

## Revising McPhail's Feminist Policy Analysis Framework: Updates for Use in Contemporary Social Policy Research

Heather Kanenberg  
Roberta L. Leal  
Stephen "Arch" Erich

**Abstract:** *In 2003, McPhail published a Feminist Policy Analysis Framework concluding that the many available methods of policy analysis across disciplines, including social work, treated policies as gender-neutral compositions. McPhail (2003) asserted that these methods denied the many ways that institutions and policies of society are organized by the concepts of gender, therefore presenting incomplete products of analysis. This guiding purpose for the development of McPhail's (2003) Feminist Policy Analysis Framework endures a full fifteen years later. In the years since publication of McPhail's Framework, advancements have been made in both feminist theory and in policy analysis methods. This conceptual article outlines a much-needed revision moving the framework into a contemporary position with the inclusion of a focus on privilege, oppression, and intersectionality. The revised framework presented herein is a more conceptually comprehensive and practical model for use by all, but particularly social work students and scholars. The revised model represents an update rendering it more effective in today's polarized political climate as well as with the recently revised social work educational policy (Council on Social Work Education, 2015). A revised framework of Feminist Intersectional Policy Analysis is presented, including guiding questions and conceptual complexities to consider in the work of analysis.*

**Keywords:** *Feminist; policy; analysis; intersectionality; social work*

Policy analysis is commonly conceptualized as “neutral” and yet, this approach is inadequate in developing a full understanding of the policy under study (Shaw, 2004). This central message was the guiding purpose for the development of the Feminist Policy Analysis Framework by McPhail (2003). The need to develop a method that acknowledges the way gender is used to organize societal structures, and is regulated through policies, is essential and relevant fifteen years after original publication (McPhail, 2003). In order to arrive at an accurate answer about the effectiveness of any given policy and its impact on society, scholars and practitioners must include explicit analysis of gender and gender identity, race, socio-economic status, sexuality, and more.

Applying theories and methods and moving beyond this neutral veil to directly address issues of gender and intersecting identities in relation to policy are necessary to allow for a deeper understanding of the systems and processes of oppression and domination (Dill & Zambrana, 2009; Hankivsky & Cormier, 2011). Of primary concern is the capacity to address the reality that the public discussion over time has been dominated by white cisgender males which has resulted in a society filled with notions, policies, regulations, and conventions that are constrained and preferential (Harding, 1998).

---

Heather Kanenberg, PhD, LMSW, Associate Professor & BSW Program Director, Roberta L. Leal, PhD, LMSW, Assistant Professor, and Dr. Stephen “Arch” Erich, PhD, LCSW, Professor Emeritus, University of Houston-Clear Lake.

Copyright © 2019 Authors, Vol. 19 No. 1 (Spring 2019), 1-22, DOI: 10.18060/22639



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

McPhail's Feminist Policy Framework, as developed 15 years ago, is grounded in feminist theory and is a product of synthesizing multiple feminist analytic perspectives on policy (McPhail, 2003). As there is no one feminist theoretical perspective, neither is there one single approach to social policy analysis (DiNitto, 2016; Hyde, 2000; Karger & Stoesz, 2014; Midgley, Tracey, & Livermore, 2000). Grounded in feminist theory and social policy discourse, the McPhail Framework is an appropriate fit for many analyses regarding process, goals, and outcomes. Use of McPhail's Feminist Policy Framework to examine and identify issues within modern and historical policy allowed for the determination of the gendered nature of these structures to our society. The inquiry and study of policy through a feminist lens, resulted in well-crafted and feasible recommendations for reform that acknowledge women's intersections with the policies and programs under study. The products of a feminist policy analysis provide a tool to aid social work researchers and educators, in ameliorating injustice both in practice and in the classroom, for those who are multiply-marginalized (e.g., transwomen of color, migrant women, incarcerated women).

Social work professionals are intrinsically connected to the community due to the nature of their educational preparation and the many roles they serve in the community. This results in social work professionals having a wealth of knowledge and foresight about the implications of policy change. Even if not consciously, direct practitioners see the impact of policies, both positive and negative, every day on their clients. The misstep in policy development and advocacy occurs when social workers fail to develop the political will to share their insights and information with the decision-making authorities or to work to become the decision-making authority. Despite this reality, social work professionals—whether they practice at the micro, mezzo, or macro level—have the acumen, training, and knowledge to synthesize research and experiential data to provide a richer, fuller, and more nuanced understanding of the context within which any policy operates. Further, the multi-theoretical training of the profession, coupled with the professional mandate to work toward advancing social justice, leaves social work professionals well-situated to do the work of policy analysis.

In this article, we present a review and critique of policy analysis methods, including McPhail's Feminist Policy Analysis Framework (McPhail, 2003). An explanation and integration of intersectional theories in the work of policy analysis is provided. Critique of the historical and current analysis methods results in a needed revision to the McPhail Framework. Ultimately, a new conceptual framework known as the Intersectional Feminist Policy Analysis Framework is presented for social work practitioners and scholars to use as they work to promote social justice for those who are multiply-marginalized.

## **Literature Review**

### **Feminist Theories**

Feminist theory has evolved over time to represent many standpoints which ultimately share some thematic similarities in both focus and intention. While not exhaustive, among the many feminist theoretical orientations there are: Liberal feminisms, radical feminisms, socialist feminisms, lesbian feminist theories, cultural and ecofeminisms, postmodern feminist theories, global feminisms, black feminisms, and black feminist criticisms

(Crenshaw, 1989; hooks, 2012; McPhail, 2003). Feminist theory has long focused on the issue of gender as well as other marginalized groups and elucidated the notions and implications of patriarchy in social interactions as well as social institutions. Efforts to bring exploitation and domination to an end have been of primary concern for feminist scholars and activists (hooks, 2012). The feminist movement has altered the lived experience of society by asserting that laws and policy should embody awareness that women are the equals of men and are deserving of equal opportunities and rights (hooks, 2012). Feminism resulted in a transformed experience of the economy, of employment, and social structures often at the cost or oversight of the varied experiences of those who represent multiple domains of diversity in their identities beyond gender (hooks, 2012).

Feminist theories have also offered a more revelatory analysis of the interconnectedness of gender, race, ethnicity, and class. These theories ask for all women -and all people- to develop a critical consciousness that would allow for the analysis and dismantling of patriarchy and privilege which would shift traditional notions of “positions” in society. Feminist theory is more productively conceived as a multifaceted, fluid undertaking than as a bounded field (Hawkesworth & Disch, 2016). Feminist theories and feminist research are focused on challenging the assumptions about cisnormativity and heterosexuality as well as the primary constructs of gender, sex, and privilege as being some part of the natural stable identity (Butler, 1998; Hawksworth & Disch, 2016). Rather, these are political constructs that have been constituted over time including tenuous interactions among many, ultimately varying across domains of culture, time, social structures, and more.

Feminist Theory is centered in the struggle to end sexist oppression (hooks, 2000) and has the power to transform all lives in profound and lasting ways. The goal is not to privilege any one group of women, a singular race/ethnicity, or class of women and does not privilege women over men. hooks (2000) asserts that race and class oppression should be recognized as issues with the same import as sexism if we are to engage in the struggle to end the ideology of domination that permeates social, economic, and political structures.

To critically assess the injustices perpetuated by those with privilege and power, an emphasis has developed within feminist theory to analyze laws and policies granting rights, opportunities, privileges, and immunities to white men, cisgender individuals, those without physical or mental health conditions and those who were systematically denied to women, people of color, and people living with disabilities (Hawkesworth, 1994). Feminist scholars have levelled efforts at public law and public policy as a target for change for the past several decades (Hawkesworth, 1994; Marshall, 1999; McPhail, 2003). Early feminist scholarship explored the historical experiences of women as autonomous beings with agency and as contributors to the social, political, and economic aspects of life. This trend has continued to add other perspectives such as: Critical race theories, intersectionality theory, and feminist critical analysis.

## **Intersectionality**

In two central pieces of scholarship Crenshaw (1989, 1991) introduced the interdisciplinary theory of intersectionality. These pieces presented a theory rooted in the use of critical race theory and Black feminism as a tool to understand the marginalization of Black women within the antiracist theory as well as anti-discrimination law (Crenshaw, 1989). In their work, Crenshaw seeks to ensure political and social associations along the intersections of gender and race/ethnicity in our society do not distill down to one unit or exclude and marginalize those who are different (Crenshaw, 1991).

Crenshaw asserts that work in both academic and political realms has branded one identity category as dominant (gender) and this has resulted in the use of social power to marginalize and oppress those who represent multiple undervalued identity positions in society. The theory of intersectionality in essence identifies groups at the intersection of two or more identity categories who are then included in an analysis rather than left out of focus and subsequent potential political action (Crenshaw, 1989, 1991).

Crenshaw (1989, 1991) criticized previous theorizations of feminism for largely reflecting the ideas and oppression of white women, as well as, Anti-racist doctrine for largely ignoring how issues of sex interact with race. In doing so, they specifically argued that looking at marginalization based solely on sex or race is inadequate to properly identify the concerns and needs of Black women who experience discrimination on the basis of both gender and race. Importantly, they identified specific examples of how the narrow interpretations of existing law and social policy ignored the multiple marginalization experiences of Black women. Thus, providing clarity that people who are marginalized in multiple ways (e.g., Latinx women, transwomen of color, migrant women) are likely to have different experiences than those who suffer marginalization in only one dimension.

Crenshaw's groundbreaking work has served as a foundation for the continuing theoretical development of the theory of Intersectionality (Hankivsky, 2018; Nash, 2008). Intersectionality has shown great promise as a means of improving our understanding of people and their status in society in terms of multiple relative oppressions and/or privileges (see Corus et al., 2016; Hankivsky, 2018; Mansfield, Welton, & Grogan, 2014; Pearson & Jackson, 2000). In addition, intersectionality encourages critical reflection allowing researchers and decision-makers to consider the inherently complex relationships and interactions between relevant social factors. Unlike its theoretical predecessors, intersectionality focuses on the voices that have not been heard; those who do not fit neatly into a particular social category. Further undergirding this approach are those who have experienced discrimination, as intersectional theorists see them as having an epistemological advantage, that is critically important when creating a vision of a just society (Matsuda, 1987).

Over the last 25 years, intersectionality has increasingly become connected with feminist thinking and practice (Bastia, 2014; Carastathis, 2014; Marecek, 2016; Yuval-Davis, 2006). For example, the common approach in social work is now accepted practice to consider a variety of biopsychosocial characteristics, as well as their cumulative effects at micro, mezzo, and macro levels as a result of the connection (Hankivsky, 2012). Moreover, the theory of intersectionality, integrated with feminist theory, has served as a

conceptual base for studies analyzing the effects of discrimination that included multiply-marginalized persons who embody two or more of the following characteristics: Sex, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender, gender identity, nationality, age, physical ability as well as any other relevant statuses considered in combination with one another rather than independently (Hankivsky, 2012). From an intersectional perspective, multiple relative oppressions as well as multiple relative privileges may be considered together. Dill and Zambrana (2009) explain this by pointing out that an intersectional analysis serves to reveal the way enmeshing of social systems play a role at the individual level in the way identity is performed, but also at the structural level in the many ways that inequalities and injustices are bred, cultivated, and extended. Nash (2008) asserts that there have been minimal efforts to study subjective social positions that are either partially or wholly considered privileged. Nash (2008) also notes that intersectionality has become a primary analytic tool for theorizing about identity and oppression while also questioning whether intersectionality is a theory of subjective marginalization or a general theory of identity.

Key characteristics of this paradigm, according to Hankivsky and colleagues (2014), include the position that no life or lives can be reduced down into a single factor which describes identity. It is impossible to understand the depth of the lived experience and those living it by distilling focus onto or prioritizing any one characteristic or factor (Hankivsky et al., 2014). This becomes even more challenging when considering those commonly considered categories or locations such as race, ethnicity, sex, gender, gender identity, sexuality, nationality, and physical ability; these are all social constructs that are fluid, dynamic, and ever-changing in response to what is transpiring in the environment, politics, and more (Hankivsky et al., 2014). Phenomena like power, place, and time are influencing each of those social locations that a person can possess and these locations in-turn influence the other social locations and identities leaving the interactions inseparable from the experience of the social structure. This interplay of the nuances of identity, this intersectionality, is then a focus of any work that is done to develop an understanding of oppression and discrimination. Hankivsky (2012) argues that, the promotion of social justice and equity is of foremost importance and should be the goal when the intersectional paradigm is applied. This is exemplified when in the extensive efforts to use the theory of Intersectionality as a conceptual basis for policy analysis, Hankivsky (2012) identified the following guiding principles [considerations] for future researchers: “Intersecting categories, multi-level analysis, power, reflexivity, time and space, diverse knowledges, social justice, and equity” (p. 35).

Despite intersectionality’s widespread acceptance as an improved way of understanding the lived experiences of multiply-marginalized people, there remain unresolved concerns. Nash (2008) and Hankivsky and Cormier (2011) discuss a variety of concerns including ontological, epistemological, and methodological issues. For instance, intersectionality’s conceptual complexity and nuanced and fluid understanding of identity create practical concerns centered on what, how, and when to measure issues of interest (Nash, 2008). Carbadó, Crenshaw, Mays, and Tomlinson (2013), aptly point out that intersectionality cannot be applied in a perfectly comprehensive way with the assumption it will recognize and identify the intersectional powers and problems that trouble society. For example, as Fausto-Sterling (2012) posits, asking questions about the future of gender,

questioning the necessity of only two gender categories, and searching for deeper understanding of the link between sex and gender are the very questions that propel society into an advanced conceptualization of how intersectionality is flexible. Indeed, just as differing levels of knowledge and awareness affect one's ability to recognize privilege, power, and oppression, so too is the capacity to consider the ways those who are multiply marginalized experience social and cultural surroundings. It is through an in-progress consideration of intersectionality that scholars recognize the obligation to persist on an on-going basis to move intersectionality to uncultivated domains (Carbado et al., 2013).

### **Policy Analysis**

Policy analysis requires the systematic investigation of a social policy or set of policies and is clearly an influencing factor if not a driving force of social work practice (Karger & Stoesz, 2014). Policy analysis can be used to review the interconnectedness of policies and gender and allows us to conceptualize and bridge the issues with their extensive fiscal and socio-political impact upon community well-being. Public Policy Analysis (PPA) has been studied for decades and is now a branch of many academic disciplines including social work, political science, law, and economics (Midgley et al., 2000). Inquiry into social policy has many approaches and dozens of models of analysis are available for researchers (DiNitto, 2016; Dunn, 1994; Gilbert & Terrell, 2013; Jansson, 2003; Karger & Stoesz, 2014; Marshall, 1999; Midgley et al., 2000). As Dunn (1994) asserts, the goal of policy analysis is to ensure that the debates concerning policy and the discourse around relevant knowledge associated with policies in consideration, promotes both collective and individual understanding of policy analysis, and ultimately improve policies. Through thorough analysis, a policy's impact on target populations, other programs, and other social policies, as well as the administrative organizations implementing said policy, can be articulated and utilized to ensure that the most worthwhile solution is pursued (Karger & Stoesz, 2014). However, when policy research is conducted, the use of a systematic framework for analysis to inform the decision-making process helps to reduce costs and unintended and preventable injuries (Amin et al., 2011; Karger & Stoesz, 2014).

According to Mansfield et al. (2014), the traditional approach to policy analysis has been linear and presumably absent of value judgements. The scientific application of policy analysis has been employed in a manner in which multidisciplinary frameworks have been devalued or ignored, thus their products have been lacking in nuance and depth (e.g., Nation at Risk, The American Competitiveness Initiative, & Educate to Innovate; Mansfield et al., 2014). This misstep on the part of traditional models of analysis allows for a position of (false) neutrality, rather than inclusion, toward policies, which have actually acted to manifest discriminatory practices toward traditionally oppressed and marginalized groups (Mansfield et al., 2014). For example, research has found that the economic policies which led to the United States' 2008 Great Recession have compounded inequalities for these members of society across gender, family composition, race, among others (Cingano, 2014). The Voting Rights Act, in its constitutional history and legitimacy, has been re-interpreted in recent years to oversimplify and objectify the criteria within the nuanced legislation, as a means of suppressing voting for those who are older adults, persons of color, and people living in poverty (Baldwin, 2015; Levitt, 2017). Current

nondiscrimination policies at the state and local levels permit discrimination in employment and housing for nonbinary individuals and certain immigrant populations (Movement Advancement Project & GLADD, 2011). Historical analysis of The New Deal (Dill & Zambrana, 2009) reveals a nationally endorsed program of social insurance that provides generous benefits to disproportionately more white and male workers, while creating a concurrent state supported system of underfunded benefits for those who have inconsistency in their employment; a group comprised of primarily women and people of color (Gordon, 1994). Analyzing policies to best understand the potential manipulation of resources, the wielding of power, the manifestation of oppressive forces, and differential impact upon populations can result in a more just and equitable society. In short, policy analysis should not be an exercise in presumed neutrality, rather intentionality, otherwise we risk further marginalization and oppression of the most vulnerable members of society by failing to acknowledge the systemic privileges bestowed upon white, cisgender, able-bodied, native-born men.

### **Feminist Policy Analysis**

In contemporary policy analysis, the official authorities hold the positions of power and, therefore, possess the capacity to decide priorities for social, economic, immigration, educational, defense, regulatory, and healthcare policies (Marshall, 1999). Feminist scholars have long asserted that policy analysis is too often silent on the issue of gender as well as other variables of identity that lead to marginalization, resulting in traditional policy analyses with limited and contradictory understandings of the ways in which women's lives are affected by policy (Harding, 1986; Shaw, 2004).

Feminist theory and its use of a holistic lens through which it views the interconnectedness of the material, social, spiritual, and intellectual components of the lived experience suggest it is well suited as a frame for scrutinizing social policy and resource allocation (Robbins, Chatterjee, & Canda, 2006). Feminist policy research brings gender into analytical focus, exploring the ways in which gender is constructed by the policies of the welfare state. It examines the role social policies play in ordering gender relations in a variety of contexts and environments (Sainsbury, 1999). Perhaps one of the most straightforward and germane assertions of feminist analysis is that it is impossible to understand the social policies of our society without appreciating how they deal with women and traditionally marginalized groups (Pascall, 1997).

Feminist policy analysis also allows for critical review of those who create the policy as well as those targeted by the policy. Without question, the themes emphasized in policy analysis conducted by social work professionals as well as the major tenet of feminist theories fuse together nicely as one analytically explores how the *personal is political* within any policy under review. Lastly, by reviewing federal, state, or organizational policy with a feminist lens, outcomes and proposals for policy reforms are more likely to meet the needs of those using the programs and services.

### **The Feminist Policy Analysis Framework**

McPhail (2003) presented a framework of policy analysis from within the field of social work that moves beyond viewing the world in gender-neutral terms. Their review of the mainstream policy analysis models of the time as well as the few feminist frameworks available led her to a chasm. Seeing no clearly explained comprehensive framework to analyze policy with a “gendered lens” she developed one (McPhail, 2003). This Framework of analysis includes a series of questions that are not without challenge to apply as they often conjure the tensions and controversies that stem from long-standing debates within feminist thinking (McPhail, 2003). Nonetheless, McPhail’s Feminist Policy Framework serves as a means for making women as well as other marginalized groups visible via systematic evaluation of social policy which ultimately has profound implications for society.

McPhail’s Feminist Policy Analysis was the first of its kind from the discipline of social work, with grounding in both feminist thought and systematic policy research. McPhail (2003) asserts that the goals underlying the framework include identifying the assumptions and stereotypes of women that are embedded in policy as well as ending the traditional patriarchal oppression of women. The process of analysis with McPhail’s Feminist Policy Analysis Framework is pursued in an effort to address power disparities between women and men with the ultimate goal of bringing a more equivalent balance of power and control between women and men (McPhail, 2003).

Underlying McPhail’s Feminist Policy Framework are values shared by both feminist theorists and the Social Work profession. Proceeding with feminist values of refusing to allow false equivalencies, rethinking power, appreciating the process equally with product, using women’s realities as the base from which to work, and acknowledging that all things personal have political roots, the framework upholds many of the six core values asserted by the National Association of Social Workers Code of ethics (McPhail, 2003; National Association of Social Workers [NASW], 2017). In addition, McPhail’s Feminist Policy Analysis Framework is not entrenched in one feminist theoretical perspective (e.g., liberal, radical, Black, social, lesbian). Instead it is inclusive of questions and perspectives that can be shared by many feminist perspectives in an effort to honor multiple feminist identities and to enhance the product of the analysis. The final value inherent in McPhail’s Feminist Policy Analysis Framework is the assertion and acknowledgement that all policy affects women (McPhail, 2003). Women are not just affected by public assistance and child care policy as is generally assumed. Indeed, women are directly and differentially affected by policies regarding social security, homeland security, immigration, mental health, education, healthcare, and tax policies.

The Feminist Policy Analysis Framework developed by McPhail (2003) is a collection of questions to be asked of a policy and constitutes a systematic feminist analysis. The questions provided explore major themes of feminist analysis which are the issues of equality; special treatment and protection; the myth of gender neutrality; multiple identities; context of the policy; language; rights and responsibilities; the symbolic versus the material; role equity and change; and the access to/assignment of power (McPhail,

2003). Ultimately, this was an effort to be purposefully inclusive of those who experience marginalization.

### **Revising McPhail's Feminist Policy Framework**

As is asserted by McPhail (2003), not all questions in the framework are always relevant and many are dependent upon the policy being studied. In addition, the list of questions in the Feminist Policy Framework is not exhaustive, as it would be impossible to develop one list that is considered a comprehensive analysis for all social policies. There have been advancements in the way policy is conceptualized in the past 15 years. In addition, Feminist and Intersectional Theories and thinking have evolved and changed in the decade since the original publication of McPhail's Feminist Policy Framework (McPhail, 2003). Recognizing these factors, the Feminist Policy Framework has been revised in a move toward more inclusively reflecting the most current understandings of social issues, lived experiences, social contexts and structures, the certainty of multiple marginalization in today's society, and more. The fundamental feminist lens used in shaping McPhail's original Feminist Policy Framework and the themes identified as key elements of the framework remain.

This revision of McPhail's original Feminist Policy Analysis Framework into the new Intersectional Feminist Policy Analysis Framework is an effort to bring intersectional theories to bear on policy frameworks to make them more inclusive. There was a decision to tether the assessment to a focal point at the center – gender – while risking the critique of essentialism. In this Intersectional Feminist Policy Analysis Framework, the intersectional qualifiers come after the identification of woman to speak of the multiple categories of human experience. While some might advocate for an annihilation of the existing systems of categorization, from a social policy standpoint, such an act would not serve the current goal of bringing more and more people into a state of recognition and inclusion by the state.

### **Revisions to the Framework: Patriarchy/Gendered Policy**

Questions of relevance, necessity, and feasibility have led to the removal of some questions and alteration of the original McPhail Framework (2003). There were questions outlined in the original Equality, Special Treatment/Protection, Context, Material/Symbolic Reforms, and Other sections that were included in other areas, deemed irrelevant, or inconsequential to an analysis of social policies of today and, thus have been removed from the original model. Edits in the form of additional areas of analysis are centered on the feminist and intersectional tenets of patriarchy and oppression.

Revisions to the original framework include adding the terms *gendered policy* and *oppression* to the guiding questions of the framework. The term *gendered*, is often defined as specifically relating to, preferencing or biased toward one gender (New Oxford American Dictionary, 2001). *Gendered policy* is a term used in policy analysis and particularly feminist policy analysis. It relates to policies with differential impact upon men and women revealing cisgender normativity and binary understandings of gender. One difficulty in advancing the understanding of gendered policy is the nature of the current

approach to policy discourse which understands gender equality as gender neutrality and refuses to acknowledge the presence and influence of patriarchy (Breitkreuz, 2005). This means caregiving, family responsibilities, and the economic implications of these issues are assumed to be the same for men and women (Breitkreuz, 2005). As has been articulated, the inequalities that exist in the economic opportunities afforded to women and men result in a significant disadvantage for women (Breitkreuz, 2005). However, use of the typical and traditional methods of policy analysis does not yield the requisite information. The more traditional methods of analysis do not account for the impact of gender/gender identity in the ways that policies affect the populous (Sapiro, 1990). Frequently, patriarchal and paternalistic understandings about the nature and influence of gender are embedded in the policies and these are not highlighted or identified. In addition, there is often an assumption of cisgender as the norm and the foundation upon which policies are built. The resulting products of the traditional models of policy analysis offer incomplete understandings of how social policies impact women – cisgender and transgender – and nonbinary individuals and the ways in which their wellbeing is linked to the general welfare of society (Sapiro, 1990).

Jordon (2006) drawing on the work of Esping-Anderson set the stage for improving gendered policy analysis by ensuring it clearly addressed the effects of patriarchy. An emphasis in policy analyses on the ability of civil and social systems to empower women (while delineating transgender and cisgender distinctions) and liberate them from oppressive patriarchal family relationships (Dill & Zambrana, 2009; Hankivsky, 2012; Jordan, 2006) promotes a richer more authentic understanding of ways in which we can promote women's freedom and autonomy.

Ultimately, an improved gendered policy analysis strips out assumptions and brings the differential treatment of women and men into focus (Hyde, 2000). Additionally, gendered policy analysis can help to name the cisgender normativity and binary understandings of gender that permeate social, economic, and health policy. By engaging in an analysis and identification of gendered policy, one is able to detect the consequences of customary and established approaches and the methods by which they serve the patriarchal structure of the state (Hankivsky & Cormier, 2011; Hyde, 2000). Social policies make possible the reproduction of gender norms and roles and binary understandings of gender, thus supporting male privilege within a cisgender assumption of culture (Hyde, 2000; Movement Advancement Project & GLADD, 2011). Perhaps of primary importance as one attempts a feminist intersectional policy analysis is recognizing the bulk of the social policies that affect cisgender and transgender women most intensely are not aimed at them as a primary subject, but through them (Sapiro, 1990).

### **Revisions to the Framework: Oppression**

The concept of oppression has been the focus of volumes of study which explore issues of difference from race and gender to class and physical ability (Anderson & Collins, 2004; Freire, 1970; Ore, 2006; Robbins et al., 2006; Turner, Singleton, & Musick, 1987). In their formative work, *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Friere (1970) begins the work with a conceptualization of oppression as dehumanization or the theft of humanity and justice from individuals or peoples. This thievery of humanity serves as a barrier or impediment

to the process of becoming more completely human for those subjected to oppression (Friere, 1970).

Turning now to the profession of social work and its focus on oppression, Gill (1998) proceeds with an understanding of oppression as "...a mode of human relations involving domination and exploitation - economic, social, and psychologic - between individuals; between social groups and classes within and beyond societies" (p. 10). Further, Gill (1998) views oppression as a dynamic process that affects virtually all interactions and relationships when woven into our culture, systems, and structures. Oppression is a central term of political discourse and is not often used in the mainstream as it is incompatible with the expression of individualism that dominates our societal and political structures (van Wormer, 2004). Oppression is personal and political as it relates to the impact of exploitation upon people (van Wormer, 2004).

McPhail's original Feminist Policy Analysis Framework is changed here using oppression as defined by Turner et al. (1987) and Frye (1983) in their similar conceptualization of the term. Turner and colleagues (1987) articulate that oppression is best understood as a systematic denial which results in the inability of people to access the goods, services, and resources of their surrounding communities. They also assert, at the procedural level oppression constitutes explicit actions by a group of individuals that are intended to leave or push people into a subordinate position in society (Turner et al., 1987). Building on Frye's (1983) definition, Johnson (2006) further asserts that oppression may include factors such as social relationships between subordinate positions in society and in order for an individual to feel oppressed they must also belong to an oppressed category. In addition, oppression can vary in intensity, the more thorough the denial of power, tangible resources and assets, and privilege, the more intense the oppression (Turner et al., 1987).

Frye (1983), a foremost feminist theorist focusing on the concepts and constructs of oppression, explains oppression as a dichotomous experience that both attracts and resists. Frye (1983) notes that the word "oppression" is rooted in the concept of pressing and that "something pressed is something caught between or among forces and barriers which are so related to each other that jointly they restrain, restrict or prevent the thing's motion or mobility" (p. 2). Restraining subordinate groups to "fit" a culturally defined category forces those who are members of an oppressed group to be perceived as an outsider (Johnson, 2006). The concept of restriction and preventing access to resources or movement and mobility in one's lived experience echoes the work of Turner et al. (1987). When lived experiences of whole groups are ignored, options and opportunities are denied or nonexistent (Dill & Zambrana, 2009). Frye (1983) presents the concept of the double-bind as the experience of oppressed people(s) who are forced into situations with very few solutions and each of these solutions is certain to result in deprivation, disadvantage, or condemnation.

Frye's (1983) feminist lens draws attention to women as an oppressed population and asserts that there are systematic forces and obstacles that make women vulnerable and highly susceptible to penalties, loss, and disapproval. She provides examples of such double binds which constrain women's lives including "whether one works outside the

home or not, is on welfare or not, bears children or not, raises children or not, marries or not, stays married or not, is heterosexual, lesbian, both or neither..." (p. 4). Each of these and many other factors in women's lives serve to limit the potential and feasibility of any alternative due to the tensions in which they exist and the consequence each factor carries (Frye, 1983). Using social factors, such as gender, to define standards for humanity reduces people to a single dimension further excluding oppressed groups and potentially leading to ideas or experiences of inferiority (Johnson, 2006; Ore, 2018). When analyzing the lived experience of those oppressed, they are best understood as living in a cage in which all possible options include seemingly insurmountable barriers that result in restricted movement and immobilization. These forces and barriers are intentionally built into the structures that bind the person to their circumstances and prevent mobility to a status of power or privilege.

Frye (1983) indicates, when one is reviewing policy, society, community, social experiences, and more it is possible to engage in such analysis while failing to recognize factors which cage and oppress women. Negative meanings and values assigned to these factors lead to assumptions that being female is harmful (Ore, 2018) thus making it essential to consider such experiences in any analysis. To honestly identify oppression, according to Frye (1983), it is necessary to look beyond essentializing moments or experiences and to use a systemic lens. Doing so allows one to view the full context of the structure recognizing the interrelatedness of the forces and phenomena which are systematically associated resulting in the immobilization of women. Intersectionality challenges traditional modes of knowledge (Dill & Zambrana, 2009) allowing for a more fluid understanding of lived experiences of and structures surrounding those in oppressed groups.

### **Revisions to the Framework: Integrating Intersectionality**

It is important to acknowledge the fluidity and nuance in the lived experience of any one person as a result of policy implementation. Further an emphasis on understanding the many ways inequality is perpetuated through policy is at the heart of any policy analysis informed by intersectional theory. Identity is complex and includes membership in multiple groups as well as individual characteristics; identity is not singularly shaped by the race, class, ethnicity, gender, gender identity/expression, physical ability, sexuality, religion, nationality, migration status, incarceration history, and more (Dill & Zambrana, 2009). Instead, there is a combination of all characteristics which impact the lived experiences of people and results in some statuses as more valued or privileged than others in our hierarchically organized social structures (Dill & Zambrana, 2009). When one engages with an analysis informed by Intersectional Theory, the resulting knowledge is generated from and about oppressed groups. It is essential to look at the social locations of those impacted by the policy and the ways in which the policy might advance or perpetuate systems of inequality. This knowledge makes obvious the domains of power present in our society and the many ways in which oppression is ordered and preserved through multiple aspects of identity concurrently (Crenshaw, 1991; Dill & Zambrana, 2009). Table 1 integrates intersectionality into McPhail's original Feminist Policy Analysis Framework. The new additions are indicated by italicized text.

Table 1. *The Intersectional Feminist Policy Analysis Framework\**

<p><b>Intersectional Identities</b></p> <p>A. How do <i>diverse and intersecting identities such as gender, race, ethnicity, sexual identity, gender identity/expression, class, religion, national origin, documentation status, migration status, carceral status, ability/disability, interact with other identity categories?</i></p> <p>B. Are white, middle-class, <i>able-bodied, cisgender, heterosexual</i> women the assumed standard for all women?</p> <p>C. <i>How are systems of power and inequality (racism, classism, colonialism, cishnormativity, heterosexism) used to control or oppress those who occupy different social locations?</i></p> <p>D. Does the policy address the multiple identities of women? The multiple oppressions an individual woman may face?</p>
<p><b>State-Market Control</b></p> <p>A. <i>Does the policy oppress women who experience multiple levels of inequality due to their identity by creating a double bind for women with regard to the issue of labor? Are women limited and/or constrained in their participation in the labor market due to the policy (e.g., eligibility criteria, benefits, geographic limitations, wait lists)?</i></p> <p>B. Is the unpaid and/or underpaid labor and work of caring provided by <i>vulnerable groups</i> considered and valued or taken for granted? <i>Is there wage theft or subordination of workers transpiring?</i></p> <p>C. Does the policy contain elements of social control of <i>cisgender women, transgender women, nonbinary individuals, migrants</i>? <i>Are there other social locations of women that result in social control of their identity due to devaluing or creating of additional inequalities?</i></p> <p>D. Does the policy replace the patriarchal male with patriarchal state?</p> <p>E. How does the policy mediate gender relationships between the state, market, and family? For instance, does the policy increase <i>different groups of women's</i> dependence on the state or men? <i>If so, which women (race, ethnicity, class, sexual identity, gender identity/expression, religion, national origin, documentation status, migration status, carceral status, ability/disability, and more) are impacted most?</i></p> <p>F. <i>What is the policy's view of women as charity recipients vs. worker-citizens? Paying special attention to women's identities along lines of race/ethnicity, sexual identity, gender identity/expression, class, religion, national origin, documentation status, migration status, carceral status, ability/disability, or other identity categories.</i></p>

Table 1. *The Intersectional Feminist Policy Analysis Framework\**

<p><b>Equality</b></p> <p>A. Does the policy achieve gender equality? Is there equality of results or disparate impacts? <i>Is there inequality between cisgender and transgender or nonbinary individuals?</i></p> <p>B. Does the policy treat people differently in order to treat them equally well? Does the policy consider <i>gender differences and resultant discrimination based upon race, ethnicity, sexual identity, gender identity/expression, class, religion, national origin, documentation status, migration status, carceral status, ability/disability in order to create more equality?</i></p> <p>C. If the positions of women and men were reversed, would this policy be acceptable to men?</p>
<p><b>Special Treatment/Protection</b></p> <p>A. Does any special treatment of women <i>and those who occupy different social locations (race, ethnicity, class, sexuality, etc.)</i> cause unintended or restrictive consequences?</p> <p>B. Is there an implicit or explicit double standard <i>regulating the lives of women who represent varied race, ethnicity, sexual identity, gender identity/expression, class, religion, national origin, documentation status, migration status, carceral status, ability/disability identities?</i></p> <p>C. Does being labeled different and special cause a backlash that can be used to constrain rather than to liberate women?</p>
<p><b>Gender Neutrality</b></p> <p>A. Does presumed gender neutrality hide the reality of the gendered nature of the problem or solution?</p>
<p><b>Context</b></p> <p>A. Are women clearly visible in the policy?</p> <p>B. Does the policy consider the historical, legal, social, cultural, and political contexts of women's lives and lived experiences both now and in the past?</p> <p>C. <i>Does the policy make an "essential woman" visible (white, able-bodied, cisgender, and privileged) while leaving others in shadow? Coming out of theories of essentialism where 'essence' forms ideas around entire categories and becomes a way of making problematic blanket statements.</i></p> <p>D. <i>Is the white, cisgender, heterosexual, able-bodied male experience used as a standard? Are results extrapolated from male experience and then applied to women? How are the specifics of a variety of women's experiences centered to inform the policy (i.e. how are the intersections of a woman's identity brought to light in the policy?)?</i></p> <p>E. Have the programs, policies, methodologies, assumptions, and theories been examined for bias <i>at the intersections of gender race/ethnicity, sexual identity, cis-privilege, gender identity/expression, class, religion, national origin, documentation status, migration status, carceral status, ability/disability identity?</i></p> <p>F. Is women's biology treated as normal rather than as an exception to a male-defined norm? <i>Is womanhood not defined in biology? Are transgender women treated as equal to cisgender women?</i></p>

Table 1. *The Intersectional Feminist Policy Analysis Framework\**

<p><b>Language</b></p> <p>A. Does the language infer <i>white, cisgender, heterosexual, able-bodied</i> male dominance or female invisibility?</p> <p>B. Are gendered expectations and language encoded in the policy? <i>Are those expectations present cisnormative?</i></p> <p>C. <i>Is there acknowledgement of multiple identities (race/ethnicity, sexual identity, gender identity/expression, class, religion, national origin, documentation status, migration status, carceral status, ability/disability) present in the language of the policy?</i></p>
<p><b>Equity/Rights and Care/Responsibility</b></p> <p>A. Is there a balance of rights and responsibilities for women and men in this policy? <i>How are multiply marginalized groups rights and responsibilities acknowledged in the policy?</i></p> <p>B. Does the policy sustain the pattern of men being viewed as public actors and women as private actors or does the policy challenge this dichotomization? <i>Are there groups made invisible based on their race/ethnicity, sexual identity, gender identity/expression, class, religion, national origin, documentation status, migration status, carceral status, ability/disability identities within the policy?</i></p> <p>C. Are women penalized for either their role as wives, mothers, or caregivers or their refusal to adopt these roles?</p> <p>D. Does the policy pit the needs of women against the needs of their fetus or child(ren)? <i>Does the policy address the needs of certain women but not others? Are certain fetuses/children valorized while others are deemed punishable?</i></p> <p>E. <i>Does the policy oppress women by creating double binds for women with regard to physical and psychological well-being?</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">a. <i>Does the policy limit and or restrict women’s access to healthcare and behavioral healthcare?</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">b. <i>Do women experience restrictions to their children’s access to healthcare and behavioral healthcare and/or restrictions to access to healthcare and behavioral healthcare for their families as a result of the policy?</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">c. <i>Are there other social, economic, logistic, or environmental forces specifically related to the policy that create a double bind for women related to physical and psychological well-being?</i></p>
<p><b>Material/Symbolic Reform</b></p> <p>A. Is the policy merely symbolic or does it come with provisions for funding, enforcement, and evaluation?</p> <p>B. Are <i>special</i> interest groups involved in overseeing the policy implementation? <i>How do those in power over the policy implementation get to their position (hired, government appointment, etc.)? Do those with power represent a diversity of perspectives and identities?</i></p> <p>C. Is litigation possible to refine and expand the law’s interpretation?</p> <p>D. What is the strength of authority of the agency administrating the policy?</p> <p>E. Is there room to transform a symbolic reform into a material reform? How?</p>

Table 1. *The Intersectional Feminist Policy Analysis Framework\**

<p><b>Role Change and Role Equality</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Is the goal of the policy role equity or role change?</li> <li>B. Does the type of change proposed affect the chance of successful passage?</li> <li>C. <i>Does the policy impact women’s economic autonomy as a step toward equality? Does it pay special attention to the differences of women along their race/ethnicity, sexual identity, gender identity/expression, class, religion, national origin, documentation status, migration status, carceral status, and ability/disability identities?</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Power Analysis</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Are women <i>representing diversity along race/ethnicity, sexual identity, gender identity/expression, class, religion, national origin, documentation status, migration status, carceral status, ability/disability identities</i> involved in making, shaping, and implementing the policy?</li> <li>B. Does the policy work to empower women <i>of varying race/ethnicity, sexual identity, gender identity/expression, class, religion, national origin, documentation status, migration status, carceral status, ability/disability identities</i>?</li> <li>C. Who has the power to define the problem? What are competing representations of the problem?</li> <li>D. How does this policy affect the balance of power? Are there winners and losers? Is a win-win solution a possibility?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Is the social construction of the problem recognized? What are alternate representations of the problem?</li> <li>B. Does this policy constitute backlash for previous policy gains for <i>multiply marginalized groups</i>?</li> <li>C. How does <i>intersectional</i> feminist scholarship inform the issue?</li> <li>D. What organizations representing women of color and women with differing identities were involved in the policy formulation and implementation? Was there consensus or disagreement?</li> <li>E. Where are the policy silences? What are the problems for <i>women of color, women with disabilities, immigrant women, formerly incarcerated women, queer women, trans women, and more that are denied the status of problem by others</i>? What policy is not being proposed, discussed, and implemented?</li> <li>F. How does the policy compare <i>to similar transnational policies</i>? Are there alternative models that can be learned from and borrowed from?</li> <li>G. Does the policy blame, stigmatize, regulate, or punish women? Or does it specifically <i>blame, stigmatize, regulate or punish, marginalized groups of women such as poor, queer, trans, undocumented, incarcerated, and/or abused women of color</i>?</li> </ul>
<p>* Intersectionality is woven throughout McPhail’s original Feminist Policy Analysis Framework using <i>italicized font</i>.</p>

### Conclusion

When undertaking an analysis of policy, it is requisite that the efforts stem from a position of understanding the multiple identities which interact and impact each member

of society. As was stated at the World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance (2001):

An intersectional approach to discrimination acknowledges that every person be it man or woman exists in a framework of multiple identities, with factors such as race, class, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, age, disability, citizenship, national identity, geo-political context, health, including HIV/AIDS status and any other status are all determinants in one's experiences of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerances. (§119)

By altering McPhail's Feminist Policy Analysis Framework to be informed by an intersectional approach, we underscore the many concurrent interactions of discrimination as a result of the multiple identities that define people. The manifestation of these forces of multiple marginalization in policy become clear to the analyst.

This work requires that the researcher, highlight the many ways in which discrimination and marginalization can occur in the lives of people subjected to and subjugated by the policies under review. It is the responsibility of the researcher to make present and visible the historically underrepresented and oppressed by focusing on the complexity of social policies and the structures used to promote inequality (Dill & Zambrana, 2009). To be clear, there is no singular characteristic of identity (race, class, gender identity, sexuality, nationality) that can explain the human condition without understanding its connection to other characteristics (Dill & Zambrana, 2009). Thus, our efforts to frame the revised model of analysis in terms of understanding race, ethnicity, class, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, and those who are multiply marginalized, will always fall short. It is a beginning, an advancement over other models and methods of analysis, designed to prompt analysts to consider the complexity of identity and its contribution to inequality when situated in the social structures of today's society.

When considering how to help advance the understanding of current and future social work professionals, the curriculum is a key tool by which we can reach students. The Council on Social Work Education (2015) declares that,

The purpose of the social work profession is to promote human and community well-being. Guided by a person-in-environment framework, a global perspective, respect for human diversity, and knowledge based on scientific inquiry, the purpose of social work is actualized through its quest for social and economic justice, the prevention of conditions that limit human rights, the elimination of poverty, and the enhancement of the quality of life for all persons, locally and globally. (p. 2)

In pursuit of social justice and improving quality of life, there are several competencies identified that students of social work, graduating from accredited programs, should have mastery over. There is an expectation that students will complete their social work education with mastery in improving human rights, as well as social, and economic, justice. Students are also expected to demonstrate mastery in the ability to use research to guide their practice as well as using their practice wisdom to then shape the exploration of new scientific understandings of their work (CSWE, 2015). There is also a requirement that

students of social work are prepared to engage in the work of understanding policies and their impacts (CSWE, 2015). Competency in each of these areas of practice and/or skill sets requires that students have awareness and abilities with understanding social policies and social structures.

Having the skills to engage in an intersectional feminist policy analysis, rooted in an understanding of the multiply marginalized groups of society will allow students to be informed advocates as well as agents of change. It is an opportunity to ensure the curriculum of any program helps students to advance their knowledge of the most current understandings of the way social structures and forces influence the well-being of people who represent diversity of race/ethnicity, age, sexual identity, gender identity/expression, class, religion, national origin, documentation status, migration status, carceral status, and ability/disability identities. Additionally, the outcomes of an intersectional feminist policy analysis will provide the data and evidence needed to support efforts for social change. The clearly articulated, ordered, intersectional feminist policy analysis framework lends itself to the classroom and use with students as it provides a concrete outline to guide the new student in their endeavors. By focusing on the intersectional feminist policy analysis framework faculty will be able to explain how questions, for which the default is not the white, cisgender, heterosexual, able-bodied male, advance critical thinking and leads to a more nuanced understanding of those who are multiply marginalized as well as the concepts of privilege and oppression.

## References

- Amin, M., MacLachlan, M., Mannan, H., El Tayeb, S., El Khatim, A., Swartz, L., ... Schneider, M. (2011). Equiframe: A framework for analysis of the inclusion of human rights and vulnerable groups in health policies. *Health & Human Rights: An International Journal*, 13(2), 1-20. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0035864>
- Andersen, M. L., & Collins, P. H. (Eds.). (2004). *Race, class, and gender: An anthology* (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thompson/Wadsworth.
- Baldwin, B. (2015). Backsliding: The United States Supreme Court, Shelby County v. Holder and the dismantling of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. *Berkeley Journal of African American Law and Policy*, 16(2), 251-262. doi: <https://doi.org/10.15779/Z38KS5P>
- Bastia, T. (2014). Intersectionality, migration and development. *Progress in Development Studies*, 14(3), 237-248. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1464993414521330>
- Breitkreuz, R. S. (2005). Engendering citizenship? A critical feminist analysis of Canadian welfare-to-work policies and the employment experiences of lone mothers. *Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*, 32(2), 147-165.
- Butler, J. (1998). Contingent foundations: Feminism and the question of "Postmodernism." *Cadernos Pagu*, 11, 11-42.
- Carastathis, A. (2014). The concept of intersectionality in feminist theory. *Philosophy Compass*, 9/5, 304-314. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/phc3.12129>

- Carbado, D. W., Crenshaw, K. W., Mays, V. M., & Tomlinson, B. (2013). Intersectionality: Mapping the movements of a theory. *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race*, 10(2), 303-312.  
doi: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1742058X13000349>
- Cingano, F. (2014). *Trends in income inequality and its impact on economic growth* (OECD Social, Employment and Migration Working Papers No. 163).  
doi: <https://doi.org/10.1787/5jxrjncwvxv6j-en>
- Corus, C., Saatcioglu, B., Kaufman-Scarborough, C., Blocker, C. P., Upadhyaya, S., & Appau, S. (2016). Transforming Poverty-Related Policy with Intersectionality. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 35(2), 211-222.  
<https://doi.org/10.1509/jppm.15.141>
- Council on Social Work Education. (2015). *2015 educational policy and accreditation standards*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from  
[https://www.cswe.org/getattachment/Accreditation/Accreditation-Process/2015-EPAS/2015EPAS\\_Web\\_FINAL.pdf.aspx](https://www.cswe.org/getattachment/Accreditation/Accreditation-Process/2015-EPAS/2015EPAS_Web_FINAL.pdf.aspx)
- Crenshaw, K. W. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist policies. *University of Chicago Law Forum*, 139-167.  
doi: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429500480-5>
- Crenshaw, K. W. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241-1299.  
doi: <https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039>
- Dill, B. T., & Zambrana, R. E. (Eds.). (2009). *Emerging intersections: Race, class, and gender in theory, policy, and practice*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- DiNitto, D. M. (2016). *Social welfare: Politics and public policy* (8th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Dunn, W. N. (1994). *Public policy analysis: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NY: Prentice-Hall.
- Fausto-Sterling, A. (2012). *Sex/gender: Biology in a social world*. NY: Routledge.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. NY: Seabury Press.
- Frye, M. (1983). *The politics of reality: Essays in feminist theory*. Trumansburg, NY: The Crossing Press.
- Gilbert, N., & Terrell, P. (2013). *Dimensions of social welfare policy* (8th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Gill, D. G. (1998). *Confronting injustice and oppression: Concepts and strategies for social workers*. New York: Columbia University Press.

- Gordon, L. (1994). *Pitied but not entitled: Single mothers and the history of welfare, 1890-1935*. New York: Maxwell Macmillan International.
- Hankivsky, O. (2012). *An intersectionality-based policy analysis framework*. Vancouver, BC: Institute for Intersectionality Research and Policy, Simon Fraser University.
- Hankivsky, O. (2018). Gender-based analysis plus in Canada: Problems and possibilities of integrating intersectionality. *Canadian Public Policy*, 44(4), 303-316.  
doi: <https://doi.org/10.3138/cpp.2017-058>
- Hankivsky, O., & Cormier, R. (2011). Intersectionality and public policy: Some lessons from existing models. *Political Research Quarterly*, 64(1), 217-229.  
doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912910376385>
- Hankivsky, O., Grace, D., Hunting, G., Giesbrecht, M., Fridkin, A., Rudrum, S., ... Clark, N. (2014). An intersectionality-based policy analysis framework: Critical reflections on a methodology for advancing equity. *International Journal for Equity in Health*, 13(1). doi: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12939-014-0119-x>
- Harding, S. (1986). *The science question in feminism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Harding, S. G. (1998). *Is science multicultural? postcolonialisms, feminisms, and epistemologies*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Hawkesworth, M. (1994). Policy studies within a feminist frame. *Policy Sciences*, 27(2-3), 97-118. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00999883>
- Hawkesworth, M., & Disch, L. J. (2016). *The Oxford handbook of feminist theory*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.  
doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199328581.013.1>
- hooks, b. (2000). *Feminist theory: From margin to center* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- hooks, b. (2012). *Writing beyond race: Living theory and practice*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Hyde, C. (2000). Feminist approaches to social policy. In J. Midgley, M. Tracey, & M. Livermore (Eds.), *The handbook of social policy* (pp. 421-435). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Jansson, B. S. (2003). *Becoming an effective policy advocate: From policy practice to social justice* (4th ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Thomson Brooks/Cole.
- Johnson, A. G. (2006). *Privilege, power, and difference* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw Hill.
- Jordan, J. (2006). Mothers, wives, and workers: Explaining gendered dimensions of the welfare state. *Comparative Political Studies*, 39(9), 1109-1132.  
doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414005284215>

- Karger, H. J., & Stoesz, D. (2014). *American social welfare policy: A pluralist approach* (7th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Levitt, J. (2017). Quick and dirty: The new misreading of the Voting Rights Act. *Florida State University Law Review*, 43(2), 573-610. Retrieved from <https://ir.law.fsu.edu/lr/vol43/iss2/7>
- Mansfield, K. C., Welton, A. D., & Grogan, M. (2014). "Truth or consequences": A feminist critical policy analysis of the STEM crisis. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 27(9), 1155-1182. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2014.916006>
- Marecek, J. (2016). Invited reflection: Intersectionality theory and feminist psychology. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 40(2), 177-181. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0361684316641090>
- Marshall, C. (1999). Researching the margins: Feminist critical policy analysis. *Educational Policy*, 13(1), 59-76. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904899131006>
- Matsuda, M. J. (1987). Looking to the bottom: Critical legal studies and reparations. *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review*, 22, 323-399.
- McPhail, B. A. (2003). A feminist policy analysis framework: Through a gendered lens. *Social Policy Journal*, 2(2-3), 39-61. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1300/J185v02n02\\_04](https://doi.org/10.1300/J185v02n02_04)
- Midgley, J., Tracey, M., & Livermore, M. (Eds.). (2000). *The handbook of social policy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Movement Advancement Project & GLADD. (2011). *An ally's guide to talking about transgender-inclusive non-discrimination laws*. Boulder, CO: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.lgbtmap.org/file/allys-guide-talking-about-trans-inclusive-ndos.pdf>
- Nash, J. C. (2008). Re-thinking intersectionality. *Feminist Review*, 89(1), 1-15. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1057/fr.2008.4>
- National Association of Social Workers. (2017). *Code of ethics of the National Association of Social Workers*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <https://www.socialworkers.org/About/Ethics/Code-of-Ethics/Code-of-Ethics-English>
- New Oxford American Dictionary. (2001). *Gendered*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.
- Ore, T. E. (2006). *The social construction of difference and inequality: Race, class, gender and sexuality* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw Hill.
- Ore, T. E. (2018). *The social construction of difference and inequality: Race, class, gender, and sexuality* (7th ed.). Boston, MA: Oxford University Press.
- Pascall, G. (1997). *Social policy: A new feminist analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Pearson, R., & Jackson, C. (2000). Interrogating development: Feminism, gender and policy. In C. Jackson & R. Pearson (Eds.), *Feminist visions of development: Gender analysis and policy* (pp. 1-16). NY: Routledge. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0432.2008.00397\\_1.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0432.2008.00397_1.x)

- Robbins, S. P., Chatterjee, P., & Canda, E. R. (2006). *Contemporary human behavior theory: A critical perspective for social work* (2nd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Sainsbury, D. (1999). *Gender and welfare state regimes*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Sapiro, V. (1990). The gendered basis of American social policy. In L. Gordon (Ed.), *Women, the state, and welfare* (pp. 36-54). Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Shaw, K. M. (2004). Using feminist critical policy analysis in the realm of higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 75(1), 56-79.  
doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2004.11778896>
- Turner, J. H., Singleton Jr., R. S., & Musick, D. (1987). *Oppression: A socio-history of Black-white relations in America*. Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.  
doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/30.5.461>
- van Wormer, K. (2004). *Confronting oppression, restoring justice: From policy analysis to social action*. Alexandria, VA: Council on Social Work Education. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcl096>
- World Conference Against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance. (2001). *NGO forum declaration*. NY: United Nations. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/WCAR/durban.pdf>
- Yuval-Davis, N. (2006). Intersectionality and feminist politics. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 13(3), 193-209. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350506806065752>
- Author note:** Address correspondence to: Dr. Heather Kanenberg, Associate Professor, University of Houston-Clear Lake BSW Program, 2700 Bay Area Blvd, Box 22, Houston, TX 77058. Email: [KanenbergH@uhcl.edu](mailto:KanenbergH@uhcl.edu)