



Der Wissenschaftsfonds.



universität
wien

Momentum Kongress: Transformation Track #9: Transformation von & durch Bildung

Beitrag:

*Transformation Towards Gender Equality Through Financial
Literacy Education? A Critical Feminist Policy Analysis of
Austrian Financial Education Policy*

Dovaine Buschmann, MA
Dovaine.buschmann@univie.ac.at

Table of Contents

Abstract 3
Introduction 4
State of the Art..... 7
Theoretical Concepts and Assumptions 8
Methodology, Methods and Analysed Materials 13
Literature 17

Abstract

This doctoral thesis addresses the ongoing feminist debate on the financialization of the everyday life by proposing to analyse how public policies result from and contribute to the changing relations between society, financial market and the state. Combining theoretical concepts from feminist political economy, mobility studies and policy analysis, this thesis develops an innovative analytical framework that is capable of grasping the process of ‘bordering’ – imagining, setting, conceptualising and negotiating borders between the public and the private spheres. The project aims to analyse the process of policy formulation of Austrian Financial Literacy Education (FLE) policy by pursuing the research question: how are the borders between the public and the private spheres (re-)negotiated in the policy-making process? Furthermore, this thesis pursues to understand what implications (if any) does the process of ‘bordering’ on the policy level have for gender relations. In this endeavour, the project will conduct context, actor, process and bordering analysis that will be based on a three-fold methodological strategy including methods of qualitative document analysis, expert interviews and qualitative content analysis.

Introduction

The proposed doctoral project is financed by the FWF doc.funds programme in the research platform “Mobile Cultures and Societies” at the University of Vienna. The overall objective of the research group is to merge different disciplinary approaches, theories and procedures with the aim to develop new methodological, structural and substantial categories of research in the field of Mobility Studies. My doctoral project Transformation Towards Gender Equality Through Financial Literacy Education? A Critical Feminist Policy Analysis of Austrian Financial Education Policy” pursues to establish a conceptual link between mobility studies and feminist political economy. The primary interest of the thesis is to contribute to both fields of research by conducting a feminist materialist policy analysis of Financial Literacy Education (FLE) policy that has been released in Austria in 2021.

Mobility studies are based on the idea of the so-called “mobility turn” (Sheller & Urry 2006; Faist 2013; Sheller 2014, 2017) in social sciences. This ‘turn’ is characterised by questioning the fixity of territories and states, and by proposing a fluid understanding of processes and identities. The mobilities paradigm is “part of a broader theoretical project aimed at going beyond the imagery of ‘terrains’ as spatially fixed geographical containers for social processes, and calling into question scalar logics such as local/global as descriptors of regional extent.” (Hannam et al. 2006: 5, emphasis DB) Looking from a political science perspective, this understanding of mobility is applicable not only in the analysis of the changing role, characteristics and scale of the state as an institution, but also how terrains of ‘the public’ and ‘the private’ are transformed, negotiated, re-produced, entangled, displaced – moved and made immobile.

The idea to question dichotomies and oppositional thinking, as well as ‘going beyond’ conceptualising social terrains as fixed is not new, but has been central to feminist thought since the second wave of the feminist movement. Carole Pateman has argued that a feminist critique of the public/private dichotomy “is central to almost two centuries of feminist writing and political struggle; it is, ultimately what the feminist movement is about” (Pateman 1989: 118). Recent works of feminist political economists has offered a valuable framework for advancing research on the changing public/private divide, towards an analysis of financialization of the daily life and hence to the ongoing mobility and circulation not only of money but of societal spheres (Elias & Roberts 2016; Roberts 2013, 2015, 2016; Lai 2017, 2018; LeBaron 2010, among others). The term financialization can be defined as “encroachment of finance into the

realms of everyday life” (Van der Zwan 2014: 111) and means that financial market, financial products and services (such as consumer credit, medical or student loan, home mortgages, capital-funded pension plans, etc.) are increasingly used in order to provide for social reproduction and basic individual needs. The policy idea of financial literacy education is also an example of how finance enters the everyday life through education and daily practices.

Historic Materialist Policy Analysis (HMPA) is a research approach that aims to analyse how “specific policies are formulated against the background of essentially competing and contradictory interests of different social forces” (Brand et al. 2021: 1). This approach is capable of analysing how policies contribute to reproduction and regulation of social contradictions, such as the one of separation between the public and the private spheres. The HMPA approach is limited for its insufficient understanding of gender relations specifically. Hence, the endeavour of this thesis is to enhance HMPA by including feminist political economy insights on the changing nature of the public/private divide due to financialization of social reproduction, as well as arguments stemming from mobility studies of bordering. The overall aim is to assess FLE with respect to its proclaimed goal to promote gender equality.

In this doctoral project, the three approaches complement each other and offer an innovative theoretical framework to study FLE policy for two reasons. Firstly, the feminist critique of the ‘mobility turn’ and the corresponding metaphors of mobility and immobility were directed, among other things, at the lack of consideration of gender-specific power structures and understanding of gender beyond an empirical¹ category (see, e.g. Ahmed et al. 2003; Skeggs 2004; Dannecker & Sauer 2021). Overall, most of the mobility-related works that examine how mobilities and gender intersect (Uteng 2011; Lutz 2009), and how mobilities are gendered (e.g. Cresswell & Uteng 2008, Sheller 2008) aim to show the gender difference in travel aspirations, motivations, technologies used and pathways travelled. In contrast to these studies, the proposed doctoral thesis will engage with feminist political economy and HMPA and will provide a sufficient systematic theorization of gender as an analytical category. This means that the analysis of gender will concentrate on how gender, a gendered division of labour and gender relations are constructed and codified in the process of boundary shift between the social

1 I use the differentiation between gender as *empirical* and as an *analytical* category that has been made by Spike Peterson (2005). She has argued that gender as an empirical category “ends to become a synonym for ‘women’, who as a category can then be ‘added’ to prevailing analyses and frameworks” (Peterson 2005: 500). Adopting gender as an analytical category, however, means “investigating and theorising about identity, difference and historically specific hierarchies of oppression” (ibid.: 503).

spheres of publicity and privacy. Hence, mobility is understood as a process of negotiating gender relations through designing and formulating policies.

Secondly, the feminist HMPA approach to policy will, too, be informed by the insights stemming from mobility literature. While a lot of attention has been focused on the context, results and effects of the contemporary transformation between the public and private spheres (see, among others, Weber 2001; Ettinger 2019; Sauer 2001b; Scheele 2009), it has remained unclear how this process takes place, especially in the context of policy-making. This research gap will be addressed by consulting concepts of ‘mobile border’ (Rumford 2006a), ‘bordering’ and ‘re-bordering’ (Yuval-Davis et al. 2019; Rumford 2006b; Rumford & Cooper 2018).

The proposed monograph pursues the preliminary research question: **how are the borders between the public and the private spheres (re-)negotiated in the process of policy-making and what implications does this have for gender relations?** The question of how policy-making impacts the sphere of everyday life and how this is related to unequal gender relations is therefore in the centre of this thesis. Consequently, it resonates with political science research’s interest to analyse and understand structural inequalities and societal power relations. The research object is the policy of Financial Literacy Education that has been released in Austria in 2021. Apart from the surprising point of time for designing this policy, it is a worthy case to examine the mobility of the social spheres for the two following reasons. Firstly, feminist financialization studies stimulate a reflection on the importance of ‘the household’, where narratives about economic behaviour “draw upon imaginaries not just of market activity, but also of the ‘private’ spheres of family, intimacy and sexuality” (Smith 2016: 236). The policy of Financial Literacy Education addresses families and households as important target audiences of financial education measures, whereby household finances and their inherent risks are presented to be a responsibility of individuals. Hence, the analysis of the FLE policy is a promising case for understanding how the social spheres are entangled in the process of policy formulation and adoption. Secondly, financial education policy is a research object that “connects financial institutions, public policies and everyday life” (Lazarus 2020: 390). A three-fold methodological strategy including qualitative document analysis and expert interviews will be pursued and presented in more detail in the respective chapter of this proposal.

State of the Art

The general idea of FLE has been explored from many perspectives. A vast number of studies have critically analyzed dominant narratives (Ramsay 2017; Pinto 2013; Arthur 2012), and discourses (English 2012; Wolf 2018; Blue & Pinto 2017) about financial consumers' literacy and education. Other studies explored the precise definition of FLE (Faulkner 2015; Morgan 2022; Nicolini 2019 in chapter 1; Remund 2010; Hütten et al. 2018), developed innovative methods of measuring literacy (Agarwal & Mazumder 2013; Schürkmann, & Schuhen 2013) and examined the link between financial literacy and financial behaviour (Kaiser & Menkoff 2017; Mandell & Klein 2009). Some case studies described the level of and the need for FLE measures in different countries (Nicolini & Cude 2022, chapters 19-28; Lusardi & Mitchell 2011) and regions of the world (Nicolini 2019). In the landscape of FLE studies, little research is dedicated to analysing national FLE policies in detail. Works that do, however, scrutinize national policies are predominantly concerned with content (Pettersson 2021; Grifoni & Messy 2012) and effects on individuals of financial literacy policies (Urban et al. 2020; Frisancho 2020; O'Connell 2009; Lusardi 2006). Hence, political-economic and institutional aspects of FLE policy-uptake in a respective local context have so far been overlooked within this strand of research. Studying the Austrian case of FLE policy formulation from a feminist HMPA perspective will fill this research gap by putting light on actor networks, policy context and policy processes that have led to a certain design of Austrian FLE policy.

Scholarly interest in gender and gender-based inequalities caused by the so-called 'financial illiteracy' is rapidly increasing. Studies that examine gender inequalities are mainly based on concepts such as "gender gap in financial literacy" (i.a. Rink et al. 2021; Preston & Wright 2019; Cupak et al. 2018; Hasler & Lusardi 2017; Fonseca et al. 2012) or "gender difference in financial literacy" (i.a. Potrich et al. 2018; Bottazzi & Lusardi 2021; Chen & Volpe 2002). These concepts shed light on supposedly different behavioural patterns, knowledge levels and attitudes towards financial market that men and women exhibit. The prevailing implicit assumption of these studies is that gender inequality in financial matters stems neither from social structures, nor the way financial market and financial products are made available for society, but mainly from individual behaviour that depends on gender. While there are some general insights reflecting that financial literacy education is an "answer to the financialization of everyday life" (Lazarus 2022), or a "legitimization criterion for social selection" (Weber 2010), these critical works do not analyse asymmetric gender relations specifically. In line with the research interests of this dissertation, I intend to deploy a feminist political economy notion

of gender inequality in my project, namely, as renegotiation of the division of public and private spheres in line with patriarchal-capitalist interests, transformation of the state and development tendencies of socio-economic system.

Summing up, what has been missing so far, are studies that link FLE policy analysis with feminist research interests in order to reveal how negotiation of gender relations takes place on the level of policy-making. My dissertation project seeks to fill these gaps and contribute to feminist policy analysis in offering a comprehensive and methodological innovative approach for the investigation of the policy-making process of financial literacy education in Austria.

Theoretical Concepts and Assumptions

This thesis combines concepts from Historic Materialist Policy Analysis (HMPA), Feminist Political Economy and Mobility Studies. Contrary to other approaches towards analysing policies, HMPA (Brand et al. 2021; Brand 2013; Buckel et al. 2017) adopts a broad and complex understanding of a policy as “unstable compromises among social forces which are formulated through specific state apparatuses or even groups or alliances in particular apparatuses” (Brand et al. 2021: 7). Subsequently, the process of policy formulation is conceptualised as “a form by which to rationalize politics, i.e. conflicts and problems, and through which to deal with societal contradictions and tensions” (ibid.). Hence, following the HMPA approach, a policy is neither a ‘rational’ answer to a defined social problem, nor a ‘best practice’ example to solve that problem. Instead, a certain policy design and formulation is always contested, it might be ambiguous, contradictory and fluid. Furthermore, HMPA’s account towards policy analysis examines “how specific policies are formulated against the background of essentially competing and contradictory interests of different social forces and how, if at all, they contribute to societal reproduction and the regulation of contradictory social relations and crisis tendencies” (Brand et al. 2021: 1). HMPA is thus primarily focused on analysing material structures and interests that have impacted a certain policy-formulation whereby it analytically considers the “background of manifold social relations of (re-)production (...) which are contradictory, dynamic, crisis-prone and lead to latent or manifest conflicts” (Brand et al. 2021: 2). Analysing how policies result from and reproduce gender-specific inequalities, however, cannot be limited to a general analysis of social contradictions but requires a distinctive theoretical terminology. Hence, this dissertation focuses on the public/private division and its negotiation on the policy level as a conflict that shapes and organises relations of social reproduction.

Feminist theories question historically institutionalized, but arbitrary, ambivalent and always shifting separation between the public and the private spheres, and aim to reveal how, and in which way the separation functions as “an organizational and perceptual pattern of reality that regulates social relations, that allows, permits, and prohibits (...), regulates access to certain resources, forms identities and groups of actors (...), and organizes interests” (Sauer 2001b: 5, translation D.B.). Feminist political economy’s concept of ‘financialization of social reproduction’ shows that the increasing role of finance in the daily life of households and individuals results in a new constellation of the public/private divide. For Bakker and Gill (2003), social reproduction encompasses three dimensions: 1) biological reproduction of the species; 2) the reproduction of the labour force, which involves not only subsistence but also education and training; 3) the reproduction of provisioning and caring needs that may be wholly privatized within families or socialized or, indeed, provided through a combination of the two (Bakker & Gill 2003: 32). Studies that focus on social reproduction point out the ways that realms of privacy and domesticity have been connected to financial market, especially on the example of debt. Latest since the “multiple crisis” (Demirovic et al. 2011) of 2007/8, debt has become necessary for many households to meet the basic needs and costs of social reproduction (food, healthcare, housing, education, etc.), and as a result of this process, “women and their households become fully exposed to what money may do on financial markets, and they shoulder the risks of this exposure” (Adkins 2015: 44). With the process of financialization and indebtedness of households, “many reproductive activities have now become immediate sites of capital accumulation” (Federici 2014: 233). The structural change impelled by financialization on the level of the domesticity is in the centre of my conceptual framework to explore feminist concerns on current shift of borders between the social spheres.

Theorising the border between public and private spheres as ‘mobile’ (i.e. negotiable, replaceable, always in movement) includes three aspects. Firstly, the concept adopts broad understanding of politics. This means that ‘politics’ is not equated with public space within a national state, therefore, consequently, this approach recognises political “spatiality beyond territoriality” (Rumford 2006: 160.). Analyses of a new spatiality of politics are thus characterised by “a shift from state-centric approaches to a concern with other, non-territorial spaces: public spheres, cosmopolitan communities, global civil societies, non-proximate or virtual communities, and transnational or global networks, none of which can be bordered in

conventional ways” (Rumford 2006: 160)². Hence, due to its wide understanding of the political space, the concept of mobile border is suitable to grasp the changing nature of the public/private divide. Secondly, following on the insight that borders are expressions of social power relations, a ‘mobile border’ is socially negotiable. This means that “societal actors can redefine borders or appropriate them for purposes other than those originally intended” (Rumford 2006: 159). Hence, the definition of border between the public and the private spheres is a struggle of (gendered) interests that are carried out by social actors. This aspect is especially relevant in the analysis of policy-making: the design and formulation of a policy has an implicit understanding or imagination of a ‘mobile border’ and therefore represents how gender relations have been negotiated. Finally, borders “can be experienced – and imagined – in many different ways” (Yuval-Davis 2004: 218) and are, therefore, experienced differently by all people (cf. Yuval-Davis 2004; Rumford 2006; Rumford 2008). This aspect highlights social inequalities that are related to the changing constellation of the public/private divide: while policies that stimulate financialization of the daily life can be beneficial for those who provide financial products or services, they may at the same time deepen precarious living conditions of the poor. As the interest of this thesis is not only where the borders are (re-)drawn within FLE policy, but more importantly – how, with an emphasis on mechanisms, context and actors, the borders are negotiated, it is important to theoretically reflect on the process of setting and negotiating borders, namely the process of ‘bordering’.

At the heart of the term ‘bordering’³ is the idea that the process of making – imagining, setting, conceptualising and negotiating – borders “constitutes a principal organising mechanism in constructing, maintaining, and controlling social and political order” (Yuval-Navis et al. 2019: 5). This idea holds an assumption that analyses of bordering are occupied not only with questions such as who moves and who does not (issue of capacity to move), but even more importantly – with questions asking who determines, regulates and controls whose movements (issue of hierarchy and power). Differently said, “some of the crucial analytical as well as political questions related to bordering concern the understanding of the ‘who’, ‘how’, and ‘why’ of the construction and control of specific borders in specific times and spaces” (Yuval-

2 In this quote Rumford denounces ‘the political’ to the public sphere only and therefore ignores theoretical tradition of conceptualising the private sphere as political.

3 The terms ‘rebordering’ and ‘debordering’ usually accompany analyses of bordering. Rebordering generally means a reestablishment of the border, as well as its relocation somewhere else, and debordering could be described as demolition of the boundary. However, due to the limited space of this proposal, I will not discuss these terms in detail. They will be considered and incorporated in the later phase of this thesis.

Davis et al. 2019: 4). Resulting from this, I understand bordering as a practice of governing and control – a practice that is situated in and constituted by political negotiations, social conflicts and struggles of competing interests. Therefore, studies that explore contemporary bordering processes are primarily interested in reflecting on those conflicts and interests and hence need to pay close attention to the role that bordering plays in particular political projects, such as, in this case, the policy of FLE.

Doing feminist historic-materialist policy analysis

In this section I will describe how the three theoretical concepts will be bridged and transformed into adequate tools to analyse policies. HMPA is operationalised as a three-step process, namely as 1) context analysis, 2) actor analysis and 3) process analysis (Brand 2021; Buckel et al. 2017; Kannankulam & Georgi 2014). Leaning to previously discussed theoretical concepts I propose to include the category of ‘bordering’ as a fourth step that aims to explore the movement of public/private divide in the context of financialization of social reproduction. Figure 1 illustrates the analytical framework of the proposed project.

Figure 1: Analytical framework

	Focus
Context Analysis	Political and social contestation and struggles in the policy process
Actor Analysis	Overall actor constellation: actor groups, coalitions, networks
Process Analysis	Most important events and decisions in the policy process
Bordering Analysis	Negotiations of border between public and private spheres in the policy process

Source: own illustration

a) Context analysis

Context analysis primarily focuses on “political and social contestation and struggles in the policy process” (Brand 2021: 9), whereby conflicts (over social problems, their precise definition and political management) play a central role and can be understood as competing actors’ interests. Resulting from this, context analysis strives to “reconstruct this conflict as a specific historical situation to which social and political forces reacted” (Kannankulam & Georgi 2014: 63). The guiding questions of this analytical element are: due to which structural conditions did the Austrian FLE policy emerge at a specific time and in a specific form? How is the global trend of financialization of social reproduction related to the FLE policy uptake? Structural conditions such as influence of international organizations, scientific findings that are instrumentalised for policy legitimation, austerity measures, constellation of public and

private institutions that shape how state and other policy actors work together to solve the problem of “financial illiteracy” will be analysed in the context analysis.

b) Actor analysis

The actor analysis starts with identifying relevant political actors and stakeholders who have taken part (actively and passively) in the policy-formulation process. A good example for actor analysis is the activist organization “Attac” that was involved in the Austrian FLE negotiations in the beginning of policy-making process, but has abandoned the process due to internal conflicts concerning definition of financial literacy. This example highlights that power struggles among actors and actor coalitions are worth examination. The overall aim of the actor analysis is to get an overview of the variety of actors and their (gendered) interests, as well as actor constellations, coalitions and networks. Guiding questions are: what conflicts over definition of the FLE policy may be identified? Which actors with what (gendered) interests had the prerogative of formulation and definition of the policy, and which actors/actor constellations/networks were excluded from the formulation process? What significance do policy actors ascribe to gender relations?

c) Process analysis

A process analysis “reconstructs the dynamic process in which the investigated conflict (...) unfolded through different phases and turning points” (Kannankulam & Georgi 2014: 67). It aims to identify “crucial events and decisions in the policy process and to derive a periodization from this” (Brand et al. 2021: 13). To carry out process analysis, I will ask questions such as: what strategies did policy stakeholders pursue in order to achieve a common understanding and definition of financial literacy in Austrian FLE policy? How did the actor constellations change in the course of policy formulation? How, if at all, did the compromises between different (gendered) interests emerge?

d) Bordering analysis

As illustrated in figure 1, the analysis of bordering results from the context, actor and process analysis. Hence, bordering is an analytical lens that aims at analysing the negotiation of borders between the public and the private spheres and its gendered implications in the policy-making process. The following questions will be asked in the analysis: where is the border between the public and the private spheres drawn in the Austrian FLE policy? What is privatized, and what

is made public by introducing this policy? Are there any spaces ‘in-between’ the public and the private and if so, where are they? How and where does the process of bordering take place in the context of policy-making? What are the crucial events, turning points and decisions that determine the public/private divide? What new insights concerning gender relations can be made by analysing the process of bordering of the social spheres on the policy level?

Methodology, Methods and Analysed Materials

Figure 2 illustrates my preliminary methodological procedure. Each analytical element of a feminist HMPA relies on a respective method and different analysed materials. Content, actor and process analyses do not represent a linear sequence for carrying out HMPA, but are understood as elements of a circular, iterative research process (cf. Brand et al. 2021: 9). Each of these steps can be an entry point of analysis, but I will start with context analysis. I will pursue a three-step methodological strategy. In order to analyse the context of FLE policy, I will conduct document and literature review. Actor analysis will rely on expert interviews. The process analysis will, too, rely on expert interviews. The overall collected data will be used to conduct bordering analysis. This final methodological step will rely on qualitative methods of data interpretation, namely, qualitative document and qualitative content analyses.

Figure 2: Methods and Analysed Materials

Analysis	Methods of data collection	Materials	Methods of data interpretation
Context Analysis	Document & literature review	Legal FLE instruments of the OECD and the EU; scientific studies on FLE in Austria; relevant policies in the field of finance, economy, gender equality and education	Qualitative document analysis
Actor Analysis	Expert interviews	For preliminary interviewee list see figure 3	Qualitative content analysis
Process Analysis	Expert interviews	For preliminary interviewee list see figure 3	
		Method of data interpretation	Materials
Bordering Analysis	Qualitative document & Content analysis	1) “A national financial literacy strategy for Austria” (OECD 2021a); 2) “Financial Literacy in Austria: Relevance, evidence and provision” (OECD 2021b); 3) Revision and analysis of collected data	

Source: own illustration

1) Context Analysis

To begin with, a qualitative document analysis will be made with the aim to get an overview of Austrian FLE policy context and structural conditions that have led to a certain policy formulation. The focus of the document analysis will be to identify and examine following contextual aspects of FLE policy: 1) Austrian federal laws, regulations and policies concerning financialization of social reproduction; 2) international agreements, declarations and recommendations referring to FLE; 3) scientific studies that are used to support the idea of “financial illiteracy” in Austria. The collected documents will be analysed by instructions for qualitative document analysis (Bowen 2009; Altheide & Schneider 2013).

2) Actor & Process Analysis

The second step of my methodology will be to pursue actor and process analysis by conducting expert interviews described by Froschauer and Lueger (2003) as well as Meuser and Nagel (2009). The overall interest in conducting interviews is to understand why and due to which circumstances did a specific policy formulation emerge at a specific moment in time and in a specific form. In this step, expert interviews will be only conducted once with each interview partner. I understand actor and process analysis as ‘thematic blocs’ within conducted interviews that will be addressed in the interview situation. *Actor analysis* will explore the interviewees’ perceptions on actor networks, actor interests as well as prevailing conflicts and struggles in their common aim to bring about Austrian formulation of FLE policy. *Process analysis* will concentrate on experts’ views on important events, decisions and compromises in the policy formulation process. I understand an ‘expert’ as a person who has deep knowledge on networks, processes and conflicts that have shaped Austrian FLE policy-making. Figure 3 shows organizations and institutions that have been involved in the process of designing the Austrian National Strategy for FLE. I will conduct interviews with at least 20 experts working for those institutions. The experts will be selected on the basis of two criteria: their gender expertise as well as their active engagement in the formulation of Austrian National Strategy for FLE policy – their presence in conferences, meetings and work groups working on the Austrian National Strategy. All interviews will be recorded, anonymised, transcribed and analysed by applying qualitative content analysis (Mayring 2019, 2014). I am convinced about the access to interviews as I have already established connections to some of the institutions mentioned.

Figure 3: Institutions and organisations involved in the FLE policy formulation

Respondents (in alphabetical order)
ASB Schuldnerberatungen GmbH (asb)
Attac Austria
Austrian Bankers Association
Austrian Federal Economic Chamber
Austrian Financial Market Authority (FMA)
BAWAG Group
Bildungsakademie der Österreichischen Versicherungswirtschaft
Consumer Advice - Chamber of Labour Upper Austria
Environment Agency Austria (Umweltbundesamt)
Erste Financial Life Park (FLiP)
ERSTE Stiftung
Federal Chamber of Labour / Bundesarbeitskammer Österreich
Federal Ministry for Digital and Economic Affairs (BMDW)
Federal Ministry for Social Affairs, Health, Care and Consumer Protection (BMSGPK)
Federal Ministry of Climate Action, Environment, Energy, Mobility, Innovation and Technology (BMK)
Federal Ministry of Education, Science and Research (BMBWF)
Federation of Austrian Industries
ibw Institut für Bildungsforschung der Wirtschaft Austria
ifs Schuldenberatung
ING Österreich
Institute of Business Education at Vienna University of Economics and Business
Julius Raab Foundation
Junior Achievement Austria
KLARTEXT - Finanzielle Gesundheit / Schuldnerberatung OÖ
Ministry of Social Affairs, Health, Care and Consumer Protection
Österreichisches Gesellschafts- und Wirtschaftsmuseum
Oesterreichische Nationalbank
Schuldenberatung Burgenland
Schuldenberatung Salzburg
Schuldnerberatung Kärnten
Schuldnerberatung Niederösterreich gGmbH
Schuldnerberatung Steiermark GmbH
Schuldnerberatung Wien, Finanzbildung
SCHULDNERHILFE OÖ
Three Coins
University Teacher College Vienna & Krems + IFTE.at + e.e.si
Verein Wendepunkt
Wiener Börse AG
Zweite Sparkasse

Source: “Financial Literacy in Austria: Relevance, evidence and provision” (OECD 2021b: 77)

3) Bordering analysis

As illustrated in the figure 2, two previous methodological steps (context, actor and process analysis) lead to the analysis of bordering. Hence, this third methodological step can be described as an analytical lens with which I will interpret relevant data. Bordering analysis consists of qualitative document analysis as well as qualitative content analysis of data collected in previous research steps. Firstly, two Austrian FLE policy documents will be analysed: a) “A national financial literacy strategy for Austria” (OECD 2021a) and b) “Financial Literacy in Austria: Relevance, evidence and provision” (OECD 2021b). Qualitative document analysis “aims to explore the structural problems and methodological tools that document creators and their recipients have to deal with, and attempts to make the implications of different forms of

design and strategies of representation explicit” (Wolff 2013: 513, translated by D.B.). In this sense, the focus of the document analysis will be to examine 1) which understanding of financial literacy and of gender/gender equality are dominant in the documents; 2) where is the border between the public and the private spheres drawn in the Austrian FLE policy; 3) how are the public and the private spheres represented in the policy documents, what topics are related to the social spheres, and how is the displacement of the border represented in the documents. Secondly, I will revise data collected in context, actor and process analysis with the specific focus on the process of ‘bordering’. This means that I will derive propositions from the findings that theorise how the borders between the public and the private spheres are (re-)negotiated in the background of Austrian FLE policy-formulation process.

Ethical considerations

The project is guided by the principles of informed consent, voluntary participation, confidentiality, and anonymity. The study will ensure anonymity of the interviewees at all stages of the research by not addressing the interview partner during the interview by name, as well as by securing the interview codification in a safe folder on my computer (not online). Furthermore, a written informed consent of expert participants will be signed so that both the interviewees and I have a record of what has been agreed, including limits to confidentiality and anonymity (if any), how data will be used, and a clarification of the participants’ right to comment on or possibly correct factual inaccuracies in material. Explicit consent will be asked for in case direct quotations will be used in research outputs. It is important to clarify whether or not experts wish and are able to check the accuracy of my analysis. However, interviewees will not be offered the opportunity to change the transcript in any way other than to correct the above-mentioned factual inaccuracies.

Literature

- Adkins, L. (2015). What can money do? Feminist theory in austere times. *Feminist Review*, 109, pp. 31–48.
- Agarwal, S., & Mazumder, B. (2013). Cognitive abilities and household financial decision making. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 5(1), pp. 193-207.
- Ahmed, S., Castada, S., Fortier, A.M., Sheller, M. (2003). *Uprooting/ Regrounding. Questions of Home and Migration*. Oxford: Berg.
- Aitken, R. (2007). *Performing capital: Toward a cultural economy of popular and global finance*. Springer.
- Allon, F. (2014). The feminisation of finance: Gender, labour and the limits of inclusion. *Australian Feminist Studies*, 29(79), pp. 12–30.
- Alsemgeest, L. (2015). Arguments for and against financial literacy education: where to go from here? *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 39(2), pp. 155-161.
- Altheide, D., & Schneider, C. (2013). Process of qualitative document analysis. In: *Qualitative media analysis*. SAGE Publications, pp. 38-74.
- Arthur, C. (2012). *Financial literacy education*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Arthur, C. (2014). Financial literacy education as public pedagogy for the capitalist debt economy. *TOPIA: Canadian Journal of Cultural Studies*, 30, pp. 147-164.
- Bakker, I., & Gill, S. (2003). Ontology, method, and hypotheses. In: *Power, production and social reproduction*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 17–41.
- Blue, L. E., & Pinto, L. E. (2017). Other ways of being: Challenging dominant financial literacy discourses in Aboriginal context. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 44(1), pp. 55-70.
- Bottazzi, L., & Lusardi, A. (2021). Stereotypes in financial literacy: Evidence from PISA. *Journal of Corporate Finance*, 71.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative research journal*.
- Brand, U. (2013). State, context and correspondence. *Contours of a historical-materialist policy analysis*. *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft*, 42(4), pp. 425-442.
- Brand, U., Krams, M., Lenikus, V., & Schneider, E. (2021). *Contours of historical-materialist policy analysis*. *Critical Policy Studies*, pp. 1-18.
- Buckel, S., Georgi, F., Kannankulam, J., & Wissel, J. (2017). *The European border regime in crisis: theory, methods and analyses in critical European studies*. Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung.
- Chen, H., & Volpe, R. P. (2002). Gender differences in personal financial literacy among college students. *Financial services review*, 11(3), pp. 289-307.

- Clarke, C. (2015). Learning to fail: resilience and the empty promise of financial literacy education. *Consumption Markets & Culture*, 18(3), pp. 257-276.
- Cupák, A., Fessler, P., Schneebaum, A., & Silgoner, M. (2018). Decomposing gender gaps in financial literacy: New international evidence. *Economics Letters*, 168, pp. 102-106.
- Dannecker, P., & Sauer, B. (2021). Gender und Mobilität oder Mobilität und Gender? Programmatische Überlegungen zu einem komplexen Zusammenhang. In: *Mobile Kulturen und Gesellschaften/Mobile Cultures and Societies*, pp. 87-99.
- Demirovic, A., Dück, J., Becker, F., & Bader, P. (2011). *VielfachKrise. Im finanzmarktdominierten Kapitalismus*. Hamburg: VSA-Verlag.
- Diani, M. (2002). Network analysis. *Methods of social movement research*, pp. 173-200.
- Disney, R., Gathergood, J., & Weber, J. (2015). Credit counseling: a substitute for consumer financial literacy? *Journal of Pension Economics & Finance*, 14(4), pp. 466-491.
- English, L. (2012). Financial literacy and academics: A critical discourse analysis. *Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education*, 25(1), pp. 17-30.
- Ettinger, P. (2019). *Intimisierung des Öffentlichen?* Wiesbaden: Springer VS, pp. 37-49.
- Faist, T. (2013): The mobility turn: a new paradigm for the social sciences? *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 36:11, pp. 1637-1646.
- Faulkner, A. E. (2015). A systematic review of financial literacy as a termed concept: More questions than answers. *Journal of Business & Finance Librarianship*, 20(1–2), pp. 7–26.
- Federici, S. (2014). From commoning to debt: Financialization, microcredit and the changing architecture of capital accumulation. *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, 113(2), pp. 231–244.
- Fonseca, R., Mullen, K. J., Zamarro, G., & Zissimopoulos, J. (2012). What explains the gender gap in financial literacy? The role of household decision making. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 46(1), pp. 90-106.
- Frisancho, V. (2020). The impact of financial education for youth. *Economics of Education Review*, 78.
- Froschauer, U., & Lueger, M. (2003). *Das qualitative Interview. Zur Praxis interpretativer Analyse sozialer Systeme*. Wien: WUV-Univ.
- Grifoni, A., & Messy, F. A. (2012). Current status of national strategies for financial education: A comparative analysis and relevant practices.
- Guérin, I. (2012). Households' over-indebtedness and the fallacy of financial education: insights from economic anthropology. *Microfinance in Crisis Working Papers*, Series, 1.
- Haiven, M. (2017). The uses of financial literacy: Financialization, the radical imagination, and the unpayable debts of settler colonialism. *Cultural Politics*, 13(3), pp. 348-369.

- Hannam, K., Sheller, M., & Urry, J. (2006). Mobilities, immobilities and moorings. *Mobilities*, 1(1), pp. 1-22.
- Hasler, A., & Lusardi, A. (2017). The gender gap in financial literacy: A global perspective. Global Financial Literacy Excellence Center, The George Washington University School of Business.
- Hütten, M., Maman, D., Rosenhek, Z., & Thiemann, M. (2018). Critical financial literacy: an agenda. *International Journal of Pluralism and Economics Education*, 9(3), pp. 274-291.
- Kaiser, T., & Menkhoff, L. (2017). Does financial education impact financial literacy and financial behavior, and if so, when? *The World Bank Economic Review*, 31(3), pp. 611-630.
- Kannankulam, J., & Georgi, F. (2014). Varieties of capitalism or varieties of relationships of forces? Outlines of a historical materialist policy analysis. *Capital & Class*, 38(1), pp. 59-71.
- Koopmans, R., & Statham, P. (1999). Political claims analysis: Integrating protest event and political discourse approaches. *Mobilization: an international quarterly*, 4(2), pp. 203-221.
- Lange, B., Power, D., & Suwala, L. (2014). Geographies of field-configuring events. *Zeitschrift für Wirtschaftsgeographie*, 58.
- Lazarus, J. (2020). Financial literacy education: a questionable answer to the financialization of everyday life. In: *The Routledge international handbook of financialization*, pp. 390-399.
- Leifeld, P., & Haunss, S. (2012). Political discourse networks and the conflict over software patents in Europe', *European journal of political research*, 51, pp. 382-409.
- Lusardi, A. (2006). Financial literacy and financial education: Review and policy implications. *NFI Policy Brief*, 11.
- Lusardi, A., & Mitchell, O. S. (2011). Financial literacy around the world: an overview. *Journal of pension economics & finance*, 10(4), pp. 497-508.
- Lutz, H. (2009). Gender Mobil? Geschlecht und Migration in transnationalen Räumen. In: *Gender Mobil? Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot*, pp. 8-26.
- Mader, P., Mertens, D., & Van der Zwan, N. (2020). *The Routledge international handbook of financialization*. Routledge.
- Mandell, L., & Klein, L. S. (2009). The impact of financial literacy education on subsequent financial behavior. *Journal of Financial Counseling and Planning*, 20(1).
- Mayring, P. (2014). *Qualitative content analysis: theoretical foundation, basic procedures and software solution*. Klagenfurt: Beltz.
- Mayring, P. (2019). Qualitative Content Analysis: Demarcation, Varieties, Developments. In: *Forum Qualitative Social Research* 20(3).
- Mayring, P., & Fenzl, T. (2019). Qualitative inhaltsanalyse. In: *Handbuch Methoden der empirischen Sozialforschung*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, pp. 633-648.

- Meuser, M., & Nagel, U. (2009). The expert interview and changes in knowledge production. In: *Interviewing experts*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 17-42.
- Morgan, P. J. (2022). Fintech, financial literacy, and financial education. In: G. Nicolini & B. J. Cude (Eds.), *Handbook on financial literacy*. Routledge, pp. 239–258.
- Nicolini, G. (2019). *Financial literacy in Europe: Assessment methodologies and evidence from European countries*. Routledge.
- Nicolini, G., & Cude, B. J. (2022). *The Routledge Handbook of Financial Literacy*. Routledge.
- O’Connell, A. (2009). Evaluating the effectiveness of financial education programmes. *OECD Journal: General Papers*, 2008(3), pp. 9-51.
- OECD (2021a) A national financial literacy strategy for Austria. <https://www.oecd.org/daf/fin/financial-education/austria-financial-literacy-strategy.htm> (27.05.2022)
- OECD (2021b) Financial Literacy in Austria: Relevance, evidence and provision. www.oecd.org/finance/financial-education/austria-financial-literacy-strategy.htm (27.05.2022)
- Pagliari, S., & Young, K. (2020). How financialization is reproduced politically. In: *Routledge Handbook of Financialization*. Routledge, pp. 113-123.
- Pateman, C. (1989). *Feminist Critiques of the Public/Private Dichotomy*, In: *The Disorder of Women. Democracy, Feminism and Political Theory*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Peterson, S. V. (2005). How (the meaning of) gender matters in political economy. *New Political Economy*, 10(4), pp. 499-521.
- Pettersson, J. (2021). The problematization of consumers in Swedish financial literacy education. *Cultural Studies*, pp. 1-24.
- Pinto, L. E. (2012). One size does not fit all: Conceptual concerns and moral imperatives surrounding gender-inclusive financial literacy education. *Citizenship, Social and Economics Education*, 11(3), pp. 177-188.
- Pinto, L. E. (2013). When politics trump evidence: Financial literacy education narratives following the global financial crisis. *Journal of Education Policy*, 28(1), pp. 95-120.
- Pinto, L. E., & Coulson, E. (2011). Social justice and the gender politics of financial literacy education. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 9(2), 54-85.
- Potrich, A. C. G., Vieira, K. M., & Kirch, G. (2018). How well do women do when it comes to financial literacy? Proposition of an indicator and analysis of gender differences. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Finance*, 17, pp. 28-41.
- Predmore, S. (2020). *Feminist and gender studies approaches to financialization*. The Routledge International Handbook of Financialization. London, New York: Routledge.
- Preston, A. C., & Wright, R. E. (2019). Understanding the gender gap in financial literacy: evidence from Australia. *Economic Record*, 95, pp. 1-29.

- Ramsay, I. (2017). *Personal insolvency in the 21st century: A comparative analysis of the US and Europe*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Remund, D. L. (2010). Financial literacy explicated: The case for a clearer definition in an increasingly complex economy. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 44(2), pp. 276–295.
- Rink, U., Walle, Y. M., & Klasen, S. (2021). The financial literacy gender gap and the role of culture. *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*, 80, pp. 117-134.
- Rumford, C. (2006a). Theorizing borders. *European journal of social theory*, 9(2), pp.155-169.
- Rumford, C. (2006b). Borders and rebordering. In *Europe and Asia beyond east and west*. Routledge, pp. 195-206.
- Rumford, C., & Cooper, A. (2018). *Bordering and connectivity*. Routledge International Handbook of Cosmopolitanism Studies.
- Rumford. (2008). Introduction: Citizens and Borderwork in Europe. *Space & Polity*, 12(1), pp. 1–12.
- Sauer, B. (2001a). *Die Asche des Souveräns: Staat und Demokratie in der Geschlechterdebatte (Vol. 16)*. Wien: Campus Verlag.
- Sauer, B. (2001b). Öffentlichkeit und Privatheit revisited. *Grenzneuziehungen im Neoliberalismus und die Konsequenzen für die Geschlechterpolitik* In: *Kurswechsel: Zeitschrift für gesellschafts-, wirtschafts-und umweltpolitische Alternativen*, 16(4), pp. 5-11.
- Sauer, B., & Wöhl, S. (2011). Feminist perspectives on the internationalization of the state. *Antipode*, 43(1), pp. 108-128.
- Scheele, A. (2009). Widersprüchliche Anerkennung des Privaten. Eine Kritik aktueller Entwicklungen wohlfahrtsstaatlicher Politik. *Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft*, pp. 167-182.
- Schürkmann, S., & Schuhen, M. (2013). Kompetenzmessung im Bereich financial literacy. *Zeitschrift für ökonomische Bildung* (01), pp. 73-89.
- Schürz, M. (2006). Financial Education for the Poor in the United States. In: Mooslechner, P., Schuberth, H. and Weber, B. (eds) *The Political Economy of Financial Market Regulation. The Dynamics of Inclusion and Exclusion*, Cheltenham, Edward Elgar, pp. 140–167.
- Sheller, M. (2008). Gendered mobilities: Epilogue. In: *Gendered Mobilities*, Uteng. T.P. & Cresswell, T.: *The new mobilities paradigm*. *Environment and Planning* (38), pp. 207–226.
- Sheller, M. (2014). *Sociology after the mobilities turn*. *The Routledge handbook of mobilities*, pp. 45-54.
- Sheller, M. (2017). From spatial turn to mobilities turn. *Current Sociology*, 65(4), pp. 623-639.
- Sheller, M., & Urry, J. (2003). Mobile transformations of public and private life. *Theory, culture & society*, 20(3), pp. 107-125.
- Sheller, M., & Urry, J. (2006). The new mobilities paradigm. *Environment and planning A*, 38(2), pp. 207-226.

- Skeggs, B. (2004). *Class, Self, Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Smith, N., (2016). Towards a queer political economy of crisis. In: Hozic, A.A. & True, J. (eds.), *Scandalous Economics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Urban, C., Schmeiser, M., Collins, J. M., & Brown, A. (2020). The effects of high school personal financial education policies on financial behavior. *Economics of Education Review*, 78.
- Uteng, T. P., & Cresswell, T. (Eds.). (2008). *Gendered mobilities*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Uteng, T.P. (2011). *Gender and Mobility in the Developing World*. Background Paper for the World Development Report 2012. New York: World Bank.
- Van der Zwan, N. (2014). Making sense of financialization. *Socioeconomic Review*, 12(1), pp. 99–129.
- Verloo, M., & Lombardo, E. (2007). Contested gender equality and policy variety in Europe: Introducing a critical frame analysis approach.
- Wasserman, S., & Faust, K. (2007). *Social Network Analysis: Methods and Applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Weber, B. (2001). Öffentlich/Privat-neue Grenzziehungen im Übergang zum Postfordismus. *Kurswechsel: Zeitschrift für gesellschafts-, wirtschafts-und umweltpolitische Alternativen*, (4), pp. 24-37.
- Weber, B. (2010). Finanzbildungsbürgertum und die Finanzialisierung des Alltags. *PROKLA. Zeitschrift für kritische Sozialwissenschaft*, 40(160), pp. 377-393.
- Williams, T. (2007). Empowerment of whom and for what? Financial literacy education and the new regulation of consumer financial services, *Law & Policy*, 29, pp. 226–256.
- Willis, L. E. (2008). Against financial-literacy education. *Iowa L. Rev.*, 94, 197.
- Willis, L. E. (2011). The financial education fallacy. *American Economic Review*, 101(3), pp. 429-34.
- Wöhl, S. (2014). The state and gender relations in international political economy: A state-theoretical approach to varieties of capitalism in crisis. *Capital & Class*, 38(1), pp. 87-99.
- Wolff, S. (2013). Dokumenten- und Aktenanalyse. In: Uwe Flick, Ernst von Kardorff und Ines Steinke (Eds.): *Qualitative Forschung. Ein Handbuch*. Hamburg: Rowohlt, pp. 502-513.