion, yes, different groups can have different perceptions of an issue. Still, it is the notion of being put into different situations and experiencing other things that allow perception to be distorted. For a position to not be looked at simply for the way that it is. I believe that different ways of life allow for prejudice but that a group can be wrong for engaging in prejudice because of how they were brought up. I think groups can be blinded from the truth and that there is a fault in prejudiced thinking.

The second source that I found regards intersectionality and Leslie McCall's approach, not Crenshaw's. While Crenshaw focuses on the larger social systems that create an intersectional disadvantage in many scenarios, McCall's "intra-categorical" approach focuses on "particular social groups at neglected points of intersection" 'to reveal the complexity of lived experience within such groups'. So, McCall's approach disregards the social systems that may have caused the inequalities to begin with, which Crenshaw believes is the problem. The tools I used for this source **highlighting the problem, distinguishing what I have to say, arguing the other side, uncovering latent values, and dissenting**.

My attempt goes like this: The problem with McCall's thinking is that she disregards the social constructions that allow for the intersection at every point of women's oppression. McCall believes that focusing on specific social categories would reveal complexity within groups. However, I think that one has to understand the inadequate social systems first to know why neglected groups of women share commonalities in the first place. One has to attempt to understand the larger picture first to understand the smaller one. However, suppose I were only to use McCall's approach. In that case, I could eventually understand the larger picture by educating myself on injustices within categories and working my way up to understand the larger social systems that have allowed for it. However, by doing so, I believe McCall has dismissed a certain feminist way of thinking; one has to realize that what women share is our differences, which is the only commonality between us. To understand this thinking, one has to first ask, "why are there so many differences?" Because of the social constructions and systems that have placed us into these different categories.

This work has helped me *greatly*. I was able to find two varying points of view that allowed for my thinking and for my opinions to be even stronger than before. As a result, I feel more well-rounded in my review. By analyzing and dissecting opposed views, I gathered the information for my research that is crucial when it comes to effectively delivering my points.

Source #1: Brown, Rupert. *Prejudice: Its Social Psychology*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010. Print.

Source #2: McCall, Leslie. "The Complexity of Intersectionality." *Signs*, vol. 30, no. 3, 2005, pp. 1771–1800. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/426800. Accessed 28 July 2021.