Journal of Social Equity and Public Administration, 2025, 3(2): 293–308.
https://doi.org/10.24926/jsepa.v3i2.6260

Intersectionality in Practice: How Public Transit Agencies Understand and Apply Intersectionality in the Pursuit of Gender Equity

Josephine K. Hazelton-Boyle

Intersectionality offers public administrators great potential to understand the complex identities and lived experiences of the public and advance social equity. Conversations around intersectionality in public administration scholarship to date are primarily theoretical and have served an important role in introducing the concept to the field. However, gaps remain surrounding what it means for public administrators to apply an intersectional perspective to their work. This research builds on theoretical advancements to explore intersectionality in practice. Integrating a content analysis of all publicly available documents and websites posted by 129 U.S. public transit agencies with rich qualitative interviews with 45 U.S. public transit administrators, this research examines how transit administrators understand and apply intersectionality in the pursuit of gender equity. Findings from this research demonstrate specific areas in which transit administrators use intersectionality in their work to help create more equitable communities for all.

Introduction

Although transportation is a foundational necessity for full participation in society, not all groups experience mobility equally. Gender intersects with other personal and social identities to shape an individual's mobility experience. A growing body of literature grapples with questions of equity and mobility; however, much of the previous transportation literature on gender focuses on understanding women's experiences and mobility patterns. While this literature serves an important purpose in documenting that gender contributes to transportation inequity, much of the previous research lacks an intersectional perspective, which is problematic because gender cannot be extracted from its connections to other social identities such as race, ethnicity, sexuality, class, age, ability, religion, and immigration status. An intersectional perspective of gender equity allows a focus on gender without ignoring the ways in which gender is connected to other social identities.

Intersectionality is well-positioned to add rich new insights to understanding urban transportation equity and offers a valuable framework for administrators. In imagining a "feminist city," Kern (2020) argues that an intersectional feminist approach to urban transportation would expand conversations of gender beyond a male/female dichotomy.

To help move beyond the gender binary, Kern (2020) suggests researchers ask how efforts to respond to gender considerations can work in solidarity with other equity concerns instead of competing with one another. This study examines situations in which administrators have used intersectionality to transcend dualistic thinking that puts the needs of multiple groups in conflict with one another and find solutions that work for all.

Through the lens of transportation, this research works to advance an understanding of intersectionality in the applied work of public administrators. Although not a problem unique to public administration, the field's eagerness to dilute and categorize human experience reinforces the idea that identities are fixed and static. One way this occurs is through continued emphasis on aggregate social data, which fails to capture the intersections between data points and neglects to account for the relationship between categories. At times, the field of public administration has lost sight of the people that public agencies serve by overlooking the gaps and connections between data points by "superficially compartmentalizing" individuals (Sabharwal and Chordiya 2025, 25). Intersectionality presents

one way to understand the complex identities and lived experiences of the public by centering the voices of marginalized groups and working to democratize decision-making (Sabharwal and Chordiya 2025). This research explores the challenges and tensions associated with reliance on aggregate data and illustrates how using other ways of knowing can enrich the equity-focused work of public administrators.

Although intersectionality is often perceived to confront several of the hegemonic norms of public administration (Blessett 2020), in exploring how U.S. transit agencies apply intersectionality in their work, this research demonstrates that intersectionality is not inherently in conflict with other administrative values, and instead offers great potential for guiding administrators in their work.

Literature Review

Intersectionality: More Than Just a Buzzword

Intersectionality is concerned with the relationship between overlapping social identities as well as the corresponding relationship to systems of power (Collins and Bilge 2016). Although related concepts such as "triple oppression" and Critical Race Theory existed in the literature prior to identifying the term (Collins 2019) intersectionality was largely developed out of Black feminist legal scholarship (Crenshaw 1989; 1990). Coined by Kimberlé Crenshaw, intersectionality was introduced to understand the unique challenges of Black women that could not be attributed solely to their Black identity or their identity as a woman, but rather an interaction between the overlapping oppressions of racism and sexism (Crenshaw 1989).

Intersectionality adopts a post-structuralist view of identities such as race, gender, sexuality, and class (Bilge 2010; Collins and Bilge 2016). Emphasis is given to the socially-constructed nature of categories of identity and experience. In this way, identity is not fixed and unified, but rather, fluid and changing. Dhamoon (2011) depicts this as a matrix to illustrate that human identities are not stable, nor do they operate in isolation. Therefore, the focus of intersectionality is the relationship between different identities and the corresponding relationships with systems of power. With this understanding of how human identities are inextricably intertwined, it becomes impossible to "separate out" a particular identity and conceptualize it in complete isolation from its relationship to other identities (Collins 2000; Dhamoon 2011). This challenges positivist tendencies to apply static categories to identities and treat them as independent variables (Carastathis 2014). Hancock (2007) argues that intersectionality's focus on relationality changes the public policy focus:

> [M]ultiple marginalizations of race, class, gender, or sexual orientation at the individual and institutional levels create social and political stratification, requiring policy solutions that are attuned to the interactions of these categories. Intersectionality theory claims that these policy problems are more than the sum of mutually exclusive parts; they create an interlocking prison from which there is no escape. (65)

In other words, intersectional work and research must resist the tendency to explore questions of inequity by "adding together" social variables because it would be contrary to the fundamental premise of intersectionality's emphasis on the interaction between social identities.

Heckler and Starke (2020) note that some have critiqued intersectionality for its continued reliance on the categorization of human identity. However, it is important to distinguish that an intersectional approach to categories of identity is distinct. For positivists, identities are categorized for the purpose of isolating, knowing, and predicting (Carastathis 2014; Smith 1998). The assumption is that identities are stable and uniform. Whereas, intersectionality is rooted in the belief that identity is fluid and changing (Dhamoon, 2011). This understanding acknowledges that there is variance within social identities and many operate along a spectrum (Heckler and Starke 2020). The strength of intersectionality is in what Cho, Crenshaw, and McCall (2013) refer to as "an intersectional way of *thinking* about the problem of sameness and difference" (795).

Intersectionality provides a way of conceptualizing the dynamic and evolving nature of human identity in a way that theorizes and responds to social inequalities. Much of the work of Patricia Hill Collins has focused on expanding this way of thinking about social issues to develop intersectionality as a theory that responds to social inequity (Collins 2019). Collins, along with Sirma Bilge (2016), identify and explain six core tenets of intersectionality: social inequalities, relationality, power, social context, complexity, and social justice. These six ideas capture the spirit of intersectionality and are described in Table 1.

Collins (2019) argues that intersectionality does not need to be a grand narrative that is all-encompassing, but

Table 1. Core Tenets of Intersectionality

Social Equity	• Intersectionality is fundamentally concerned with addressing social inequalities. • Intersectionality takes a distinct approach to viewing social equity; social inequities are not discussed in isolation but in relation to one another. • Discussing inequities in relation to one another gives each other deeper meaning.
Relationality	• Essential for intersectionality as social identities cannot be extracted and discussed or studied in isolation from one another. • Resists dualistic thinking that pits concepts against one another in competition for scarce resources. • Intersectionality embraces a both/and approach that focuses on connections rather than an either/or frame.
Power	• Central for intersectionality as power structures uphold oppression and inequity. • Power is maintained through social structures. • Power imbalances are reinforced through multiple avenues including language and epistemic privilege; in this context, epistemic privilege refers to placing greater value and importance on the ideas and experiences of those operating privileged positions in society. • In an intersectional framework, power is also conceptualized as power relations, acknowledging, for example, that racism and sexism cannot be fully understood in isolation but in relation to one another.
Social Context	• Social identities and power structures do not exist in a vacuum; they exist within historical, cultural, geographical, political, and economic contexts. • Intersectionality recognizes that it is imperative to recognize the social context and cultural specificity when examining issues of identity.
Complexity	• Intersectionality is complex and the inherent complexity should be embraced. • Practicing intersectionality involves resisting the tendency and desire to reduce the complexity of intersectional work by seeking a "one-size-fits-all" standardized approach, which creates "blinders" and limits the ability to see certain connections.
Social Justice	• Intersectional work must recognize that all inequities are rooted in historical contexts. • Applying intersectionality involves recognizing historical injustices in the work for equity.

Source: Adapted from the intersectionality framework developed by Collins and Bilge (2016).

rather, should be used in instances where it can provide a framework for understanding and addressing social inequity. Intersectionality does have limits, and therefore should be employed as a means to accomplish certain theoretic contributions but does not need to go beyond that of which it is designed (Collins 2019). While various scholars have cautioned against prescriptive requirements for intersectionality, fear of intersectionality becoming a meaningless "buzzword" suggests that intersectionality should retain some unifying concepts, most notably the focus on relationality (Hancock 2007).

Intersectionality will be used in the presentation and analysis of the findings of this research by retaining its position as a unique analytic framework. In public administration, scholars such as Stivers (2002) and Bearfield (2009) have long argued for considering gender and race in connection to one another, but retaining commitment to the core tenets described above offers potential to more fully appreciate intersectionality's potential for public administration.

Intersectionality has gained relatively little traction in the field of public administration to date, which Blessett (2020) attributes to the fact that intersectionality confronts many of the hegemonic norms of the field, particularly the emphasis on efficiency and economic values. As some argue that social transformation is necessary to achieve social equity (Collins 2019), questions remain what this means for public administration's reliance on incremental change over radical or systemic change.

For public administration, intersectionality offers more than just acknowledging that individual and social identities matter, but it is a way of conceptualizing identity in a manner that theorizes and responds to social inequity. Although placing methodological limits or prescriptions on what can be considered intersectional research could be difficult or even problematic (Collins

2019), intersectional research embraces the complexity of studying identity and leverages such complexity to achieve new understandings of equity. Most importantly, public administration scholars must recognize that social equity is enduring, and new inequities continue to emerge, which means that social equity work is an ongoing challenge and never done (Gooden 2015); a challenge for which intersectionality and a commitment to its core tenets are well-equipped.

Gender Equity and Mobility

Gender differences in transportation use, perceptions, and needs are observed worldwide. Njoh (1999), for example, finds that gendered mobility disparities in Cameroon are reflective, in part, of a history of colonialism and economic turmoil, which are exacerbated by a lack of gender-conscious transportation planning. Some countries have deeply rooted policies and cultural practices that limit women's access to transportation and their ability to travel without a male companion (Domosh and Seager 2001). In the United States, policies and practices to restrict women's spatial mobility are often implicit (e.g., ignoring the impact of gender on mobility needs or failing to accommodate transit passengers traveling with strollers and young children) and control of their spatial mobility is often executed in a far more subtle manner (Laws 1997). For example, when places are not designed to accommodate women's safety needs, women may self-limit their behavior and choose not to travel certain places or at certain times of day (Valentine 1992). When transportation fails to be responsive to the mobility needs of marginalized members of the public, transportation planning and policy, as the prior literature suggests, is situated as a tool that reinforces societal hierarchies and institutionalizes mobility restrictions for women and gender minorities (Domosh and Seager 2001).

These policies and practices have different impacts on the way individuals physically move. Throughout her lifetime, a woman's transportation needs change, and obstacles to mobility can be diverse and varied and dependent on personal circumstances such as pregnancy and parenthood, especially since women are more likely to travel with young children (Laws 1997; Lopata 1980). A large body of literature has documented women's distinct transportation needs and revealed differences in travel patterns (Hayden 2002; McGuckin and Murakami 1999), destinations and trip purpose (Krizek, Johnson, and Tilahun 2005; Rosenbloom 2004; Wachs 1992), as well as mode choice and routes traveled (Akar, Fischer, and Namgung 2013; Krizek, Johnson, and Tilahun 2005; Primerano, Pitaksringkarn, and Tisato 2008). Data indicates that women, on average, make more walking trips than men and make up a slight majority (55%) of U.S. public transit ridership overall (Rennert, Fung, and Harvey 2024). It is also important to recognize much of the gender and transportation literature is concerned with the disproportionate violence, harassment, and perceived vulnerability women and gender minorities experience in the public sphere and particularly on public transit (Loukaitou-Sideris and Fink 2009; Lubitow et al. 2017; Valentine 1992).

Additionally, transportation needs and experiences are influenced by a myriad of social and economic factors (Clarke 2017; Martens 2016). In this way, gender identity intersects with other forms of personal or group identity (including race, ethnicity, sexuality, class, age, ability, religion, and immigration status) and this presents challenges, complicates mobility needs, and further contributes to the ways in which mobility options differentially serve individuals based on their identity. For example, Hutchinson's (2003) research reveals how race, gender, and economic status shape transit passengers' experiences. Hutchinson (2003) finds that low-income women of color not only face barriers in accessing transit services but are subject to harassment and stigma associated with using public transportation.

Social Equity and Transportation Administration

Several scholars in public administration such as Gerard Wellman and Sam Larson have argued why public transit services, and the decisions of public transit administrators, matter for social equity (see, for example, Larson 2020; Wellman 2015a, 2015b). The decisions made by transit administrators have a direct impact on the lived experiences of the public:

> Few public administrators wield as much power over the life chances and outcomes of poor populations as transit administrators; their selections between policy alternatives determine which jobs transit dependents can access and when, how much they must pay for transit, how long they must spend en route to destinations, and which locations will be inaccessible except by foot. (Wellman 2015a, 123)

Not only do transit administrators make decisions that directly influence the mobility experience, they

also can help serve as advocates for their communities in conversations with policymakers. In examining how transit administrators perceive the stigma associated with public transit ridership, Hazelton-Boyle and Wellman (2022) find that policy elites perpetuate transit stigma, which administrators can help mitigate.

Transportation administrators wield power in influencing the mobility outcomes of the public. Writing within the context of urban planners, Healey (2003) argues that what they perceive to be "normal" or "correct" becomes embedded in administrative practices, which reinforces and reflects certain assumptions. It is, therefore, important to examine how public transit agencies understand intersectionality and how intersectionality can help advance gender equity in transit.

Methodology

Research Question and Study Design

This study is designed to answer the following primary research question: "How do U.S. public transit agencies apply intersectionality in their gender equity work?" A two-stage qualitative study was designed to answer the research question. First, a document analysis of all publicly-available planning documents, policies, program reports, and agency websites from 129 U.S. transit agencies was conducted to understand how agencies publicly discuss concepts and topics related to intersectionality and gender equity to the population they serve (see the subsequent section below for more detail on agency selection). Document analyses are aimed at systematically analyzing text in context to derive meaning and insight on a particular topic (Tracy 2013). Relevant documents from each qualifying U.S. transit agency were located through an internet-based search as well as by systematically reviewing transit agency websites. The collected documents were then uploaded and analyzed using MAXQDA qualitative coding software. Key search terms were informed by existing theory and literature and aimed at capturing relevant mentions of gender, intersectionality, and related concepts. The document analysis process categorized agencies on the extent to which gender and intersectionality were publicly discussed, which helped to identify which agencies were contacted for an interview as well as shape the context of interviews with public transit administrators.

In-depth, semi-structured interviews with public transit administrators from U.S. public transit agencies were then conducted to gain an understanding of perceptions and experiences addressing issues related to intersectionality and gender equity in public transit. Using a semi-structured interview protocol, an interview guide was used to frame conversations around pre-determined topics, while allowing for flexibility and probes as the interviews evolve (Rubin and Rubin 2012). After an introduction to the research and the researcher, interviews began with a series of broad questions around gender and gender equity in transit to prompt interviewees to discuss their experiences, behaviors, actions, and examples from their work. Questions were also asked to discern whether they approach their work through an intersectional lens.

Subsequent questions asked about what they are doing to address gender-related mobility challenges. If interviewees conveyed an understanding of intersectionality, then interviewees were asked to describe specific examples where intersectionality applies to their work. Given the semi-structured nature of the interview guide, probes and follow-up questions were utilized throughout the interview to clarify meaning, deepen the conversation, and inquire about nuances and specific examples. The questions were worded in a manner to facilitate depth and open-ended responses. To help ensure an accurate interpretation of the data, the interviewer did not use the words "intersectionality" or "intersections" in questioning unless an interviewee had previously done so themselves.

Agency and Interviewee Selection

To identify agencies for inclusion in this study, the planning, service, and financial data for every U.S. urban transit agency was retrieved from the Urban Integrated National Transit Database. All agencies serving a metropolitan statistical area (MSA) population greater than 500,000 with an operating budget of at least $10 million were included in the study. This follows parameters previously established in the transit administration literature (see Wellman, 2015a, for example). In total, 129 public transit agencies met the criteria for MSA population and operating expenditures. For each of the 129 agencies included in the document and analysis process, all publicly available agency documents and websites were systematically searched for key terms to capture discussions of intersectionality and gender equity as well as related concepts and topics. The key search terms were informed by existing research and theory and designed

to detect mentions of topics relevant to this research. In total, 28 key search terms were used including: gender, equity, women, woman, womxn, men, man, girls, girl, boys, boy, female, male, trans, transgender, transsexual, non-binary, nonconforming, gender queer, intersectionality, LGBT, harassment, sexual violence, sex trafficking, trip-chaining, stroller, childcare, and caretaking. The documents and webpage information were retrieved over a period of three months (June-August 2021); each agency's documents and webpages were systematically reviewed at two different points during the period to help achieve completeness.

All documents and webpages containing the key search terms were retrieved and uploaded to MAXQDA for analysis. The documents retrieved for each agency were analyzed in their entirety to understand the extent to which gender is discussed in public documents as well as the context surrounding mentions of gender and intersectionality. Each of the 129 agencies was given a corresponding gender-inclusivity ranking based on the extent to which the agency's documents discussed gender equity and intersectionality.

In total, 79 agencies were classified as "Low Intersectional Gender-Inclusivity"; 41 agencies as "Moderate Intersectional Gender-Inclusivity"; and nine as "High Intersectional Gender-Inclusivity." Defining characteristics for agencies in the "Low Intersectional Gender-Inclusivity" category include little or no mention of gender/related topics, policies or practices in place that could potentially disadvantage marginalized groups, and no recognition of intersectionality. For these agencies, if gender was mentioned, it was typically only in the context of general nondiscrimination statements and/or equal opportunity statements. "Moderate Intersectional Gender-Inclusivity" agencies had some mention of gender and other equity-related topics but lacked intersectional considerations. Agencies in this category had specific examples of gender equity considerations mentioned, but they were either limited in scope or isolated instances. Agencies in the "High Intersectional Gender-Inclusivity" category publicly discussed intersectionality (either explicitly or implicitly) in discussions of gender-responsive efforts. Agencies in this category had formal gender-responsive policies and practices in place that were discussed.

In selecting transit agencies for participation, the goal was to carefully promote representation within several important factors that may have influenced how agencies view and pursue gender equity. Four factors were used in the agency selection criteria: 1) intersectional gender inclusivity categories from the document analysis process; 2) geographic diversity (to maintain diverse representation from all U.S. Census divisions); 3) Metropolitan Statistical Area population of transit agency (500,000–4 million and greater than 4 million); and 4) modes of transit service provided. In total, 30 agencies were selected for participation in the interview portion of the study. Four other agencies declined participation by virtue of nonresponse; in these cases, alternate agencies meeting similar selection criteria were identified.

The aim of the interviewee selection process was to conduct an interview with the highest-ranking transportation administrator from each agency that met the following selection criteria: 1) has regular direct involvement with their agency's transit planning and decision-making processes; 2) has knowledgeable insight into transit operations decisions; and 3) has involvement with their agency's public engagement processes. It was also a requirement that interviewees have a minimum of one year tenure with the agency. Organizational charts were collected for each agency to determine the highest-ranking transit planning administrators. Potential interviewees were contacted via email, introduced to the research, and the criteria for selection were discussed. Participants were then invited to participate in an interview via phone or video conferencing. If interviewees did not meet the selection criteria, they were asked to identify the next highest-ranking transit administrator and the same protocol was followed. Interviewees were provided with informed consent information detailing their rights as a participant prior to the interview. In some cases during the interview, questions were asked that were outside of the knowledge or experience of the selected interviewee. In these situations, interviewees provided the contact information of another administrator within the agency and the same procedure for interviewee recruitment and participation was followed. For some agencies, one interviewee could provide adequate insight into all the topics of the research, whereas other interviewees' job duties were narrower in scope and multiple interviews were needed from the agency to fully explore all topics of study. Interviews were conducted with administrators from each agency until all content areas of the interview could be discussed, resulting in a total of 45 interviews with participants from the 30 U.S. transit agencies. Position titles held by

interviewees included General Manager/CEO, Chief of Planning, Transit Planner, Title VI Director and Chief of Operations. It is important to also note that the number of interviews was not strictly predetermined prior to starting the research. IRB was approved based on an approximate range determined by the goals of this research and norms established in the literature. The actual number of interviews conducted reflected an effort to maintain a diverse representation of important agency criteria described above, ensuring interviewees from each agency could knowledgably speak to all areas of study. Interviews continued until data saturation was reached (Maxwell 2013). Data saturation is achieved when the interviews continue to reveal similar patterns and no new significant themes emerge (Maxwell 2013; Tracy 2013). Utilizing active listening techniques and note taking during the interview as well as drafting summative memos at the conclusion of each interview to document major topics discussed helped to determine when data saturation was reached.

Interviews ranged in length from approximately 35 minutes to one hour and 40 minutes, with an average of 48 minutes in length. Interviewees were guaranteed anonymity, an important measure to promote participant openness and truthfulness (Rubin and Rubin 2012; Tracy 2013). All interviews were electronically recorded and transcribed to prepare for analysis.

Data Analysis and Data Trustworthiness

The primary data analysis method involved coding the public documents and interview transcripts using MAXQDA qualitative coding software. The goal of the active coding process was to lead to a "total immersion" into the data to understand complexities and nuances while deriving meaning (Saldana 2015, 41). Documents and interview transcripts were read in their entirety and a directed coding method was used to systematically code the corpus of the data. Following the directed coding technique, the primary and subcodes were established based on the topic and derived from existing theory. The theory and literature streams informing this coding step include intersectionality theory, gendered mobility, and transportation administration. This technique is useful for conceptually organizing the data and working to extend a theoretical framework (Saldana 2015).

During the second coding phase, the data were reread and an axial coding method was used to organize codes and subcodes around nodes to recognize conceptual themes and establish connections across the data (Saldana 2015). In this phase, the coding was centered around the primary codes while allowing for additional codes and subcodes to capture emergent patterns and themes. Axial coding was used as the process, and it is particularly useful for revealing meaningful connections across the data (Saldana 2015). From the cyclical coding process, the meaning of the data can be generated, analyzed, and understood.

Several methods were used during the research process to maintain trustworthiness of the findings. First, the researcher made continuous efforts to check their biases during the research design and analysis stage to prevent forming premature conclusions. Throughout the interview process and the data analysis stage, the researcher frequently met with two expert peers to discuss emerging patterns and themes. Peer debriefing can be an important step in checking researcher biases and accurately interpreting qualitative findings (Roller and Lavrankas 2015; Vogel and Hazelton-Boyle 2024). In this research, the peer debriefing process with other experts involved establishing regular meetings to help make sense of the initial data, connect findings to existing theory, interrogate and address researcher biases through reflexivity, and gain advice in addressing any emergent challenges or concerns. The peer debriefing process was particularly valuable in this research for helping to process the often-heavy topics that were discussed in the interviews. Additionally, multiple strategies described by Maxwell (2013), including respondent validation, negative cases, and triangulation were used to promote rigorous analysis and trustworthy results. Respondent validation techniques were regularly used during the interviews to confirm that the researcher correctly understood what was being communicated by the interviewee. Maxwell (2013) argues respondent validation "is the single most important way of ruling out the possibility of misinterpreting the meaning of what participants say" (p. 244). Another technique utilized in the analysis involved searching for negative cases, or the intentional effort of examining potential discrepant data to check for alternate explanations of the findings and help ensure accurate conclusions are drawn from the data (Maxwell 2013). Additionally, conducting both the content analysis and interviews helped to facilitate data triangulation across multiple sources and types of data during the data analysis phase. Triangulation is an important step in maintaining trustworthiness of the data (Lune and Berg 2017; Maxwell 2013). Using thick descriptions

and direct quotations from interviews in the presentation of the findings further promotes accuracy and authenticity of the results (Brower, Abolafia, and Carr 2000).

Findings

This section integrates interview data as well as data from the publicly available documents and websites to discuss how intersectionality is present in the work of transit agencies. While no interviewee claimed they or their agency apply an intersectional view to the entirety of their work in transit, a majority of interviewees representing agencies in the "moderate intersectional gender-inclusivity" category and all interviewees representing "high intersectional gender-inclusivity" agencies discussed elements of how they view their work and gender equity in a manner that aligns with intersectionality. This suggests that intersectionality is understood by a greater number of agencies than suggested by analyzing publicly available documents, as only the nine "high intersectional gender-inclusivity" agencies publicly discussed concepts related to intersectionality.

Before discussing each theme in turn, Table 2 provides an overview of the findings as well as connections to the core tenets of intersectionality advanced by Collins and Bilge (2016) discussed previously. While the core tenets are interconnected, Table 2 identifies the ones most exemplified by each theme. As a reminder, the interviewer did not use the terms "intersectionality" or "intersections" in questioning unless the interviewee had previously named and discussed it themselves.

Intersectionality as an Analytic Tool

The primary way in which intersectionality is used in the work of public transit agencies and administrators involved in this study is as an analytic tool. The analytic tool is useful for administrators to orient themselves to their work broadly and provides a distinct lens for pursuing equity considerations. Interviewees embracing intersectionality frequently explained how intersectionality enables administrators to situate contemporary challenges within broader social, economic, and historical contexts. Discussing the impetus for bringing equity into the decision-making conversation in their agency, one interviewee stated:

> To be honest, we only started a lot of these conversations very recently, within the past couple of years. They happened because of what was going on in our country. For too long, transit ignored what was going on in our society. But I very much think about these big issues like the #MeToo movement, George Floyd and police violence toward Black and Brown folks, rising homelessness, economic inequality and uncertainty brought about by the COVID-19 pandemic, and recently we've seen an increase in violence toward Asian-Americans in public spaces. All of these things do affect our transit agency and we can't just pretend they aren't happening. (Interviewee #19)

Similarly, in publicly discussing the agency's anti-harassment efforts, the Metro Transit Minneapolis website states:

Table 2. Overview of Findings and Connections to Core Tenets of Intersectionality

Theme	Description	Core Tenets of Intersectionality Exemplified
Intersectionality as an Analytic Tool	Intersectionality is used as a means for administrators to orient themselves to their work and provides a distinct lens for pursuing equity considerations in transit	• Relationality • Social context • Social equity • Complexity • Power • Social justice
Intersectionality to Respond to Conflicting Transit Safety Concerns	Intersectionality is used by transit administrators to recognize and respond to differing safety concerns	• Relationality • Social justice • Power
Applying Intersectionality to Data and Decision-Making	Intersectionality is used to address shortcomings of commonly used transit data; intersectionality is used in decision-making to advance social equity	• Relationality • Complexity • Social equity

> We understand our community is hurting, whether from pandemic-related discrimination against Asian-Americans and Pacific Islanders; the weight of the recent police killings and related trial and civil unrest; or the ongoing issues of gender-based or sexual harassment.

Relatedly, several interviewees recognized the importance of making the connection between systems of power and gender inequity in thinking about contemporary equity challenges:

> We can't talk about gender equity without first understanding sexism and misogyny and how prevalent they are in our society and sort of built into our transit systems. And then things like transphobia, homophobia, rape culture further perpetuate systems of gender inequity. (Interviewee #32)

Many interviewees were actively aware of the historical role transit has played in furthering social inequities, and interviewees see recognizing this as crucial to their current work as transit administrators, as an interviewee described:

> There's a lot of ways in which there have been attacks on the mind, body, and spirit specifically of Black, Indigenous, and Native women and Latinx women as well. So, to truly be equitable and inclusive means we have to come to terms with what our role has been in the past with that, because most people have not been intentional and transparent and open about this kind of work throughout their entire systems. (Interviewee #16)

Finally, agencies that viewed gender equity within an intersectional frame recognized that the pursuit of equity is an ongoing and complex process. An interviewee discusses how in their view, the complexity of equity work should be embraced:

> Our agency has "check the box syndrome" where we feel like we've done the diversity thing or the equity thing, and really, what we need to understand is that this is a journey; and it is going to be full of bumps and roadblocks. This stuff is messy and complex and that is okay. I think some people find it unsettling that equity work isn't finished and that you have to have a consistent commitment to making our system better for everyone. There shouldn't be a destination with equity work, there's always more to do. (Interviewee # 40)

Embracing, rather than resisting, the complexity as well as the ongoing and evolving nature of equity work is an important component of being able to use intersectionality as an analytic tool in the practice of public administration.

Highlights from Practice: Bay Area Rapid Transit's Not One More Girl Initiative

One exemplary example of an agency integrating intersectionality as a foundational concept in their work to achieve gender equity is San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit's (BART) "Not One More Girl" initiative. "Not One More Girl" initiative is a campaign "led primarily by girls and gender-expansive youth of color, aimed at stopping gender-based violence and sexual harassment on public transportation" (BART 2023). An interviewee explained that before launching the campaign, the initiative leaders (which included the youth leaders in partnership with top BART officials and partnering local nonprofits), undertook a systematic process to understand the experiences that girls and gender expansive youth of color have when riding BART:

> We talked to as many people as we could. We went into local schools to talk to as many girls as possible and hear their experiences on our service. *We wanted to better understand the direct experience of girls and gender expansive youth of color because the overlapping of marginalized identities does in fact shape a unique experience when using our system . . .* They had a lot to share, some of which was really heartbreaking. And their direct lived experiences really steered the direction of the campaign. (Interviewee #23)

"Not One More Girl" seeks to not only mitigate harassment but, "dismantle the systems that have enabled gender-based violence and instead create systems of empowerment for riders," according to the agency website. The campaign, which includes the slogan of "*mas feminismo, menos machismo*," Spanish for more feminism and less machismo, contains a range of efforts from

awareness of the importance of bystander intervention, the addition of sexual harassment as a reporting category for BART police, the hiring of transit ambassadors and crisis intervention specialists as well as a range of resources of victims of sexual harassment or violence, including nonpolice resources.

Information about the campaign's effort to eliminate gender-based violence and sexual harassment on transit was shared using visual art, a zine (a self-published booklet), and more traditional campaign posters. The initiative also includes "healing kids" that were developed by the girls and gender-expansive youth of color that include items such as healing crystals, spoken word poems, wellness journal prompts, affirmations for girls, a healing meditation, and a feminist anthems Spotify playlist to help victims of gender-based violence and sexual harassment in their healing journey.

The agency website specifically discusses how the anti-harassment campaign was carefully designed to avoid placing responsibility on the person being assaulted. The youth involved in helping to lead the campaign were paid $18 per hour for their work, which an interviewee from the agency stated, "Paying them was a non-negotiable. . . . We insisted they be paid for their work, because we value their work and their ideas" (Interviewee #23).

The campaign culminated with a series of signage and posters on transit vehicles. Two of the posters from the campaign, depicted in Figure 1, feature girls and gender-expansive youth of color to publicly raise awareness about the harassment they experience and that it is not tolerated by the agency.

Intersectionality to Respond to Competing Transit Safety Concerns

As argued by Collins and Bilge (2016), intersectionality offers a frame that resists dualistic thinking that puts concepts against one another and in competition for scarce resources. While this concept of relationality is certainly difficult and not adopted in most cases, there are several examples from this study, primarily in "high intersectional gender-inclusivity" agencies, where transit agencies are embracing relationality to work to address the gender-specific transit safety needs of multiple groups simultaneously. Interviewees emphasized that this differs from prevailing prior approaches, which place the safety needs of different groups in competition with one another.

Interviewees often described how safety on transit is one of the primary concerns they hear from the public; however, interviewees explain that various groups have differing perceptions of what would make them feel safe on transit. For example, White women typically report wanting additional police presence on transit to feel safe, whereas Black men describe that because of increasing police officer-involved violence toward Black men, transit police do not make them feel safe. An interviewee explains that

Figure 1. Posters from Bay Area Transit's Not One More Girl Campaign

Source: BART (2021).

in their view, carefully understanding and responding to this tension through a trauma-informed lens is crucial for achieving equity:

> If we want to achieve gender equity, I think we have to recognize how our transit systems have contributed to the trauma that people of different genders and groups carry when using our system. We have Black men traumatized by our transit police force and we have so many women and LGBTQIA folks who carry the trauma of past sexual harassment. And anything we do in the name of equity has to be trauma informed and we have to work to prevent further trauma and further harm. (Interviewee #16)

Similarly, another interviewee described hearing this tension from members of the public when their agency did a public outreach campaign:

> We really clearly saw differences in what was being asked for by different groups of people. And women were almost across the board asking for additional police presence, naming safety as their first concern and one of the biggest impacts on their navigation of our system. And then we had Black men saying that they don't ride because of the police and the police presence inherently makes them feel unwelcome there. We spoke to formerly incarcerated folks who said they would come out of being in the carceral system and would get on public transportation, and when there was a police officer there, their trauma response and understanding of what they were supposed to do in those moments got completely disoriented and they didn't feel comfortable or safe to be there. So, you know, how do we hold both of those things and how do we hold them at the same time? We're working on answering that, but we know looking at alternatives to police presence has to happen. (Interviewee #23)

Another interviewee also described the importance of reevaluating the use of transit police to ensure the safety of transit users:

> We are a white city in a very white state, and for a long time our agency's response to any safety concern was more police, more police, more police. And we have a lot of white women who use our system during the middle of the day who say they want more police to make them feel safer. But with all of the conversations our country has had recently, now we're taking a step back and recognizing that policing cannot be the answer. Since I am a Black woman, I've had other Black people and countless Black men who rely on our system tell me that when they see a police officer get on their train, they get off and walk to their destination or wait for the next train. So, our transit police do not make everyone automatically feel safer and we are recognizing that." (Interviewee #2)

Recognizing that race and gender intersect to contribute to differing safety needs on public transit and perceptions of police officers, agencies are employing a variety of techniques aimed at working to ensure everyone feels safe on transit. One of the primary alternatives to armed officers discussed by interviewees is hiring community ambassadors trained in de-escalation and/or mental health professionals. When asked about alternatives to armed officers, one interviewee explained:

> We are rolling out a lot of alternatives, like our community ambassadors, who are riding the trains unarmed and with the intention of having those eyes on the train, but in a way that leads with care and concern and not with aggression and assuming the worst. (Interviewee #32)

In describing their agency's community ambassadors program, another interviewee discussed the importance of mental health professionals in responding to transit incidents:

> We recently hired a therapist who works with the transit ambassadors and plan to hire two more, so the hope is that when there's a mental health crisis, the transit ambassadors respond instead of transit police and get someone immediate help. (Interviewee #41)

Other alternatives to armed policing frequently discussed by agencies in this study that recognize the

importance of balancing safety concerns include increased training for transit operators, designing transit stops with increased safety measures, adopting mobile phone apps and increased electronic signage, and enhanced lighting. The King County Metro Transit Department Strategic Plan discusses a myriad of proposed nonpolice safety-enhancing features that will add to the safety of women and gender and sexual minorities:

> These (safety enhancing features) will promote a feeling of physical and emotional safety, improving the customer experience, and helping increase transit usage. Amenities could include lighting, shelters, seating, accessible signage (including real-time information signs), informational campaigns, and setbacks from traffic lanes. Such amenities will focus on areas with higher proportions of priority populations and will promote greater safety for women and LGBTQIA+ people. (King County Metro Strategic Plan for Public Transportation 2021–2031, 50)

Applying Intersectionality to Data and Decision-Making

A key aspect of intersectionality is viewing social inequities not in isolation, but in connection to one another (Collins and Blige 2016). This important way of conceptualizing social equity was recognized by a majority of interviewees in the "moderate intersectional gender inclusivity" category (71%) and all in the "high intersectional gender inclusivity" category, but as one interviewee explained, is not the primary way in which social equity is viewed within transit and has implications for the data and information used to inform decision-making:

> I get really frustrated with a lot of the conversations around social equity that happen in our department. When we talk about equity stuff, we get so caught up on looking at race or income or gender or people with disabilities by themselves. It's almost like some people forget that you can be in all categories at once. For instance, you can be a poor Latina with a disability. And those people do exist! And they exist on our very own system! But the way in which we conduct our equity analyses currently totally misses the point and tries to put people in these tiny boxes they don't fit into. (Interviewee #31)

Traditionally, mostly quantitative data is used to inform a majority of transit decisions. While such data has its strengths, it often involves aggregate data with strict categorization of individuals, which overlooks the interconnected and intersectional nature of the communities in which transit serves. Several interviewees explained how they use their understanding of intersectionality to challenge decisions that are made by simple categorizations and aggregate data without acknowledging the limitations:

> I am always trying to make sure our decisions embrace an intersectional understanding…We still make data-informed decisions, but I have been working to make sure that data is heavily contextualized. (Interviewee #31)

For the agencies and interviewees who recognized the importance of considering inequities in connection to one another, doing so often requires changing the types of decision-making information. Several interviewees described their work to incorporate qualitative data in an attempt to understand the connections and relationships between different groups, as described by the following interviewee:

> We recently took a hard look at how we collect data and the types of data we collect and decided to incorporate some qualitative stuff to supplement in certain areas. So far, we've conducted some virtual focus groups, and they were really eye-opening for me. I used to consider myself a numbers guy—and I still do—but I learned through our focus groups that the numbers don't always paint the whole picture of what is going on with our riders. (Interviewee #18)

Another interviewee from a different agency also stated:

> The numbers are one thing, but they don't tell the whole story. We recently have also been really pushing for focus groups to try to understand how some of these complex and intertwined equity issues come into play in transit. (Interviewee #45)

These examples suggest that intersectionality has the potential to serve as an important tool informing the work of public administrators, particularly when traditional approaches fall short.

Highlights from Practice: Los Angeles Metro's Understanding How Women Travel Report

In 2019, the Los Angeles Metro released *Understanding How Women Travel*, a comprehensive analysis of women's travel patterns in Los Angeles with the purpose of developing action items and informing future transportation policy and decision-making. The report is the only case from the data in this study where a transit agency analyzed comprehensive gender-based transit needs throughout their service area in a detailed and systematic manner. The findings revealed significant differences in how women travel, including that in comparison to men, women tend to take many more trips, shorter trips, travel to more destinations, and conduct more caretaking trips. In addition, the report found that women are more likely to trip-chain (combining multiple designations into a single trip) and more likely to travel midday when transit service is reduced. The report concludes that these findings of women's travel patterns:

> Show that women may need to adjust their own schedule and travel needs to accommodate others, and in doing so, give up some of their own autonomy and control over when and how they travel. (9)

The report explicitly acknowledged how the agency has traditionally relied on aggregate data, which ignores the specific mobility needs of women and how gender intersects with other marginalized identities:

> Even in cases where gender information is collected, the agency has never disaggregated its data analysis by gender to understand the unique travel patterns and preferences of women. Despite the known gender disparities in travel behaviors, the data and analysis that inform the most important transportation planning decisions at Metro remain gender neutral. (Understanding How Women Travel, 5)

The report goes on to explain that in addition to disaggregating data, qualitative methods including participant observation, interviews, focus groups, participatory workshops, and "pop up workshops" were used to capture the intersectional needs and identify the specific and unique travel burdens experienced by women of color, women with disabilities, older women, women traveling with children, and women below the poverty line.

Intersectionality and Stroller and Fare Policies

Another area in which transit agencies in this study are actively using an intersectional approach is by modifying transit policies to reflect that gender and parenthood intersect to shape distinct mobility challenges. One area in which this comes up frequently is surrounding whether to allow open strollers onboard transit vehicles. Official websites for agencies such as Cleveland Regional Transit District, San Francisco Muni, and Metro Transit Minneapolis describe recent changes to their policies that allow for children to remain in strollers while in transit. Interviewees working for agencies that made such stroller policy changes described the importance of recognizing how gender intersects with parenthood to shape mobility challenges, such as the difficulty of requiring folded strollers:

> I am a single mom and I know firsthand how difficult it is to have a squirmy toddler in one arm and a folded stroller in another. It was myself and several other moms in our agency who really pushed [agency] to change the stroller policy. Our official policy now is that as long as the child is secured in the stroller and the stroller brake is on and the stroller is not blocking the aisle, then we welcome open strollers. I think it was a great thing for women and children. (Interviewee #14)

Additionally, agencies describe the financial challenges of passengers who are primarily women, traveling with young children. The Denver Regional Transportation District planning documents acknowledge that the agency's existing fare policy is a burden for minority communities, including women and LGBTQ individuals, and seek their feedback in the agency's fare study.

Interviewees frequently described their agency's efforts to reduce the cost of traveling with children. While many agencies have policies allowing children under a certain age to ride for free, other agencies limit the number of children who can ride for free with each adult, and others require children to pay full fare. One interviewee described their view of the importance of a reduced child fare:

> We're looking at reducing the cost of traveling with children and hope to launch a 50% off for children's fare next year. Think about it, women traveling with three children, that adds up and it is expensive for them to use transit. (Interviewee #45)

Another interviewee described starting preliminary conversations around raising the age of children who ride for free:

> Right now, we allow children under six to travel for free with an adult, but I've started conversations around "what if we increase that to 12?" I believe that would make a big impact for women, especially low-income women, traveling with children. (Interviewee #37)

Discussion

Through the perspective of U.S. public transit agencies, this research demonstrates that intersectionality can be and is used as a meaningful lens to inform the practice of public administration and further equity-related work. This study revealed that intersectionality helps administrators recognize the complicated interconnectedness between systems of power and personal identity, which in turn, provides a useful framework for helping administrators better respond to the unique equity-related challenges experienced by the public they serve.

This study revealed that there are specific areas in which public transit administrators have used intersectionality to directly inform their work. From balancing differing safety needs, to the data and information used in transit decision-making, to ensuring transit policies are inclusive, intersectionality is used by transit administrators in specific scenarios to serve the public more equitably. Intersectionality scholars have argued that transformational change is needed to fully embrace intersectionality and achieve equity outcomes (see Collins 2019). However, many of the scenarios revealed in this study where intersectionality is practiced are small, incremental measures. This is unsurprising given the norms of public administration favor incremental changes over radical, transformational change (Blessett 2020). Further research would benefit from exploring the long-term potential and impact of incrementally pursuing intersectionality.

While this research helped to document the importance of intersectionality and examine instances where intersectionality informs public transit administration, it is important to reiterate that a majority of transit agencies involved in this study were found to lack an intersectional understanding and approach in their work. Therefore, additional work is needed to ensure agencies understand that a failure to utilize intersectionality in situations where it is warranted may perpetuate and institutionalize inequities.

All of the "high intersectional gender-inclusivity" agencies, which publicly discussed intersectionality are in historically politically liberal cities, which may help explain why the agency publicly values gender equity and practices intersectionality, as equity efforts within public agencies are often influenced by the views of the public in which they serve (Guy and McCandless 2020). However, other agencies and interviewees embracing intersectionality in their work are from cities and states with a wide range of political leanings, suggesting further research is needed to understand the locus of considering intersectionality within agencies. Additionally, this study focused on transit agencies with an MSA population of 500,000 and above and at least a $10 million operating budget. Future research would benefit from examining the ways in which intersectionality informs the work of smaller transit agencies.

Some of the scenarios in this study where intersectionality is considered are described by participants as being in the discussion or planning stages. This suggests that intersectionality is gaining traction in the work of transit agencies but has not been a priority for an extended period of time. Since these efforts are recent, many interviewees communicated they do not have ample resources to understand what other agencies are doing; hopefully, this research serves as one touchstone for transit agencies as intersectionality in transit becomes an increasingly important framework for transit administration.

Conclusion

Transit does not exist within a raceless, classless, genderless vacuum, and transit agencies must recognize that intersectionality offers an important framework for conceptualizing and responding to the interconnected nature of social identities that shape an individual's vulnerability when using public transportation. While this research sought to be robust and comprehensive, it is not an attempt at making vast generalizations or capturing every instance in which intersectionality is used in practice. Rather, this research serves to take conversa-

tions on intersectionality in public administration from theory to practice by demonstrating ways in which practitioners understand and apply intersectionality in their work. In so doing, it is clear that intersectionality offers practitioners significant opportunity to more fully understand and respond to disparities and help create more equitable communities for all.

Acknowledgments: This research was funded by the U.S. Department of Transportation's Dwight David Eisenhower Transportation Fellowship Program.

The author would like to thank the 45 interviewees who made this research possible by generously sharing their time, experience, and expertise.

References

Akar, Gulsah, Nicholas Fischer, and Mi Namgung. 2013. "Bicycling Choice and Gender Case Study: The Ohio State University." *International Journal of Sustainable Transportation* 7 (5): 347–365. https://doi.org/10.1080/15568318.2012.673694

BART.2021. "Not One More Girl Phase I." Accessed at https://www.bart.gov/guide/safety/gbv/phase-2

Bearfield, Domonic A. 2009. "Equity at the Intersection: Public Administration and the Study of Gender." *Public Administration Review* 69 (3): 383–386. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2009.01985.x

Blessett, Brandi. 2020. "Rethinking the Administrative State Through an Intersectional Framework." *Administrative Theory & Praxis* 42 (1): 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1080/10841806.2018.1517526

Brower, Ralph S., Mitchel Y. Abolafia, and Jered B. Carr. 2000. "On Improving Qualitative Methods in Public Administration Research." *Administration & Society* 32 (4): 363–397. https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399002201947

Carastathis, Anna. 2014. "The Concept of Intersectionality in Feminist Theory." *Philosophy Compass* 9 (5): 304–314. https://doi.org/10.1111/phc3.12129

Clarke, Hugh. 2017. "Who Rides Public Transportation: The Backbone of a Multimodal Lifestyle." American Public Transportation Association. Accessed at https://www.apta.com/wp-content/uploads/Resources/resources/reportsandpublications/Documents/APTA-Who-Rides-Public-Transportation-2017.pdf

Cho, Sumi, Kimberlé Williams Crenshaw, and Leslie McCall. 2013. "Toward a Field of Intersectionality Studies: Theory, Applications, and Praxis." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 38 (4): 785–810. https://doi.org/10.1086/669608

Collins, Patricia Hill. 2000. "Gender, Black Feminism, and Black Political Economy." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 568 (1): 41–53. https://doi.org/10.1177/000271620056800105

Collins, Patricia Hill. 2019. *Intersectionality as Critical Social Theory*. Duke University Press.

Collins, Patricia Hill and Sirma Bilge. 2016. *Intersectionality*. Polity Press.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé. 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 (1): 139–167.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé. 1990. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color." *Stanford Law Review* 43 (6): 1241–1299. https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039

Dhamoon, Rita Kaur. 2011. "Considerations on Mainstreaming Intersectionality." *Political Research Quarterly* 64 (1): 230–243. https://doi.org/10.1177/106591291037922

Domosh, Mona and Joni Seager. 2001. *Putting Women in Place: Feminist Geographers Make Sense of the World*. Guilford Press.

Guy, Mary E., and Sean A. McCandless. 2020. *Achieving Social Equity: From Problems to Solutions*. Melvin & Leigh.

Hancock, Ange-Marie. 2007. "When Multiplication Doesn't Equal Quick Addition: Examining Intersectionality as a Research Paradigm." *Perspectives on Politics* 5 (1): 63–79. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592707070065

Hayden, Dolores. 2002. *Redesigning the American Dream: The Future of Housing, Work, and Family Life*. W.W. Norton.

Hazelton-Boyle, Josephine K., and Gerard C. Wellman. 2022. "Transit Stigma: Transit Administrators' Views of the Role of Policy Elites in Perpetuating Stigma." *Public Works Management & Policy* 27 (3): 252–264. https://doi.org/10.1177/1087724X221088859

Healey, Patsy. 2003. "Collaborative Planning in Perspective." *Planning Theory* 2 (2): 101–123. https://doi.org/10.1177/14730952030022002

Heckler, Nuri, and Anthony M. Starke. 2020. "At the Intersection of Identities." In *Achieving Social Equity: From Problems to Solutions*, edited by Mary E. Guy and Sean A. McCandless, 53–64. Melvin & Leigh Publishers.

Hutchinson, Sikivu. 2003. *Imagining Transit: Race, Gender, and Transportation Politics in Los Angeles*. Peter Lang.

Kern, Leslie. 2020. *Feminist City: Claiming Space in a Man-Made World*. Verso Books.

Krizek, Kevin J., Pamela Jo Johnson, and Nebiyou Tilahun. 2005. "Gender Differences in Bicycling Behavior and Facility Preferences." *Research on Women's Issues in Transportation* 2 (35): 31–40.

Larson, Samantha. 2020. "Exploring How Transit Practitioners Navigate Nervousness." *Public Administration Quarterly* 44 (1): 31–68. https://doi.org/10.1177/0734914920044001 02

Laws, Glenda. 1997. "Women's Life Courses, Spatial Mobility, and State Policies." In *Thresholds in Feminist Geography: Difference, Methodology, Representation*, edited by John Paul Jones, Heidi J. Nast, and Susan M. Roberts, Rowman & Littlefield, 47–64.

Lopata, Helena Znaniecki. 1980. "The Chicago Woman: A Study of Patterns of Mobility and Transportation." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 5 (3): S161–S169.

Loukaitou-Sideris, Anastasia, and Camille Fink. 2009. "Addressing Women's Fear of Victimization in Transportation Settings: A Survey of US Transit Agencies." *Urban Affairs Review* 44 (4): 554–587. https://doi.org/10.1177/1078087408322874

Lubitow, Amy, JaDee Carathers, Maura Kelly, and Miriam Abelson. 2017. "Transmobilities: Mobility, Harassment, and Violence Experienced by Transgender and Gender Nonconforming Public Transit Riders in Portland, Oregon." *Gender, Place & Culture* 24 (10): 1398–1418. https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2017.1382451

Lune, Howard, and Bruce L. Berg. 2017. *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. Pearson.

Maxwell, Joseph A. 2013. *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach*. Sage.

Martens, Karel. 2016. *Transport Justice: Designing Fair Transportation Systems*. Routledge.

McGuckin, Nancy, and Elaine Murakami. 1999. "Examining Trip-Chaining Behavior: Comparison of Travel by Men and Women." *Transportation Research Record* 1693 (1): 79–85. https://doi.org/10.3141/1693-12

Njoh, Ambe J. 1999. "Gender-Biased Transportation Planning in Sub-Saharan Africa with Special Reference to Cameroon." *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 34 (2): 216–234. https://doi.org/10.1163/156852199X00275

Primerano, Frank, Michael A.P. Taylor, Ladda Pitaksringkarn, and Peter Tisato. 2008. "Defining and Understanding Trip Chaining Behaviour." *Transportation* 35 (1): 55–72. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11116-007-9134-8

Rennert, Lindiwe, Lauren Fung, and Donovan Harvey. 2024. "Transit Agency Leaders Rarely Reflect the Race and Gender Diversity of the Populations They Serve." *Urban Wire*. Accessed July 31, 2024. https://www..urban.org/urban-wire/transit-agency-leaders-rarely-reflect-race-and-gender-diversity-populations-they-serve

Roller, Margaret R., and Paul J. Lavrakas. 2015. *Applied Qualitative Research Design: A Total Quality Framework Approach*. Guilford Press.

Rosenbloom, Sandra. 2004. "Understanding Women's and Men's Travel Patterns." Paper presented at the Conference on Research of Women's Issues in Transportation.

Rubin, Herbert J., and Irene S. Rubin. 2012. *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. Sage.

Sabharwal, Meghna and Chordiya, Rashmi. 2025. "Doing Equity Work 'Equitably': How an Intersectional Approach Helps." In *Achieving Social Equity: From Problems to Solutions*, 2nd ed., edited by Mary E. Guy and Sean A. McCandless, 24–34. Melvin & Leigh.

Saldaña, Johnny. 2015. *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*, 3rd ed. Sage.

Smith, Mark J. 1998. *Social Science in Question: Towards a Postdisciplinary Framework*. Sage.

Stivers, Camilla. 2002. *Gender Images in Public Administration: Legitimacy and the Administrative State*. Sage.

Tracy, Sarah J. 2013. *Qualitative Research Methods: Collecting Evidence, Crafting Analysis, Communicating Impact*. John Wiley & Sons.

Valentine, Gill. 1992. "Images of Danger: Women's Sources of Information About the Spatial Distribution of Male Violence." *Area* 24 (1): 22–29.

Vogel, Morgan D., and Josephine K. Hazelton-Boyle. 2024. "Where Do We Go from Here? A Co-authored Autoethnographic Reflection on the Emotional Labor of Qualitative Interviewing and How to Navigate It." *Public Integrity* 26 (6): 686–699. https://doi.org/10.1080/10999922.2023.2219113

Wachs, Martin. 1992. "Men, Women, and Urban Travel: The Persistence of Separate Spheres." In *The Car and the City: The Automobile, the Built Environment, and Daily Urban Life,* edited by Martin Wachs and Margaret Crawford, 86–100. The University of Michigan Press.

Wellman, Gerard C. 2015a. "The Social Justice (of) Movement: How Public Transportation Administrators Define Social Justice." *Public Administration Quarterly* 39 (1): 117–146.

Wellman, Gerard C. 2015b. "Citizens or Customers? Transit Agency Approaches to Community Engagement." *Journal of Public Transportation* 18 (1): 1–11. https://doi.org/10.5038/2375-0901.18.1.8

Josephine K. Hazelton-Boyle, PhD (she/her) (jhazeltonboyle@csufresno.edu) is an assistant professor of public administration at California State University, Fresno and a faculty fellow with the Fresno State Transportation Institute. Her research interests include issues of fairness in transportation administration and policy, administrative decision-making, and intersectional feminist theory. She received her PhD in public administration from the University of Nebraska at Omaha.