



*Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 00, No. 0, 2020, pp. 1–11  
doi: 10.1111/josi.12384

This article is part of the Special Issue “Reproductive Justice: Moving the Margins to the Center in Social Issues Research;” Asia A. Eaton (Issue Editor). For a full listing of Special Issue papers, see: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/josi.2019.76.issue-1/issuetoc>

## Reproductive Justice Special Issue Introduction “Reproductive Justice: Moving the Margins to the Center in Social Issues Research”

Asia A. Eaton\* and Dionne P. Stephens

*Florida International University*

**ABSTRACT:** *Reproductive justice recognizes that women and girls’ reproductive health is shaped by intersecting systemic oppressions (e.g., racism, sexism, classism, heterosexism) which affect their ability to make meaningful choices about their reproductive lives. The articles in this issue represent a coordinated effort to apply the reproductive justice framework to the scientific study of social issues. Consistent with reproductive justice principles, all articles acknowledge the foundation of reproductive justice in the experiences and knowledge of women of color, consider the roles of power, privilege, and oppression throughout the inquiry process, and address the utility of findings for improving the lives of marginalized groups through structural and social change. With this special issue, we hope to reframe the relationship between research and practice on marginalized populations’ reproductive health, and contribute to efforts to apply reproductive justice across domains of social science, including psychological science.*

### Introduction

Research has shown that the reproductive health of women and girls is intricately tied to their cultural, social, economic, and political locations (e.g., Afable-Munsuz & Brindis, 2006; Chrisler, 2012; Inhorn & van Balen, 2002; Tornello, Riskind, & Patterson, 2014). As such, researchers and practitioners must acknowledge women’s health decisions, processes, and outcomes as extensions of their interactions with others and with systems, rather than as individual phenomena. The reproductive justice paradigm rises to this challenge, framing

---

\*Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Asia A. Eaton, Florida International University, Department of Psychology, 11200 SW 8th St., Miami, FL 33199. [e-mail: [aeaton@fiu.edu](mailto:aeaton@fiu.edu)].

and analyzing reproductive health in terms of familial, community, societal, generational, political, and economic influences and their interactions. Reproductive justice recognizes that the ability of women and girls to make meaningful choices about their reproductive lives is shaped by intersecting systemic oppressions (e.g., racism, sexism, classism, heterosexism).

While several interdisciplinary meta-theories provide systems-level lenses for examining human health, reproductive justice framework is especially appropriate for exploring women's health because it identifies connections between reproductive health and gendered sociopolitical complexities that impact women's lives around the globe (Luna, 2009; Silliman, Ross, & Gutiérrez, & Fried, 2016; SisterSong, 2018). Neither traditional feminist theories, which problematize gender, nor traditional critical race theories, which problematize race, adequately provide a means for understanding the varied, intersecting, systematic inequalities that shape reproductive health outcomes. Bridging this gap, reproductive justice provides a more critical lens than traditional systems paradigms by exposing oppression and power dynamics in an attempt to address the reproductive challenges diverse marginalized women face. Thus, reproductive justice extends beyond the mainstream reproductive rights movement's focus on gender equality and choice by positioning bodily autonomy and reproductive decision making within social-structural contexts, such as education, violence, poverty, labor, incarceration, LGBT rights, and immigration.

The reproductive justice framework was founded in the early 1990s through the advocacy work of women of color (WoC) grassroots health organizations in the United States (Asian Communities for Reproductive Justice [ACRJ], 2005; Gilliam, Neustadt, & Gordon, 2009; Silliman et al., 2016; SisterSong, 2018). Originally conceived as a framework for illustrating links between reproductive health and social justice, reproductive justice became pivotal in providing community leaders with guides for identifying how reproductive oppression is connected to the struggle for human rights (ACRJ, 2005; Luna, 2009). As "a theory, a practice, and a strategy" (Silliman et al., 2016, p. viii), reproductive justice is now used in Law, Public Health, Social Work, Psychology, Social Policy, Education, and Women's Studies scholarship to understand and address a variety of pressing social issues (e.g., Hoover et al., 2012; Luna, 2011; Luna & Luker, 2013; Rogers, 2015; Smith, 2005; Verbiest, Malin, Drummonds, & Kotelchuck, 2016).

Narratives and analyses guided by reproductive justice purposefully center WoC and other marginalized women and girls, analyze the influence of power structures and sociocultural norms on reproductive health, address intersecting oppressions, and consider dynamic interrelations among personal and environmental factors (SisterSong, 2018). Reproductive justice also focuses on empowering and organizing communities of women and girls to challenge structural oppressions. For example, inadequate health care, lack of access to prevention tools and education, poverty, and various forms of oppression have been found to directly contribute to the sexually transmitted infections (STI) outcome

disparities experienced by Black women (e.g., Boyd, Ruvalcaba, Stephens, & Madhivanan, 2017; Fletcher et al., 2016; Geter, Sutton & McCree, 2018; Kelso et al., 2014; Toth, Messer, & Quinlivan, 2013). By identifying and naming the ways in which these structures directly and indirectly influence STI prevention or acquisition, interventions have been able to improve providers' communication (e.g. Beach et al., 2011; Fray & Caldwell, 2017; Pierre- Victor, Stephens, Clarke, Gabbidon, & Madhivanan, 2017), and increase Black women's access to relevant health care services (Aziz & Smith, 2011; Castillo-Mancilla et al., 2014; Wyatt, Carmona, Loeb, & Williams, 2005). Reproductive justice approaches have also identified and addressed sexual health agency within this population (Dalmida, Holstad, DiIorio, & Laderman, 2012; Javier et al., 2018; Nguyen et al., 2010). For example, research by Nguyen et al. (2010) found that many HIV-positive women use spirituality to cope with living with HIV.

### **Reproductive Justice in Psychology**

Over the past two decades, many scholars have expanded the discourse around reproductive justice to forge new ways of constructing inequality, race, ethnicity, gender, class, and social-justice-based praxis. However, the field of psychology has been slow in applying this paradigm (see Chrisler, 2012). We suggest this is because, like feminist and critical-race theories, reproductive justice presents an epistemological challenge to our field (Warner, Settles, & Shields, 2016). It requires a shift in traditional understandings of how to conceptualize and implement psychological research, and how research activities relate to human welfare. Below, we highlight three traditional elements of psychological science that become problematized when applying the reproductive justice framework: (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.

Like intersectionality theory (Collins, 2008; Crenshaw, 1989, 1991; hooks, 1984), the framework of reproductive justice has revolutionary roots, being founded by feminist WoC to upend hegemonic and oppressive practices for the purpose of global liberation (Ross, 2018). However, mainstream scholarship, which privileges neoliberal individualism and the global north (Adams, Estrada-Villalta, Sullivan, & Markus, 2019; Patil, 2013), has been slow to adopt these transformational frameworks, or has appropriated and misrepresented them (Bilge, 2013; Kurtis & Adams, 2017). The field of psychology is perhaps slower than the average social science to unlearn the default use of a Western lens for selecting and evaluating scholarly issues and approaches (Grzanka, 2017). For example, Heinrich, Heine, and Norenzayan's (2010) article on psychology's long history of overreliance on WEIRD (Western, educated, industrialized, rich and democratic) samples was published only 10 years ago. Meanwhile, the field's

responsiveness to this urgent critique has been slow (Nielsen, Haun, Kärtner, & Legare, 2017; Rad, Martingano, & Ginges, 2018). With this special issue, we hope to participate in bringing reproductive justice into mainstream psychology and social science, while preserving and revering its origins in and attention to WoC and other marginalized peoples. As a case in point, the title of this introductory article, “Reproductive Justice: Moving the Margins to the Center in Social Issues Research,” was humbly borrowed from feminist scholar and activist bell hooks (hooks, 1984), who explored the marginalization of Black women in both American society and feminist theorizing.

Second, reproductive justice’s centering and empowerment of those facing the greatest barriers to reproductive freedom requires a shift from conventional ways of thinking about research. Psychological science has traditionally prided itself on being an unbiased science that objectively uncovers truth (Lovibond, 1970; Sheldon & King, 2001; Warner et al., 2016). From this position, it is assumed that researchers examine the factual structure and functioning of their populations, aiming to document and understand “human nature” (Sheldon & King, 2001). This positivist positionality, however, ignores the ways in which people are not simply subjects, but active agents who have their own subjectivities shaping their decision-making processes and behaviors (Leong, Holliday, Trimble, Padilla, & McCubbin, 2013; Sugarman, 2015). Moreover, the definition of “human nature” has historically been based on the dominant groups (Glick, 2008; Sears, 1986), failing to accurately describe the range of human conditions and experiences. These narrow definitions and understandings will have increasingly limited validity as our world becomes more multicultural, and result in flawed and dangerous research, policy, advocacy, practice, and education. In sum, reproductive justice requires that we challenge and rebuild basic constructs, such as who and what is included in and used to represent “human well-being” and “human nature.” As the creation and defense of constructs is a fundamental task of science (Shadish, Cook, & Campbell, 2002), reproductive justice offers the opportunity to redefine and revolutionize our field—moving us from making incremental contributions to knowledge to taking leaps of understanding in established and new domains of inquiry.

In fact, we argue reproductive justice requires that researchers no longer think simply about “producing knowledge,” but rather about operationalizing their construction of knowledge throughout the research process. Using reproductive justice, the task moving forward is not only that of asking which questions to explore, but also which groups and systems should be considered in framing and addressing those questions. How and why were these groups and systems identified? These types of questions will require researchers to move outside their comfort zones to co-constructing knowledge and developing research processes with their “subjects.” Thus, reproductive justice does not simply challenge the researcher to critique power structures which shape participants’ lives, but also to challenge

the power structures in which they negotiate their own programs of research and research foci.

Those in nonclinically focused areas of work are perhaps even less likely to integrate the community and the consideration of “practical implications” *throughout* their research process. However, reproductive justice can play a critical role toward changing this, especially in light of the increased pressure placed on researchers to move away from their ivory towers and share their work in meaningful ways with the communities they study. The National Institutes of Health (NIH), for example, has specifically prioritized translational research after facing criticisms that the enormous resources being put into understanding disease mechanisms were not resulting in commensurate gains in new treatments, diagnostics, and prevention (Butler, 2008). This means researchers must approach the ways in which they ask questions, design studies, and disseminate findings from an applied lens as well as a basic one.

Although there is only a small body of reproductive justice research in the field of psychology to date, what exists demonstrates the importance of reproductive justice as a framework in practice, research, and application (e.g., Chrisler, 2012; Grzanka & Frantell, 2017; Morison & Herbert, 2018). For example, Chrisler (2012) brought together over twenty-five scholars to address reproductive rights from a transnational, human-rights perspective in her book *Reproductive Justice: A Global Concern*. A joint initiative from the American Psychological Association (APA) Divisions 35 (Society for the Study of Women in Psychology) and 52 (International Psychology), it served to expand the traditional focus of reproductive rights by including topics that are not often explicitly referred to as reproductive issues using the reproductive justice lens. For example, it included a chapter on infant-feeding options (Johnston-Robledo & Murray, 2012). However, there is a need for continued and systematic explorations that specifically highlight reproductive justice’s utility for answering today’s most pressing health inequities.

### **Our Goals and Vision for the Current Issue**

As reproductive justice centers and values social justice, those in our field embracing the tenants of reproductive justice are challenged to use them in our daily interactions with clients and students, the development of research ideas, and/or teaching approaches. To help guide the use of reproductive justice in the research process, specifically, we have identified three strategies that should be applied: acknowledge the specific contributions of WoC; analyze the dynamics of power, privilege, and oppression; and provide application to marginalized groups cross-culturally. The articles included in this issue each use these guidelines.

*Applications of reproductive justice acknowledge and clearly articulate their foundation in WoC’s experiences and knowledge. Naming WoC’s role in the*

founding of this framework is crucial for two reasons. First, learning and remembering the history of a thought invokes notions of agency, change, human progress, the role of material circumstances in human affairs, and relevance of historical events and norms for decision-making. Historically-situating findings and ideas also increases our comprehension of the constraints, opportunities, and forces informing human experiences in the present. Second, given the burgeoning plurality of voices in our field invoking intersectional and social justice paradigms, it is critical to distinguish the unique and parallel elements of reproductive justice.

- (1) *The roles of power, privilege, and oppression are integrated throughout the inquiry process.* Intentionally acknowledging these forces serves the dual purpose of positioning the researcher in their work, and the work in broader contexts. Specifically, this approach obligates researchers to consider their own privileged positions across research processes. Further, judiciously analyzing the roles of power, privilege, and oppression increases researchers' ability to understand their underlying mechanisms, and identify ways future work can address inequities that exist in our society. This is achieved through critical discussions examining the systematic political, economic, and social environment influences that contribute to societal imbalances negatively impacting behavioral outcomes.
- (2) *The utility of findings for improving the lives of marginalized groups in terms of structural/social change (e.g., policy and practice) nationally and internationally is addressed.* Although discussions of research, clinical, and practical implications typically suggest how research findings may be practically important and inform subsequent research, reproductive justice calls for movement beyond the traditional identification of gaps in the literature, and the unique contribution of the present study. Rather, reproductive justice applications require the initiation of a dialogue on action and steps toward liberation. This effort to address the gap between science and practice encourages a sense of joint ownership, mutual collaboration, and respect between researchers and relevant communities using accessible and scientifically rigorous approaches. This ensures that the research is not only an accessible and effective contributor to change efforts, but also has meaning for those that would most benefit from this knowledge.

### **Content of the Current Issue**

The current issue is an early step toward integrating these guiding reproductive justice frameworks into psychological research examining reproductive health cross-culturally. Toward this end, the articles selected for this issue are all

grounded within the discipline of psychology and its related praxis—although not all authors are psychologists. Further, each study also includes a section in the discussion focused on complicating the issue in terms of how it would look for different groups (e.g., immigrants), and considering the extent to which their sample and findings are WEIRD (Henrich et al., 2010). Authors of all articles have also been encouraged to transform their articles into one-page white articles, written in plain language and accessible to the public. Finally, there is considerable focus on future directions, as the point of reproductive justice is to ask questions about implications and to develop solutions and coalitions.

The selected articles highlight not only the utility of a focused issue on reproductive justice, but also its timeliness and importance. Beyond the diversity in population identities here (e.g., transgender and nonbinary people, fat people), there is a clear focus on the global application of reproductive justice, with articles on targeted populations from New Zealand (Huang, Sibley, & Osborne, in press), India (Stephens & Eaton, in press), Nicaragua (Grabe, Rodríguez Ramírez, & Dutt, in press), Canada (LaMarre, Rice, Cook & Friedman, in press), Australia (Riggs & Bartholomaeus, in press), and the United States (e.g., Smith, Sundstrom, & Delay, in press). Methodological diversity is also a hallmark of this issue, as the issue includes qualitative (Grzanka & Schuch, in press), quantitative (Huang, Sibley, & Osborne, in press), mixed methods (Riggs & Bartholomaeus, in press), and systematic review (McClelland, Dutcher, & Crawford, in press) research approaches.

In conclusion, it is hoped that this special issue reframes the relationship between research and practice on marginalized populations' reproductive health, and contributes to the ongoing development of efforts to apply reproductive justice across domains. In an increasingly global context, researchers and practitioners must become skilled at identifying and reflecting on the influence of power, privilege, and oppression (including their own) in the work they do. By disseminating accessible research that speaks directly to these issues, the field will be able to more accurately and adequately address the reproductive health experiences of marginalized people everywhere.

## References

- Adams, G., Estrada-Villalta, S., Sullivan, D., & Markus, H. R. (2019). The psychology of neoliberalism and the neoliberalism of psychology. *Journal of Social Issues, 75*(1), 189–216. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12305>
- Afable-Munsuz, A., & Brindis, C. D. (2006). Acculturation and the sexual and reproductive health of Latino youth in the United States: A literature review. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health, 38*(4), 208–219. <https://doi.org/10.1363/3820806>
- Asian Communities for Reproductive Justice [ACRJ]. (2005). *A new vision for advancing our movement for reproductive health, reproductive rights and reproductive justice*. Oakland, CA: Author.

- Aziz, M., & Smith, K. Y. (2011). Challenges and successes in linking HIV-infected women to care in the United States. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, *52*(Suppl\_2). <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciq047>
- Beach, M. C., Saha, S., Korthuis, P. T., Sharp, V., Cohn, J., Wilson, I. B., ... Moore, R. (2011). Patient-provider communication differs for black compared to white HIV-infected patients. *AIDS and Behavior*, *15*, 805–811. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10461-009-9664-5>
- Bilge, S. (2013). Intersectionality undone. *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race*, *10*(2), 405–424. <https://doi.org/10.10170/1742058X13000283>
- Boyd, B., Ruvalcaba, Y., Stephens, D. P., & Madhivanan, P. (2017). The effectiveness of HIV/AIDS interventions targeting Black college women: A systematic review. *Journal of Black Sexuality and Relationships*, *3*, 77–93. <https://doi.org/10.1353/bsr.2017.0014>
- Butler, D. (2008). Translational research: Crossing the valley of death. *Nature*, *453*, 840–842.
- Castillo-Mancilla, J. R., Cohn, S. E., Krishnan, S., Cespedes, M., Floris-Moore, M., Schulte, G., ... Smith, K. Y. (2014). Minorities remain underrepresented in HIV/AIDS research despite access to clinical trials. *HIV Clinical Trials*, *15*(1), 14–26. <https://doi.org/10.1310/hct1501-14>
- Chrisler, J. C. (2012). *Reproductive justice: A global concern*. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.
- Collins, P. H. (2008). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness and the politics of empowerment* (2nd ed.). 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*(8), 139–167.
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, *43*, 1241–1299. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039>
- Dalmida, S. G., Holstad, M. M., DiIorio, C., & Laderman, G. (2012). The meaning and use of spirituality among African American women living with HIV/AIDS. *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, *34*, 736–765. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0193945912443740>
- Fletcher, F., Ingram, L. A., Kerr, J., Buchberg, M., Richter, D. L., & Sowell, R. (2016). “She told them, oh that bitch got AIDS”: Experiences of multilevel HIV/AIDS-related stigma among African American women living with HIV/AIDS in the south. *AIDS Patient Care and STDs*, *30*, 349–356. <https://doi.org/10.1089/apc.2016.0026>
- Fray, N. A., & Caldwell, K. L. (2017). Communication between middle SES Black women and health-care providers about HIV testing. *Journal of the National Medical Association*, *109*(2), 115–125. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnma.2016.11.005>
- Gete, A., Sutton, M. Y., & Mccree, D. H. (2018). Social and structural determinants of HIV treatment and care among Black women living with HIV infection: A systematic review: 2005–2016. *AIDS Care*, *30*(4), 409–416. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540121.2018.1426827>
- Gilliam, M. L., Neustadt, A., & Gordon, R. (2009). A call to incorporate a reproductive justice agenda into reproductive health clinical practice and policy. *Contraception*, *79*, 243–246. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.contraception.2008.12.004>
- Glick, P. (2008). Restating the case: The benefits of diverse samples for theory development. *Psychological Inquiry*, *19*(2), 78–83. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10478400802049886>
- Grabe, S., Rodríguez Ramírez, D., & Dutt, A. (in press). Reproductive justice: The role of community-based organizational participation in reproductive decision-making and educational aspiration among women in Nicaragua. *Journal of Social Issues*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12377>
- Grzanka, P. R. (2017). Undoing the psychology of gender: Intersectional feminism and social science pedagogy. In K. A. Case (Ed.), *Intersectional pedagogy: Complicating identity and social justice* (pp. 63–81). New York, NY: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Grzanka, P. R., & Frantell, K. A. (2017). Counseling psychology and reproductive justice: A call to action. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *45*(3), 326–352. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000017699871>
- Grzanka, P. R., & Schuch, E. (in press). 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*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12363>
- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *33*(2–3), 61–83. <https://doi.org.ezproxy.fiu.edu/10.1017/S0140525X0999152X>



- hooks, b. (1984). *Feminist theory: From margin to center*. South End Press.
- Hoover, E., Cook, K., Plain, R., Sanchez, K., Waghiiyi, V., Miller, P., ... Carpenter, D. O. (2012). Indigenous peoples of North America: environmental exposures and reproductive justice. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, *120*(12), 1645–1649. <https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.1205422>
- Huang, Y., Sibley, C. G., & Osborne, D. (in press). Breast is best, but where? Benevolent and hostile sexism underlies women's opposition to public breastfeeding. *Journal of Social Issues*.
- Inhorn, M. C., & van Balen, F. (2002). *Infertility around the globe: New thinking on childlessness, gender, and reproductive technologies*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Javier, S. J., Abrams, J. A., Moore, M. P., & Belgrave, F. Z. (2018). Condom use efficacy and sexual communication skills among African American college women. *Health Promotion & Practice*, *19*(2), 287–294. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524839916676253>
- Johnston-Robledo, I., & Murray, A. (2012). Reproductive justice for women and infants: Restoring women's postpartum health and infant-feeding options. In J. C. Chrisler (Ed.), *Reproductive justice: A global concern* (pp. 269–286). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.
- Kelso, G. A., Cohen, M. H., Weber, K. M., Dale, S. K., Cruise, R. C., & Brody, L. R. (2014). Critical consciousness, racial and gender discrimination, and HIV disease markers in African American women with HIV. *AIDS and Behavior*, *18*, 1237–1246. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10461-013-0621-y>
- Kurtiş, T., & Adams, G. (2017). Decolonial intersectionality: Implications for theory, research, and pedagogy. In K. A. Case (Ed.), *Intersectional pedagogy: Complicating identity and social justice* (pp. 46–59). New York, NY: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- LaMarre, A., Rice, C., Cook, K., & Friedman, M. (in press). Fat reproductive justice: Navigating the boundaries of reproductive health care. *Journal of Social Issues*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12371>
- Leong, F. T. L., Holliday, B. G., Trimble, J. E., Padilla, A. M., & McCubbin, L. D. (2013). Ethnic minority psychology. In D. K. Freedheim & I. B. Weiner (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology: History of psychology* (pp. 530–561). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Lovibond, S. (1970). Pure and applied psychology: Towards a significant interaction. *Australian Psychologist*, *5*(2), 120–140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00050067008259880>
- Luna, Z. (2009). From rights to justice: Women of color changing the face of us reproductive rights organizing. *Societies without Borders*, *4*, 343–365. <https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/swb/vol4/iss3/4>
- Luna, Z. T. (2011). “The phrase of the day”: Examining contexts and co-optation of reproductive justice activism in the women's movement. In A. C. Snyder & P.S. Stephanie (Eds.), *Critical aspects of gender in conflict resolution, peacebuilding, and social movements (Research in social movements, conflicts and change, Vol. 32, pp. 219–246)*. Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada: Emerald Group Publishing Limited. [https://doi.org/10.1108/S0163-786X\(2011\)0000032013](https://doi.org/10.1108/S0163-786X(2011)0000032013)
- Luna, Z., & Luker, K. (2013). Reproductive justice. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, *9*, 327–352. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-102612-134037>
- McClelland, S. I., Dutcher, H., & Crawford, B. (in press). In the fabric of research: Racial and gender stereotypes in survey items assessing attitudes about abortion. *Journal of Social Issues*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12367>
- Morison, T., & Herbert, S. (2018). Rethinking ‘risk’ in sexual and reproductive health policy: The value of the reproductive justice framework. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13178-018-0351-z>
- Nielsen, M., Haun, D., Kärtner, J., & Legare, C. H. (2017). The persistent sampling bias in developmental psychology: A call to action. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, *162*, 31–38. <http://doi.org.ezproxy.fiu.edu/10.1016/j.jecp.2017.04.017>
- Nguyen, A. B., Clark, T. T., Hood, K. B., Corneille, M. A., Fitzgerald, A. Y., & Belgrave, F. Z. (2010). Beyond traditional gender roles and identity: Does reconceptualisation better predict condom-related outcomes for African-American women? *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, *12*(6), 603–617. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13691051003658127>
- Patil, V. (2013). From patriarchy to intersectionality: A transnational feminist assessment of how far we've really come. *Signs*, *38*(4), 847–867. <https://doi.org/10.1086/669560>

- Pierre-Victor, D., Stephens, D. P., Clarke, R., Gabbidon, K., & Madhivanan, P. (2017). Role of healthcare providers' recommendation style in HPV vaccine decision-making among Haitian parents and female patients. *Californian Journal of Health Promotion, 15*(3), 68–80. <https://doi.org/10.32398/cjhp.v15i3.1910>
- Rad, M. S., Martingano, A. J., & Ginges, J. (2018). Toward a psychology of Homo sapiens: Making psychological science more representative of the human population. *PNAS Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 115*(45), 11401–11405. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1721165115>
- Riggs, D. W., & Bartholomaeus, C. (in press). Towards trans reproductive justice: A qualitative analysis of views on fertility preservation for Australian transgender and non-binary people. *Journal of Social Issues*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12364>
- Rogers, A. (2015). How police brutality harms mothers: Linking police violence to the reproductive justice movement. *Hastings Race and Poverty Law Journal, 12*(2), 205–234. [https://repository.uchastings.edu/hastings\\_race\\_poverty\\_law\\_journal/vol12/iss2/4](https://repository.uchastings.edu/hastings_race_poverty_law_journal/vol12/iss2/4)
- Ross, L. J. (2018). Reproductive justice as intersectional feminist activism. *Souls Journal, 19*(13), 159–180. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10999949.2017.1389634>
- Sears, D. O. (1986). College sophomores in the laboratory: Influences of a narrow data base on social psychology's view of human nature. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 515–530. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.51.3.515>
- Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2002). Construct validity and external validity. In W. R. Shadish, T. D. Cook, & D. T. Campbell (Eds.), *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for generalized causal inference* (pp. 64–102). Belmont, CA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Sheldon, K. M., & King, L. (2001). Why positive psychology is necessary. *American Psychologist, 56*(3), 216–217. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.216>
- Silliman, J. M., Ross, L., Gutiérrez, E. R., & Fried, M. G. (2016). *Undivided rights: Women of color organizing for reproductive justice*. Chicago, IL: Haymarket Books.
- SisterSong (2018). Reproductive justice. SisterSong: Women of Color Reproductive Justice Collective. Accessed on January 1, 2020, Retrieved from [https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research\\_and\\_citation/apa\\_style/apa\\_formatting\\_and\\_style\\_guide/apa\\_changes\\_7th\\_edition.html](https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research_and_citation/apa_style/apa_formatting_and_style_guide/apa_changes_7th_edition.html)
- Smith, A. (2005). Beyond pro-choice versus pro-life: Women of color and reproductive justice. *National Women's Studies Association Journal, 17*(1), 119–140. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4317105>
- Smith, E., Sundstrom, B., & Delay, C. (in press). Listening to women: Understanding and challenging systems of power to achieve reproductive justice in South Carolina. *Journal of Social Issues*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12378>
- Stephens, D. P., & Eaton, A. A. (in press). Emerging adult Indian women's perceptions of support systems addressing intimate partner violence victimization. *Journal of Social Issues*.
- Stephens, D. P., Patil, V., & Thomas, T. L. (2012). STI prevention & control for women globally: A reproductive justice approach to understanding women's experiences. In J. Chrisler (Ed.) *Reproductive justice: A global concern* (pp. 117–144). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger Publishing.
- Sugarman, J. (2015). Neoliberalism and psychological ethics. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology, 35*(2), 103–116. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038960>
- Tornello, S. L., Riskind, R. G., & Patterson, C. J. (2014). Sexual orientation and sexual and reproductive health among adolescent young women in the United States. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 54*(2), 160–168. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2013.08.018>
- Toth, M., Messer, L. C., & Quinlivan, E. B. (2013). Barriers to HIV care for women of color living in the southeastern US are associated with physical symptoms, social environment, and self-determination. *AIDS Patient Care and STDs, 27*, 613–620. <https://doi.org/10.1089/apc.2013.0030>
- Verbiest, S., Malin, C. K., Drummonds, M., & Kotelchuck, M. (2016). Catalyzing a reproductive health and social justice movement. *Maternal and Child Health Journal, 20*(4), 741–748. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10995-015-1917-5>
- Warner, L. R., Settles, I. H., & Shields, S. A. (2016). Invited reflection: Intersectionality as an epistemological challenge to psychology. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 40*(2), 171–176. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684316641384>

Wyatt, G. E., Carmona, J. V., Loeb, T. B. & Williams, J. K. (2005). HIV-Positive Black women with histories of childhood sexual abuse: Patterns of substance use and barriers to health care. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved*, 16(4), 9–23. <https://doi.org/10.1353/hpu.2005.0120>.

ASIA A. EATON is a feminist social psychologist and Associate Professor of Psychology. Her research examines how gender intersects with identities such as race, sexual orientation, and class to affect individuals' access to and experience with power.

DIONNE P. STEPHENS is an Associate Professor of Psychology. Her research examines the influence of culturally specific beliefs across various sexual health outcomes.