

Using reproductive justice as a theoretical frame in qualitative research in psychology

Tracy Morison

School of Psychology, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand

Private Bag X 1112 Palmerston North, 4442, Aotearoa New Zealand

T.Morison@massey.ac.nz

ORCID: orcid.org/0000-0001-9088-1662

Reproductive Justice has become somewhat of a buzzword, inspiring qualitative research on a range of sexual and reproductive issues. However, uptake in psychology has been somewhat slow, in part due to the absence of well-defined methodology and rigorous methods for applying a Reproductive Justice framework. Psychology research claiming a Reproductive Justice approach often lacks specificity regarding its underlying theoretical assumptions and how the chosen methodology enables Reproductive Justice analysis. Failing to engage with the theoretical foundations of Reproductive Justice or explicate how these inform one's work can lead to underdeveloped application, deviation from the central principles, and misappropriation of Reproductive Justice Theory, thus failing to realise its radical potential. Accordingly, focusing on the application of Reproductive Justice in qualitative psychology research, I discuss three core theoretical antecedents of Reproductive Justice and present three corresponding approaches to application, illustrated with examples. The objective is to offer concrete analytical strategies for applying Reproductive Justice theory and to stimulate further thinking and discussion regarding how the theory might be fruitfully and rigorously used in qualitative research in psychology.

Keywords: reproductive justice; theory; analysis; standpoint theory; intersectionality theory; feminist poststructuralism

Introduction

A postgraduate student I was supervising, initially excited to take a Reproductive Justice approach for her study and diligently reading about the framework, came to a supervision meeting perplexed. She understood the history and principles of Reproductive Justice, but she was not sure how the framework should be applied in empirical work. I confess that her consternation matched my own when I first wanted to use the framework. Searching for key texts to share with her as exemplars, I became even more aware that few exist. Scholars drawing on this theory (myself included) have not been very clear about how we have gone about the 'Reproductive Justice approach' we purport to use, or what precisely using a

'Reproductive Justice lens' entails. Thus, I aim to address this omission in this paper, focusing specifically on the use of Reproductive Justice as a theoretical frame in the field of psychology.

Reproductive Justice is an innovative, relatively novel, critical feminist theory that holds much promise for psychologists conducting qualitative research on sexuality and reproduction and related topics who are interested in generating social change. According to Eaton and Stephens (Eaton and Stephens 2020) Reproductive Justice theory 'offers the opportunity to redefine and revolutionise our field—moving us from making incremental contributions to knowledge to taking leaps of understanding in established and new domains of inquiry'. However, the promise of this approach is yet to be realised. Aside from a handful of feminist scholars who have argued in support of the value of Reproductive Justice as a theoretical lens, there has been relatively little uptake or (explicit) engagement with this framework in qualitative research in psychology at large (Eaton and Stephens 2020; Morison 2021a).

The limited engagement with Reproductive Justice theory in psychology has been attributed to the field's disciplinary norms and positivistic bias. To this explanation, I add the lack of clarity regarding how to apply Reproductive Justice theory in empirical studies of sexual and reproductive issues. Reproductive Justice provides a broad conceptual framework that researchers can draw on as a guide; however, it does not (explicitly) offer a distinct selection of analytical concepts or tools. Indeed, the framework has been described as an 'open-source code' (Ross and Solinger 2017): adaptable and applicable across disciplines and settings. Yet, at the same time, this adaptability can result in underdeveloped application or stray from the central principles of Reproductive Justice theory, at times seemingly paying lip service to a popular buzzword, and, ultimately, failing to realise its radical potential (Mason 2018).

To remedy this, researchers who use a Reproductive Justice lens or approach need to be (more) specific about the theoretical assumptions upon which they operate or how their chosen methodology enables a Reproductive Justice analysis. More fundamentally, it is unclear whether Reproductive Justice is an analytic approach, a framework, theory, or paradigm, with researchers using these terms interchangeably. Therefore, what exactly is meant when psychology researchers claim to take a Reproductive Justice 'approach' or to use a Reproductive Justice lens? What types of methodologies are effective for producing analyses that remain true to the principles of Reproductive Justice and realise its radical potential?

While its origins are well-rehearsed in psychology scholarship and beyond, little has been written about Reproductive Justice as a theoretical lens, much less how it might be applied or 'operationalised.' Accordingly, my aim in this article is to provide a roadmap for researchers seeking to produce Reproductive Justice analyses. I begin by briefly introducing Reproductive Justice as a relatively new feminist theory and discuss how the discipline of psychology has engaged with this theory. I then trace three key theoretical strands in the genealogy of

Reproductive Justice and parse some essential features of Reproductive Justice theory, showing how each strand represents a theoretical development that offers different avenues for application. I use three exemplar studies to demonstrate each of these approaches to applying Reproductive Justice as an analytical lens, aiming to clarify the analytical processes followed in these three approaches, provide concrete analytical strategies for applying Reproductive Justice theory, and stimulate thought and discussion on how Reproductive Justice theory might be fruitfully and rigorously applied in qualitative research in psychology.

Reproductive Justice theory as ‘a novel critical feminist theory’

Reproductive Justice is, simultaneously, a feminist framework, praxis, and theory that counters the individualism of the mainstream feminist and sexual and reproductive health and rights movements. It is a framework ‘offered [by Black activists and scholars] to the feminist world as an important contribution to the political and social analysis of reproductive politics’ (Ross and Solinger 2017, 72). Today, Reproductive Justice thinking has been hailed as one of the most critical shifts in contemporary reproductive politics (Ross 2017a), as it ‘generates material and theoretical contributions beyond the scope of what is possible for reproductive health and rights frameworks’ (Daniel 2021a, 1).

As a concept, Reproductive Justice stems from a long history of resistance and organising for racial and ethnic minority women’s reproductive freedom in the US (Avery et al., 1989). From the early 1990s, Black feminist scholar-activists developed and used it as a conceptual framework for intersectional activist practice (see e.g., Asian Communities for Reproductive Justice, 2005; SisterSong, 2003, 2007; National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health, 2013). The framework gained prominence among reproductive health and rights activists before eventually being more broadly adopted in the reproductive health sector (Daniel 2021b; Ross 2017a, 2017b). Reproductive Justice was therefore successfully used as a conceptual framework for activism and sexual and reproductive health programmes and interventions long before it was used as a theoretical frame. However, while approaches for application were originally articulated, it can be argued that these have been lost in the translation of the framework from real world political struggles to academic inquiry.

As a relatively ‘novel critical feminist theory’ (Ross 2017b, #) Reproductive Justice has only been applied as a theoretical frame in empirical research since the mid-2010s (Luna and Luker 2013; Ross 2017a). Arguing for the utility of this ‘emergent theoretical framework’ for empirical research, Ross (2017b, 184) asserts:

Reproductive justice theory is needed because many earlier theories about reproduction pay inadequate attention to the physical, social, economic, and emotional realities of Indigenous women, poor women, trans women and women of colour. Such theories fail to thoroughly analyze [sic] and critique

the system of white supremacy that determines which bodies matter and which do not.

Reproductive Justice theory provides a profoundly social and deeply politicised *analytical* framework for empirical research on sexual and reproductive matters (Ross 2017a). It allows for a more nuanced understanding of sexual and reproductive issues than does the dominant sexual and reproductive health and rights paradigm (Daniel 2021b; Eaton and Stephens 2020).

The theory broadens the analytical focus in two important ways. First, the concept of intersectionality highlights the impact of racism, classism, and other forms of oppression in conjunction with sexism, broadening the spotlight beyond 'women' as a homogenous group (Ross 2017b; Price 2019). Second, the theory is infused with social justice thinking articulated through the concept of human rights, which moves away from a narrower focus on individual rights, as found in the dominant sexual and reproductive health and rights paradigm (Daniel 2021b; Rebouché 2017). Accordingly, individual rights are viewed in relation to the spaces in which they are exercised and the role of state institutions in creating supportive spaces to enact those rights (Roberts 2004).

This novel feminist theory allows researchers to consider how reproductive lives and experiences are shaped by socio-political complexities and crisscrossing power dynamics that proceed along multiple interconnected axes of difference (e.g., classism, sexism, racism, heterosexism, etc.) (Avery and Stanton 2020). Examining the relationships between the reproductively privileged and disadvantaged elucidates the perspectives and experiences of each group and provides insight into systems of difference and inequality (Ross 2017a).

Engagement with Reproductive Justice theory in psychology

While Reproductive Justice theory is said to have 'gone viral' (Ross et al. 2017) or become a 'buzzword' (Ross 2017b) in other disciplines, engagement with the framework in psychology is still relatively new and modest (Eaton and Stephens 2020; Morison 2021a). This limited engagement has been attributed to (mainstream) psychology's disciplinary norms and positivistic bias, which are actively critical of social theory and devalue qualitative methods (Avery and Stanton 2020). Eaton and Stephens (Eaton and Stephens 2020) argue that the dominance of positivism has resulted in the field of psychology's generally '(1) slow acceptance of non-westernized and/or gynocentric lenses; (2) resistance to critiquing power within and across the research process; and (3) the tradition of isolating the individual, as the unit of study, from the systems in which they are embedded'. This explains why psychology researchers *in general* may not engage with the critical feminist theory, but not why feminist and critical psychology scholars have not applied it more widely.

Feminist or critical psychologists have produced little scholarship that draws on Reproductive Justice theory, comprising only (i) a few empirical studies

(e.g., Chiweshe, Mavuso, and Macleod 2017; Grzanka and Schuch 2020; LaMarre et al. 2020; Morison and Lynch 2016; Riggs and Bartholomaeus 2019), (ii) some theoretical papers developing the theory for application beyond the US (e.g., Macleod et al. 2017; Macleod 2018; Macleod and Reynolds 2021), and (iii) three edited collections that include authors from other disciplines (e.g., Chrisler 2012; Eaton and Stephens 2020; Morison and Mavuso 2022). This limited engagement among critical scholars in psychology could be attributed to a lack of clarity regarding how to apply Reproductive Justice as a theoretical lens, as researchers have failed to sufficiently detail the theoretical underpinnings and assumptions supporting their work. This problem may also be compounded by difficulties with applying intersectionality, which similarly ‘continues to lack a well-defined methodology, rigorous methods for examining difference and power’ (Rice, Harrison, and Friedman 2019, 412) (see Rice, Harrison, and Friedman [2019] and Grzanka [2018] for further cogent discussion on this issue in psychology).

Similarly, the original theorists have themselves not provided guidance regarding using Reproductive Justice use as a theory. Rather, they have described Reproductive Justice as ‘a sophisticated methodology ample enough to be universally adaptable’ (Ross, 2017b 303) and ‘an open-source code that people have used to pursue fresh critical thinking regarding power and powerlessness’ (Ross and Solinger 2017, 71). The versatility allows the framework to be employed an analytic lens across disciplines and adapted to suit different feminist research questions concerned with power. However, this flexibility can also result in conceptual ambiguity, making it difficult for scholars to identify the most effective perspectives and methodologies for their research.

To be clear, I am not arguing for a definitive set of guidelines to be slavishly followed—a particular penchant of psychology critiqued as ‘methodolatry’ (Harding 1987)—nor I do wish to stifle methodological creativity or theoretical innovation with a set of approved approaches. Qualitative researchers should of course be guided by their research questions and able to creatively ‘integrate theories, harness existing measures, and develop new measures in innovative ways that cumulatively capture the texture and breadth of people’s experiences’ (Moradi and Grzanka 2017). Nevertheless, it is insufficient to assert that one is taking a Reproductive Justice approach without clearly specifying what constitutes such an approach (i.e., *what exactly* makes it such) or discussing *why* the specific methodology chosen is the most constructive for Reproductive Justice research.

Researchers need to make their epistemic positions visible, as doing so provides a language for articulating how Reproductive Justice can be employed as an analytical lens in psychology research. However, to design methodological approaches that uphold the radical roots of Reproductive Justice, it is necessary to engage with its theoretical underpinnings, which suggest core principles that should be maintained in application. Part of this should involve engagement with foundational texts by Black feminist scholars, which must be duly acknowledged

in researchers' citation practices (Grzanka 2018; Rice, Harrison, and Friedman 2019). It is imperative that scholars engage with the social justice underpinnings and transformational intentions of Reproductive Justice, which were profoundly motivated and shaped by the concerns of the movement's Black Feminist forerunners (Mason 2018; McFadden 2017). This is a significant issue, given the broader politics of knowledge production in which the foundational work of women of colour is often understated or erased (Ross et al. 2017; Ross 2017b), as well as the tendency within the field of psychology to uncritically adopt radical rhetoric, such as that on diversity or justice, but continue to use business-as-usual methods (Grzanka 2018). To this end, I next discuss the major theoretical influences in the development of the Reproductive Justice framework.

Theoretical precursors and development

The theoretical precursors of Reproductive Justice lie in Black Feminist theorising, which articulated and developed the understanding that unique life experiences are produced at the intersection of various social identities and associated systems of power (Daniel 2021b). Reproductive Justice has several theoretical precursors, as detailed by Ross (2017a), one of the movement's founders. However, I narrow the focus in this article to the most influential theories in the original development of the framework, because they offer clear analytical strategies for researchers wishing to conduct analyses by applying Reproductive Justice as a frame: feminist standpoint theory, intersectionality theory, and postmodernism. There is some overlap between these theoretical strands, as they have influenced one another as they have been developed. Nevertheless, it is possible to discern distinct epistemological positions for each, which establish different objects of analysis, as summarised in Table 1.

Table 1. Overview of theoretical precursors and approaches to application

Theoretical precursor	Ontology / Epistemology	Object of analysis / Analytical categories	Approach to Reproductive Justice analysis	Possible analysis methods
<i>Feminist standpoint theory</i>	Interpretivism	Lived experiences of oppression, identity politics standpoint/identity categories	<i>Feminist standpoint approach</i>	Narrative or Thematic Analysis
<i>Intersectionality theory</i>	Contextualism Constructivism Critical realism	Meaning making shaping of experiences by social location (privilege and marginalization)	<i>Structural intersectional approach</i>	Grounded theory or Thematic Analysis
<i>Postmodern and post-structural theories</i>	Constructionism	Language & power (agency) discourses, subject positions	<i>Feminist post-structuralist approach</i>	Discourse or Thematic Analysis

I discuss each of these theoretical precursors in turn, highlighting some essential features that must be maintained in Reproductive Justice analyses to stay true to its core tenets and radical intentions, and illustrate each by drawing on examples of qualitative research in psychology.

Feminist standpoint theory

Feminist standpoint theory is a key theoretical strand underpinning the development of Reproductive Justice as a conceptual framework, evident in the movement's commitment to foregrounding marginalised groups in activism and programming (Ross et al. 2017). The fundamental tenet of feminist standpoint theory is, as Narayan (2004, 213) succinctly states, 'that our location in the world as women makes it possible for us to perceive and understand different aspects of both the world and human activities in ways that challenge the male bias of existing perspectives'. Accordingly, feminist standpoint theory can be understood as a means of 'naming the oppression of women grounded in the truth[s] of women's lives' (Hekman 1997).

Based on the view of women's experiences as a form of local, situated knowledge, feminist scholars used 'alternative ways of producing and validating knowledge' (Collins 2000) to those purportedly neutral methods proposed by the master narrative of 'malestream' science. They analysed local, situated, and communally constituted knowledge, including women's accounts of their own experiences as a way of connecting everyday life, and experiences of oppression, with an analysis of the social institutions shaping that life. These analyses were used to generate oppositional narratives or counter-hegemonic discourses to subvert those that dominate and to argue for a less repressive society (Hekman 1997).

Feminist scholars working in various theoretical spaces, including Black feminist scholars (e.g., Collins [1990; 2004a; 2004b]; Smith [2004]), have taken feminist standpoint theory in different directions. (See Harding [2004] and Hekman [1997] for an overview.) Some scholars have drawn inspiration from the postmodern view of multiple, partial, and contextually contingent accounts of reality and, correspondingly, of knowledge as situated, perspectival, and produced from many vantage points (Hekman 1997).

Building on the postmodern notion of there being multiple ways of knowing the world, Black feminist scholars, such as Collins (1990), have refuted the idea that women share a single standpoint, as proposed by several early mainstream White feminists. For instance, Hartsock (1983, 365) sought to theorise '*the* female experience' (emphasis added) envisaged as capturing the shared experience and reality of all women. While there certainly are shared experiences among women living in a male-dominated world, theorists such as Collins (1990) took the notion of 'situated knowledges' further. If, as feminist standpoint theory posits, material situations shape individual perceptions of reality, then the different

circumstances women experience should do so as well. Thus, just as differential experiences of gendered oppression grant women and men different lived experiences and perspectives on the world, so do experiences of racial, class, and other forms of oppression.

Consequently, Black feminists differentiated ‘a Black women’s standpoint’ on the basis that ‘African American women share the common experience of being Black women in a society that denigrates women of African descent. The commonality of experience suggests that certain characteristic themes will be prominent in Black women’s standpoint’ (Collins 1990, 381). Therefore, Black women and other Women of Colour possess a distinctive and unique viewpoint, based on their experiences of both gendered and racialised oppression. They hold dual insider/outsider status in the feminist movement and, for this reason, as Ross (2017a) asserts, Reproductive Justice incorporates feminist standpoint theory. Therefore, Black feminist scholars have advocated that research incorporate the experiences of women, Black people, and other marginalised groups along diverging and converging axes of difference, as articulated in Crenshaw’s (1989) notion of intersectionality (discussed below).

The proposal of a Black woman’s/feminist standpoint does not claim a purer vision or more accurate view of oppression or indeed, “reality,” nor does it draw comparisons between groups at all. As Collins (2000, 270) explains, ‘Black women’s experiences serve as one specific social location for examining points of connection among multiple epistemologies’ (or versions of reality). Likewise, feminist standpoint theory, and in turn, Reproductive Justice, is not an essentialist or reductionist framework based on shared victimisation (Ross, 2017). Rather, it is motivated by shared values of social justice and equity. Thus, although ‘women speak from multiple standpoints, producing multiple knowledges...this does not prevent women from coming together to work for specific political goals’ (Hekman 1997, 363).

Crucially, Reproductive Justice thinking has been informed by the fundamental understanding in Black feminist theory of the simultaneity of oppression (Collins 2004a). Reproductive Justice theory thus draws on a version of feminist standpoint theory that is attuned to the political, and not merely an analysis of descriptive categories of identity that differentially shape experience. Certainly, as Collins (2004b) asserts, ‘To ignore power relations is to misread standpoint theory—it’s *raison d’être*, its continuing salience, and its ability to explain social inequality’.

Taking a feminist standpoint approach to reproductive justice analysis

Applying Reproductive Justice theory using a feminist standpoint approach involves contesting commonly held beliefs and dominant understandings of people’s sexual and reproductive lives to generate new values, ideas, and practices that are emancipatory and just (Ross et al. 2017). Proceeding from an understanding of the multiplicity of standpoints, analyses centre the lived

experiences of marginalised people as a means of illuminating multiple realities and challenging master narratives that underpin the dominant view of reality (Avery and Stanton 2020; Luna and Luker 2013).

For example, Alexander (2022) investigated the experiences of five young South African mothers ‘at the crossroads of multiple intersecting marginalised identities’. These young women, racialised as Coloured¹ and aged between 16 and 24 years old, live in a largely working-class community in an impoverished, formerly racially segregated area. Many have received disrupted or unfinished education. Alexander (2022) thematically analysed participants’ narratives of their experiences of young motherhood in this context, using a standpoint feminist approach to operationalise Reproductive Justice theory. According to Alexander (2022), this lens allows for ‘the interplay of micro and macro social systems in a particular moment of a person’s life’ to be explored.

Following the tenets of Reproductive Justice, Alexander’s (2022) analysis foregrounds ‘race’ as ‘a key identity marker’, considering how it intersects with other marginalised identity positions, namely gender, age, reproductive status, and social class. She traces how participants’ experiences were shaped by historical, racialised, and gendered constructions of respectable personhood within the local context, represented by the notion of ‘*ordentlike*’ (decent) Coloured womanhood. This notion regulates young Coloured women’s experiences and negotiation of sexuality and reproduction in context-specific ways.

Intersectionality theory

Another well-known theoretical root of Reproductive Justice theory is the revolutionary and influential Black feminist theory of intersectionality. The theorisation of intersectionality is ‘linked to standpoint epistemological frameworks and have some overlapping concerns with the construction of experience, politics and epistemology’ (Naples 2009, 570). Crenshaw (1989; 1991), a legal scholar, formally developed the theory by drawing on a rich history of Black feminist thought regarding the multiplicity of oppression. The theory seeks to “account for multiple grounds of identity when considering how the social world is constructed” (Crenshaw 1991, 1245).

Critically, the concept of intersectionality was not intended to simply enumerate the diverse identity categories contributing to social disadvantages. Thus, it does not suggest a simple additive oppression model starting with gender and adding further categories, that can then potentially be ranked against one another (Gouws 2017; Collins 1990). Rather, it captures ‘the confluence of oppressions’ (Ross 2017b, 288). Collins (1990, 221) conceptualises this convergence of relationships of domination as a ‘matrix of domination’, that is, ‘a system of interlocking race, class, and gender oppression’. When understood in this way, intersectionality theory expands the focus of analysis from merely descriptive comparison of similarities and differences to the ways that systems of

oppression (and privilege) interconnect (Collins 1990). Accordingly, intersectional analyses of sexual and reproductive issues examine how social subjects are located within systems of power, attending to ‘structures of oppression in the lived experience of people to avoid a focus [merely] on identity politics’ (Gouws 2017, 23).

Power dynamics are understood as entwined and mutually constitutive ‘as opposed to parallel, independent, or discrete’ (Grzanka 2018, 593). Power is foregrounded multidimensionally (Gouws 2017). For instance, Collins (1990) proposes four interwoven dimensions of power that shape social, political, and economic lives: (1) structural, referring to the organisation of social institutions that re/produce and entrench subordination or particular groups; (2) disciplinary, dealing with regulation of inequalities via State or institutional bureaucracy and surveillance; (3) hegemonic, concerning the symbolic aspects of power (ideology, culture); and (4) interpersonal, relating to social interaction. Similarly, Smith (1996) refers to the notion of ‘relations of ruling’ to capture the ways in which historical, cultural, textual/discursive, institutional, structural, and other aspects of power contour the intersection of various categories of difference (e.g., race, gender, ability) and shape everyday life.

As an integral building block of Reproductive Justice, intersectionality manifests in Reproductive Justice theory as the explicit attention paid to how intersecting systems of power either enhance or impede conditions within which people experience sexuality and reproduction, with implications particularly for those from marginalised social groups (Daniel 2021). Accordingly, as a lens, Reproductive Justice theory allows for the examination of inequities in sexual and reproductive health that cohere around multiple axes of differentiation (Macleod and Morison 2020). Therefore, failing to employ an intersectional lens creates the risk of a myopic focus on single-issue politics and erasing the experiences of marginalised groups, and such partial knowledge leads to ineffectual strategies for change in sexual and reproductive health and rights (Daniel 2021b).

A structural intersectional approach to Reproductive Justice analysis

Intersectionality theory provides a unique system-level lens for Reproductive Justice analysis, offering ‘a means for understanding the varied, intersecting, systematic inequalities that shape [sexual and] reproductive health outcomes’ (Eaton and Stephens 2020) and related issues. Attending to macro-level politics is necessary to avoid a ‘weak’ application of an intersectional lens (Grzanka 2020, 245), that does little more than enumerate and describe multiple dimensions of identity. Matrix-style thinking—as displayed in Crenshaw’s and Collin’s theorising of intersectionality—enables “upstream” analyses of how power operates structurally to produce inequalities’ (Grzanka 2020, 251). Accordingly, experiences of discrimination are seen as shaped by privilege and marginalisation and connected to broader structural, systemic, and political factors (Bowleg 2013).

To illustrate this concept, Grzanka and Schuch (2020) used the notion of structural intersectionality to analyse focus group discussions about long-acting reversible contraception (LARC) with college-aged US American women. Taking what Naples (2009) calls a systemic approach to intersectionality, the researchers understood ‘participants’ relationships to LARC as framed at both the personal and systemic levels’ (282) and conducted a ‘critical, power-sensitive’ analysis of participants’ views and experiences with these contraceptives.

To achieve this, Grzanka and Schuch (2020) adopted an eclectic approach to data analysis, using a modified constructivist grounded theory approach informed by intersectionality theory. This method allowed them to demonstrate the significance of women’s social locations and identities (including gender, race, sexuality, and class) in shaping their views of and experiences with LARC. They reported that participants’ social locations ultimately enabled or restricted their agency—for example, contraceptive decision-making was ‘differentially constrained’ (24)—producing what they term ‘conditional agency’ (24). How participants experienced the disciplining of their sexual and reproductive autonomy was also shaped by their social locations. These findings support the handful of critical qualitative studies demonstrating how contraception can be a source of oppression for those considered ‘undesirable reproducers’ (Gomez and Wapman 2017).

Thus, Grzanka and Schuch’s (2020) use of the structural intersectionality approach to conduct a Reproductive Justice analysis provides a valuable contribution to knowledge about contraceptive coercion. This approach extends beyond the common focus on micro-level obstacles to contraceptive decision-making at the individual (e.g., beliefs or attitudes about contraception), interpersonal (e.g., patient-practitioner interactions, counselling), or even organisational levels (e.g., institutional target setting) (Morison, Ndabula, and Macleod 2022). While these are important aspects, what is missing is the wider contextual or ‘upstream’ elements—especially the wider values, norms, and assumptions that inform how people think and act about matters related to sex and reproduction—that underlie judgements, policies, and procedures (Carvajal and Zambrana, 2020). Grzanka and Schuch’s (2020) analysis demonstrates how these can be brought to light through a Reproductive Justice approach using a structural intersectionality lens to illuminate the web of power relations that regulate sex and reproduction and delimits people’s capacity to choose and act. (See also another grounded theory study, though not in psychology, by Wallace et al. (2020) who used the matrix of domination as a lens for interpreting their data.)

The postmodern turn: feminist social constructionism and poststructuralism

The postmodern turn in the 1990s helped shape approaches to intersectionality (Naples 2009) and can be considered important to Reproductive Justice theory

(Ross 2017a, Staunæs 2003). A constructionist approach to Reproductive Justice focuses on how language constructs identities and reproduces power structures. It 'examines the meanings assigned to reproductive relations and externally imposed policies and practices. Such theory unmasks the power relations of the world in narrative forms ... the stories we create, in riddles and proverbs, in the play with language' (Ross 2017b, 287). Taking a constructionist interpretation of intersectionality offers a view of power as dynamic, relational and situated by highlighting the role of interaction and social context in shaping intersections of *inter alia* race, class, gender (Naples 2009; Prins 2006).

The influence of post-modernism is most evident in Reproductive Justice's anti-essentialist approach to identity (Ross 2017a). As postmodern thinking about identity and difference entered feminist theoretical discussion, novel theories such as social constructionism and post-structuralism ushered in an anti-essentialist understanding of identity as discursively constituted (also called subjectification). The essential self of modernist and psychoanalytic theory was replaced 'with "inessential woman," a being constructed by the discourses constituting her world' (Hekman 2000, 290). (This is not to imply that the postmodern turn was without contention. See e.g., Benhabib, Nicholson, & Fraser (1995) as a key text in the debate and Ross's (2017a) discussion of some of these critiques as they relate to Reproductive Justice theory.)

The influence of postmodern theories led scholars to extend the notion of 'multiple viewpoints' proposed in Black feminist theory, as discussed above. While the conception of multiple standpoints—including Black women's standpoint—is useful for political organising, it offers a view of more-or-less fixed identity categories. Ross (2017a, 303–304) argues that 'failing to intersect the social construction of race and gender provides an impoverished analysis that denies the material reality of Black women's experiences of gender oppression' and that 'Reproductive justice theory incorporating intersectionality may be extended to address post-modernist and post-structuralist theories'.

In particular, feminist post-structuralist theory offers a way to understand the processes of identity-making as dynamic and ongoing (Macleod 2006). Such attention to identity construction (or subjectification) *in situ* allows for the possibility of resisting, rupturing, and subverting established categories, social positions, and power relations (Staunæs 2003). Reproductive Justice scholars have drawn on post-structuralist theory to highlight how social identities are constituted in various contexts. The analytical focus shifts 'from identity politics to the complexity of lived experience' (Staunæs 2003, 103) and, importantly, onto the *agency* of the social subject upon whom categorisations are placed. This focus is based on the post-structuralist understanding of subjectification (or subject construction), in which the social subject is understood as being *both* the actor *and* acted upon by discourse, context, power relations (Butler 1990; Foucault 1982).

The explicit attention to power relations *à la* feminist poststructuralism is also valuable for Reproductive Justice as a framework primarily interested in

power (Morison 2021b). Theories of power that are articulated in post-structuralist thinking offer a useful understanding of the relationship of micro-and macro-politics and their ability to dissect ‘the multiplicity and the interconnection of micro-and macro-strategies of power [is] an important tool in feminist inquiry and practice’ (Macleod and Durrheim 2002, 44). This understanding expands how power is conceptualised, offering a nuanced view of *relations of power* embedded in everyday interactions.

A feminist post-structuralist approach to Reproductive Justice analysis

A feminist post-structuralist approach to Reproductive Justice analysis allows for the exploration of how multiple intersecting categories of difference shape the construction of subjectivity. It sensitises the analysis to the operation of power as re/produced and reinforced through socio-cultural discourses and practices related to sexuality and reproduction (Chiweshe et al., 2017; Parker et al., 2019). Accordingly, this approach involves locating reproductive issues in relation to the multiple, interweaving power relations within specific social contexts by analysing the socio-cultural discourses and practices that sustain particular structural and systemic dynamics and structure social relations along axes of difference (Chiweshe et al., 2017).

An emerging body of research by feminist psychologists adopts feminist post-structuralist theory to conduct Reproductive Justice analyses of topics related to reproduction (e.g., Mavuso, Macleod, and du Toit 2022; Morison and Herbert 2019; Morison, Ndabula, and Macleod 2022; Parker 2022; Parker, Pausé, and Le Grice 2019; Chiweshe, Mavuso, and Macleod 2017). These scholars often use some form of discourse analysis, which has the advantage of providing clear analytical concepts (e.g., ‘discourse,’ ‘subjectivity,’ ‘subjectification,’ ‘subject position,’ and ‘troubled position’), while still allowing for the flexibility and creativity characteristic of discursive work.

However, like much of the other reproductive justice scholarship, most of these studies lack theoretical specificity and do not detail their underlying theoretical assumptions or logic. A useful exception is Parker and colleagues’ research on fat, reproductive embodiment in Aotearoa New Zealand, in which they explain *why* and *how* they use a post-structuralist framework to ‘operationalise’ Reproductive Justice theory for their analyses (Parker, Pausé, and Le Grice 2019; Parker 2022). According to Parker (2022), post-structuralist theory is helpful for Reproductive Justice analysis because it illuminates how subject construction is stratified by multiple intersecting categories of difference.

Analytically, a feminist post-structuralist approach to Reproductive Justice necessitates a refusal to analyse gender discourses in isolation or women as a homogeneous group. Instead, social categories are considered mutually constitutive of subjectivity and co-relational: re/produced or subverted in relation to one another. The analytical focus is on how subjectification processes and discursive effects are differentiated, diffracted, and stratified by how participants

are situated along various axes of social power (Parker et al., 2019). Parker et al. (2019, 97) demonstrates the gendered, class- and race-based dimensions of contemporary Western discourses of pregnancy and fatness using this analytical approach. Specifically, they show how these discourses depict poor Māori and Pacific women's bodies as 'risky' and unsuitable for pregnancy and, ultimately, re/producing oppressive meanings about fat women's suitability for reproduction and motherhood.

Used in this way, feminist post-structuralist theory allows Reproductive Justice scholars to expand their focus on the structural to the macro-level (structural) dimension of power to incorporate the micropolitical, while simultaneously benefitting from the explicit attention to multiple axes of difference in structuring power relations contributed by intersectionality theory (Parker, Pausé, and Le Grice 2019; Staunæs 2003). Thus, a Reproductive Justice analysis conducted through feminist post-structuralism offers a holistic analysis of the politics surrounding reproductive issues (Ross 2017a).

Essential features of Reproductive Justice analyses

Ross (2017b, 300–301) and other founding Reproductive Justice scholar-activists stipulate the need for 'parameters for how [Reproductive Justice Theory is applied] to stay true to the original intentions and realise the dynamic potential of Reproductive Justice a conceptual framework. To this end, I turn to discuss essential aspects of Reproductive Justice theory, summarised in table 2, that must be preserved in application.

Table 2. Overview of essential features

Feature	Feminist standpoint approach	Structural intersectional approach	Feminist poststructuralist approach
<i>Attention to power</i>	everyday life and experiences of oppression to the social institutions shaping that life	how power operates structurally (upstream) to produce inequalities	- power is relational and embedded in daily interactions - power reproduced and reinforced through socio-cultural discourses and practices
<i>Intersectional identities</i>	social identities differ according to diverging/converging axes and shape one's 'standpoint' or perception and experience of the world	systemic approach to intersectionality that includes 'upstream' elements (e.g., values, norms, assumptions)	subjectification processes and discursive effects are differentiated, diffracted, and stratified by one's location along various axes
<i>Situate issues in social context</i>	how individual experience is shaped	social location is connected to	complexity of lived experience,

	by historical, racialised, and gendered constructions	structural, systemic, and political factors	social identities are discursively constituted in various contexts
<i>Centre marginalised groups (or oppression and privilege)</i>	experiences of women, Black people, and other marginalised groups along axes of difference	foregrounds inequalities and structures of oppression in lived experiences	how power relations shape oppression and privilege across social groups
<i>Social Justice orientation</i>	reveals multiple realities and challenging master narratives	exposes inequities that cohere around multiple axes of differentiation	illuminates socio-cultural discourses and practices that sustain inequities and oppression

Attention to power is paramount among these issues (Ross, 2017a), which is evident as a common thread running through the three major theoretical antecedents presented above. This is the theory's distinguishing and core feature, provided by its Black feminist theoretical underpinnings. Explicit attention to power should be the hallmark of any Reproductive Justice analysis. Any study claiming to use a Reproductive Justice lens *must* be oriented towards examining the dynamics of power and oppression.

A second and related core feature also evident across all three theoretical antecedents discussed above is the focus on multiple axes of difference as structuring power relations. Reproductive Justice analyses must be intersectional. This does not simply mean attending to participants' multiple identities, but rather considering how they might experience reproductive oppression asymmetrically (Grzanka and Schuch 2020). Part of this involves attending to the historical, cultural, textual/discursive, institutional, and other dimensions that structure the intersection of various axes of difference (Naples 2009).

In addition to these features, I add criteria outlined by Ross (2017a). Although these relate mainly to using the framework for advocacy and organising (praxis), rather than theoretically in empirical research, they do have some implications for the latter. Ross (2017a) specifies that Reproductive Justice approaches must (a) contextualise issues under consideration by connecting the local and individual to the wider community and global context, (b) centre marginalised groups, and (c) have a social justice orientation. In addition Ross (2017a) clarifies that, contrary to some claims, Reproductive Justice work (advocacy, intervention/programming, and research) need not be exclusively about Black women. Rather, she notes that the core concept of intersectionality applies to understanding how power relations shape oppression and privilege across social groups. Following this reasoning, some scholars have advocated that in addition to attending to marked/oppressed positions attention should also be placed on unmarked/privileged positions (Rice, Harrison, and Friedman 2019).

Therefore, Reproductive Justice research may literally centre marginalised groups by, for example, focusing research on specific populations or over-sampling to ensure adequate representation of minorities. It may also seek to illuminate the invisible role of normativity in shaping and sustaining sexual and reproductive privilege (McFadden 2017). Either approach would serve liberatory objectives of social justice and generate knowledge that can be applied for political (e.g., policy) and socio-structural change. According to Ross (2017a), Reproductive Justice should involve working with those who are impacted as well as advocating for governmental or corporate responsibility.

Conclusion

Engaging with the theoretical foundations of Reproductive Justice is essential to ensure that analyses to realise the framework's full explanatory potential and stay true to its original aims and intentions. Chief among these, as I have shown, is the illumination of the complex, multi-dimensional operation of power in shaping people's reproductive lives and experiences. Such engagement also goes towards ensuring that the work of the theory's originators is not misappropriated; although as I have argued, appropriate attribution of these ideas is also necessary.

To this end, I have highlighted and discussed three major theoretical influences on the development of Reproductive Justice as a framework for praxis and, subsequently, a conceptual lens for research. I have shown how these each suggest ways of conducting Reproductive Justice analyses in which the epistemological assumptions—and hence, the analytical foci—can be clearly stipulated. Drawing on examples from research in psychology, I presented three approaches for effectively applying Reproductive Justice theory in empirical research: (1) a feminist standpoint approach, (2) structural intersectional approach, and (3) feminist post-structuralist approach. These by no means constitute a definitive typology of ways to apply a Reproductive Justice lens. Indeed, looking beyond psychology offers other possibilities for theoretical development and application. Reproductive Justice itself, after all, draws on critical thinking from several disciplines. Nevertheless, my intention has been to offer ways to apply the framework thoughtfully and rigorously so that, ultimately, qualitative research in psychology on sexual and reproductive issues might do and achieve justice.

Notes

¹ This racial category is specific to South Africa and refers to people of mixed racial heritage, including indigenous Africans and people enslaved during colonial rule. An alternative, less common term is *bruinmesnse* ('brown people') (Adhikari, 2006)

Acknowledgements

This work was made possible by grant funding from the *Royal Society of New Zealand, Marsden Fund*. My thanks to Kris Taylor for his comments on an earlier draft of this paper.

Disclosure statement

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

Additional information

Funding

This work was supported by the Royal Society Te Apārangi's Marsden Fund [MAU1815].

Notes on contributors

Tracy Morison (PhD) uses feminist and other critical theories and qualitative methods to explore the multiple, complex processes in which sexual and reproductive issues are embedded. Her work in qualitative methods has focused on the application of performativity theory through the narrative-discursive method and conducting qualitative research online. Her research in sexual and reproductive health traverses the related areas of health psychology, critical psychology, and feminism, exploring how the socio-political context shapes and constrains sexual and reproductive decision-making, relations, and practices. Tracy teaches in the critical health psychology programme at Massey University (Aotearoa New Zealand). She also serves as an Honorary Research Associate of the Critical Studies in Sexualities and Reproduction programme at her *alma mater*, Rhodes University (South Africa), an editor for *Feminism & Psychology*, and president of the Abortion Law Reform Association of New Zealand/Abortion Rights Aotearoa.

References

- Adhikari, M. 2006. Hope, fear, shame, frustration: Continuity and change in the expression of coloured identity in white supremacist South Africa, 1910–1994. *Journal of Southern African Studies* 32 (3):467–87.
- Asian Communities for Reproductive Justice. (2005). A new vision for advancing our movement for reproductive health, reproductive rights and reproductive justice. Oakland, CA: Asian Communities for Reproductive Justice.
- Avery, B., Barrow, W., Chisholm, S., Collins, C., Edelin, R., Gates, J., Gillespie, M., Height, D., McCabe, J.J., Malveaux, J., Norton, E.H., Tucker, C.D., Tyson, P., Waters, M., & Wattleton, F. (1989). *We remember African American women for reproductive freedom*. The National Council of Negro Women, Inc. <https://ncnw.org/files/WeRememberBrochure.pdf>
- Avery, L. R., and A. G. Stanton. 2020. Subverting the mandates of our methods: tensions and considerations for incorporating Reproductive Justice frameworks into psychological science. *Journal of Social Issues* 76 (2):447–55. doi:10.1111/josi.12386.
- Alexander, A. (2022). 'Vroeg ryp, vroeg vrot/Early to ripen early to rot': Stigma and young coloured women's negotiation of heterosex and motherhood In T. Morison & J.M.J. Mavuso (Eds.), *Sexual and Reproductive Justice: From the Margins to the Centre* (pp. 156 - 175). Lanham, MD, Lexington Press.

- Benhabib, L. Nicholson, & N. Fraser (Eds.) *Feminist contentions: A philosophical exchange*. London: Routledge.
- Bowleg, L. 2013. 'Once you've blended the cake, you can't take the parts back to the main ingredients': Black gay and bisexual men's descriptions and experiences of intersectionality. *Sex Roles* 68 (11–12):754–67. doi:10.1007/s11199-012-0152-4.
- Butler, J. 1990. *Gender trouble: feminism and the subversion of identity*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Carvajal, D. N., & Zambrana, R. E. (2020). Challenging Stereotypes: A Counter-Narrative of the Contraceptive Experiences of Low-Income Latinas. *Health Equity*, 4(1), 10-16.
- Chiweshe, M., J. Mavuso, and C. I. Macleod. 2017. Reproductive Justice in context: South African and Zimbabwean women's narratives of their abortion decision. *Feminism & Psychology* 27 (2):2013–224. doi:10.1177/0959353517699234.
- Chrisler, J. C. 2012. *Reproductive Justice: A global concern*. Santa Barbara, California: ABC-CLIO.
- Collins, P. H. 1990. *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. 1st ed. London: Harper Collins Academic.
- Collins, P. H.. 2000. *Black feminist thought: knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. 2nd ed. New York, NY: Routledge. doi:10.1086/229850.
- Collins, P. H. 2004a. Learning from the outsider within: The sociological significance of black feminist thought. In *The feminist standpoint theory reader: Intellectual and political controversies*, ed. S. Harding, 103–26. New York and London: Routledge.
- Collins, P. H. 2004b. Comment on Hekman's truth and method: Feminist standpoint theory revisited: Where's the power? In *The feminist standpoint theory reader: Intellectual and political controversies*, ed. S. Harding, 247–53. New York & London: Routledge.
- Crenshaw, K. 1989. Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, Feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 1989:139–67.
- Crenshaw, K. 1991. Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of colour. *Stanford Law Review* 43 (6):1241–99. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1229039>.
- Daniel, M. 2021. The social movement for Reproductive Justice: Emergence, intersectional strategies, and theory building. *Sociology Compass* 15 (8):1–13. doi:10.1111/SOC4.12907.
- Eaton, A. A., and D. P. Stephens. 2020. Reproductive Justice: Moving the margins to the center in social issues research. *Journal of Social Issues* 76 (2):208–18. doi:10.1111/josi.12384.
- Foucault, M. 1982. The subject and power. *Critical Inquiry* 8 (4):777–95.
- Gomez, A. M., and M. Wapman. 2017. Under (Implicit) pressure: Young Black and Latina women's perceptions of contraceptive care. *Contraception* 96 (4):221–226. doi:10.1016/j.contraception.2017.07.007.
- Gouws, A. 2017. Feminist intersectionality and the matrix of domination in South Africa. *Agenda* 31 (1):19–27. doi:10.1080/10130950.2017.1338871.
- Grzanka, P. R. 2018. Intersectionality and feminist psychology: Power, knowledge, and process. In *APA handbook of the psychology of women: History, theory, and battlegrounds*, ed. C. B. Travis and J. W. White, 583–602. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Grzanka, P. R. 2020. From buzzword to critical psychology: An invitation to take intersectionality seriously. *Women & Therapy* 43 (3–4):244–61. doi:10.1080/02703149.2020.1729473.
- Grzanka, P. R., and E. Schuch. 2020. Reproductive anxiety and conditional agency at the intersections of privilege: A focus group study of emerging adults' perception of long-

- acting reversible contraception. *Journal of Social Issues* 76 (2):270–313. doi:10.1111/josi.12363.
- Harding, S. 1987. Is there a feminist method? In *Feminism and methodology: Social science issues*, ed. S. Harding, 1–14. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Harding, S., ed. 2004. *The feminist standpoint theory reader: Intellectual and political controversies*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Hartsock, N. 1983. The feminist standpoint: Developing the ground for a specifically feminist historical materialism. In *Metaphysics, methodology and philosophy of science*, eds. M. B. P. Hintikka and S. Harding, 283–310. Dordrecht, Holland: Springer Netherlands.
- Hekman, S. 1997. Truth and method: Feminist standpoint theory revisited. *Signs* 22 (2):341–365.
- Hekman, S. 2000. Beyond identity. *Feminist Theory* 1 (3):289–308.
- LaMarre, A., C. Rice, K. Cook, and M. Friedman. Forthcoming. Fat Reproductive Justice: Navigating the boundaries of reproductive health care. *Journal of Social Issues* doi:10.1111/josi.2019.00.issue-0/issuetoc.
- Luna, Z., and K. Luker. 2013. Reproductive Justice. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 9:327–52. doi:10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-102612-134037.
- Macleod, C., and K. Durrheim. 2002. Foucauldian feminism: The implications of governmentality. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 32 (1):41–60. doi:10.1111/1468-5914.00175.
- Macleod, C. I. 2006. Radical plural feminisms and emancipatory practice in Post-Apartheid South Africa. *Theory & Psychology* 16:367–89. doi:10.1177/0959354306064284.
- Macleod, C. I. 2018. Expanding Reproductive Justice through a supportability reparative justice framework: The case of abortion in South Africa. *Culture, Health & Sexuality* 21 (1):46–62. doi:10.1080/13691058.2018.1447687.
- Macleod, C. I., S. M. Beynon-Jones, and M. Gurney Toerien. 2017. Articulating Reproductive Justice through reparative Justice: Case studies of abortion in Great Britain and South Africa. *Culture, Health & Sexuality* 19 (5):601–15. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13691058.2016.1257738.
- Macleod, C. I., and T. Morison. 2020. Fertility, childbirth, and parenting: Defining sexual and gender relations. In *The Cambridge handbook of the international psychology of women*, ed. C. Zufferey and F. Buchanan, 110–123. Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press.
- Macleod, C. I., and J. H. Reynolds. Forthcoming. Reproductive health systems analyses and the reparative Reproductive Justice approach: A case study of unsafe abortion in Lesotho. *Global Public Health*. doi:10.1080/17441692.2021.1887317.
- Mason, C. 2018. How not to pimp out Reproductive Justice: Adventures in education, activism, and accountability. *Frontiers* 34 (3):226–41.
- Mavuso, J. M. J. J., C. I. Macleod, and R. du Toit. 2022. Directive counselling undermines ‘safe’ abortion: A critical discursive psychology approach to Reproductive Justice. In *Reproductive Justice: From the margins to the centre*, eds. T. Morison and J. M. J. J. Mavuso, 247–65. Lanham: Lexington Press.
- McFadden, C. R. 2017. Reproductively privileged: critical white feminism and Reproductive Justice theory. In *Radical Reproductive Justice: Foundation, theory, practice, critique*, eds. L. J. Ross, L. Roberts, E. Derkas, W. Peoples, and P. Bridgewater Toure, 241–50. New York, NY, Feminist Press at CUNY.
- Moradi, B., and P. R. Grzanka. 2017. Using intersectionality responsibly: Toward critical epistemology, structural analysis, and social justice activism. *Journal of Counselling Psychology* 64 (5):500–13. doi:10.1037/cou0000203.
- Morison, T. Forthcoming. Reproductive Justice: A radical framework for psychology. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*. doi:10.1111/spc3.12605.

- Morison, T., and S. Herbert. 2019. Rethinking 'risk' in sexual and reproductive health policy: The value of the Reproductive Justice framework. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy* 16 (4):434–45. doi:10.1007/s13178-018-0351-z.
- Morison, T., and I. Lynch. 2016. 'We can't help you here': The discursive erasure of sexual minorities in South African public sexual and reproductive health services. *Psychology of Sexualities Review* 7 (2):7–25. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/309770127>.
- Morison, T., and J. M. J. J. Mavuso, eds. 2022. *Reproductive Justice: From the margins to the centre*. Lanham: Lexington Press.
- Morison, T., Y. Ndabula, and C. I. Macleod. 2022. The contraceptive paradox, contraceptive agency, and Reproductive Justice: Women's decision-making about long-acting reversible contraception. In *Reproductive Justice: From the margins to the centre*, eds. T. Morison and J. M. J. J. Mavuso, 247–46. Lanham: Lexington Press.
- Naples, N. A. 2009. Teaching intersectionality intersectionally. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 11 (4):566–77. doi:10.1080/14616740903237558.
- Narayan, U. 2004. The project of feminist epistemology: Perspectives from a North-western feminist. In *The feminist standpoint theory reader: Intellectual and political controversies*, ed. S. Harding, 213–24. New York and London: Routledge.
- National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health. (2013). *At the margins of care: The need for inclusive health care for transgender and gender non-conforming Latin@s*. New York, NY: National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health.
- Parker, G. 2022. Weighing in: Reimagining fat reproductive embodiment through the lens of sexual and Reproductive Justice. In *Reproductive Justice: From the margins to the centre*, eds. T. Morison and J. M. J. J. Mavuso, 121–38. Lanham: Lexington Press.
- Parker, G., C. Pausé, and J. Le Grice. 2019. 'You're just another friggin number to add to the problem': Constructing the racialized (m)Other in contemporary discourses of pregnancy fatness." In *Thickening fat: Fat bodies, intersectionality, and social justice*, ed. M. Friedman, C. rice, and J. Rinaldi, 97–109. New York, NY: Routledge. doi:10.4324/9780429507540-9.
- Price, K. 2019. Queering Reproductive Justice in the Trump era: A note on political intersectionality. *Politics & Gender* 14:581–601. doi:10.1017/S1743923X18000776.
- Prins, B. 2006. Narrative accounts of origins. *European Journal of Women's Studies* 13 (3):277–90. doi:10.1177/1350506806065757.
- Rebouché, R. 2017. Reproducing rights: The intersection of Reproductive Justice and human rights. *U.C. Irvine Law Review* 7: 579–609.
- Rice, C., E. Harrison, and M. Friedman. 2019. Doing justice to intersectionality in research. *Cultural Studies - Critical Methodologies* 19 (6):409–20. doi:10.1177/1532708619829779.
- Riggs, D. W., and C. Bartholomaeus. 2019. Toward trans Reproductive Justice: A qualitative analysis of views on fertility preservation for Australian transgender and non-binary people. *Journal of Social Issues* 76 (2): 314–37. doi:10.1111/josi.12364.
- Roberts, D. 2004. Reproductive Justice, not just rights. *Dissent* 62 (4):79–82.
- Ross, L. J. 2017a. Conceptualising Reproductive Justice theory: A manifesto for activism. In *Radical Reproductive Justice: Foundation, theory, practice, critique*, eds. L. Ross, E. Derkas, W. Peoples, L. Roberts, P. Bridgewater, and D. Roberts. New York, NY: Feminist Press at CUNY.
- Ross, L. J. 2017b. Reproductive Justice as intersectional feminist activism. *Souls* 19 (3):286–314. doi:10.1080/10999949.2017.1389634.
- Ross, L. J., L. Roberts, E. Derkas, W. Peoples, and P. D. Bridgewater, eds. 2017. *Radical Reproductive Justice: Foundations, theory, practice, critique*. New York, NY: Feminist Press at CUNY.
- Ross, L. J., and R. Solinger. 2017. *Reproductive Justice: An introduction*. Oakland: California University Press.

- Schuch, E., P. R. Grzanka, E. Schuch, and J. Lewis. 2020. Reproductive anxiety and conditional agency at the intersections of privilege: A focus group study of emerging adults' perception of long-acting reversible contraception. *Journal of Social Issues* 78 (2):270–313. doi:10.1111/josi.2019.75.issue-4/issuetoc.
- SisterSong. (2003). *SisterSong reproductive health and sexual rights national conference program book*. SisterSong Women of Color Reproductive Health Collective.
- SisterSong. (2007). *Reproductive justice briefing book: A primer on reproductive justice and social change*. SisterSong. <https://www.law.berkeley.edu/php-programs/courses/fileDL.php?fID=4051>
- Smith, D. E. 1996. The relations of ruling: A feminist inquiry. *Studies in Cultures, Organizations and Societies* 2:171–190. doi:10.1080/10245289608523475.
- Smith, D. E. 2004. Women's perspectives as a radical critique of sociology. In *The feminist standpoint theory reader: Intellectual and political controversies*, ed. S. Harding, 21–34. London and New York: Routledge.
- Staunæs, D. 2003. Where have all the subjects gone? Bringing together the concepts of intersectionality and subjectification. *Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research* 11 (2):101–10. doi:10.1080/08038740310002950.
- Wallace, H. J., S. McDonald, S. Belton, A. I. Miranda, E. Costa, and C. Matos. 2020. Who decides to have sex? Exploring the perceptions of Timorese women and men through a Reproductive Justice lens. *Culture, Health and Sexuality* 22(1):112–27.