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Abstract

Using an integrative methodology, this literature review examined critical feminist nursing knowledge around the concepts of biology, anatomy, and physiology in nursing literature in the Cumulative Literature Index of Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINHAL) and Google Scholar databases from approximately 1966 – 2010. The researcher found no literature in these databases that directly addressed the concepts from a critical feminist perspective. A number of articles and a few research reports did engage with these concepts indirectly through the concept of ‘the body’ and through specific disease processes such as breast cancer, menopause, and heart disease. After analyzing for how the key concepts were discussed, it was found that in the literature, biology caused disease and the body experienced it. Themes of ‘Dichotomies’, ‘Moving toward and Away From’, and ‘Assumptions of Nursing Epistemology’ are discussed. The literature is replete with dichotomies perhaps as a result of using a feminist perspective. Also perhaps due to the feminist perspective, there is a movement toward the social body and away from the biological body. Implicit in the literature was the understanding that biomedical and medical knowledge is translated into nursing knowledge in practice. Further research is suggested to undergo a critical feminist critique for gender, class, and race bias in knowledge presented in nurse education on the topics of biology, anatomy, and physiology.
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Introduction

This literature review will answer the question, “What is the current state of nursing knowledge from the perspective of a critical feminist concerning biology, anatomy, and physiology?”. Considering the overwhelming proportion of women in nursing, nursing’s historical subordination to male physicians and administrators, and the social context of nursing in an historically patriarchal Canadian and American society, a critical feminist critique of epistemology used in nursing is necessary for emancipatory knowledge development. If the socially unacknowledged forces of prejudice based on gender, class, and race are not made visible through critique, then injustices will continue and be perpetuated by the discipline and profession of nursing itself. Nursing education, practice, and research are three prominent areas that can unwittingly perpetuate prejudice, but also can be points where discourse can be interrupted and change can occur. Thus, to begin nursing on a path toward equitable health for all, the science, discipline, and practice of nursing needs to critically examine the foundations of the epistemology that undergirds it. It is this investigation into the influence of feminism on the knowledge used in nursing practice and used in nursing education that is the topic of this literature review.

An integrative literature review is appropriate for this topic because there is little nursing knowledge development around this topic, thus a review of past empirical and/or theoretical literature “may lead to an initial or preliminary conceptualization of the topic” (Torraco, 2005, p. 357). When I discussed my interest in the topic of knowledge development for nursing from a critical feminist perspective with nurse scholars, it became apparent that I might not find many research or other discussions in nursing journals. After a preliminary
literature search turned up no “hits” in the electronic databases, I knew that an integrated
literature review would help direct me to un-earth what knowledge there was surrounding this
topic. This literature review will consist of situating the problem within current nursing
ejpistemology and a brief re-telling of the historical relationship between feminism, nursing, and
biology. Most of the paper will be taken up with the methodology of the literature review, my
interpretation of chosen articles, critical analysis, conclusions, and possibilities for future
research.

**Situating the Problem**

In the discipline and practice of nursing there has been much discussion about what
nurses do and what the foci of concern are, but there is little research into, or articulation of,
the epistemological foundation of nursing. (Rodgers, 2005; Schultz & Meleis, 1998). Research
into epistemology in nursing asks the questions, how do nurses know what they think they
know, what do nurses know, how is nursing knowledge structured and on what basis are
knowledge claims made (Schultz & Meleis). In order to provide a background into how these
questions have or have not been addressed in the discipline of nursing, I will provide a very
brief overview of the history of epistemology in nursing.

The epistemology of nursing has historically been grounded in the “domain of women,
where care and comfort became the dominant ethic” (Baines, 1993; Cronin & Rawlings-
Anderson, 2004, p. 8). The work of nurses was seen as a natural, instinctive ability that did not
require an epistemological foundation (Cronin & Rawlings-Anderson) and founded in the ideas
of duty, responsibility, beneficence, and altruism (Rodgers, 2005). Florence Nightingale
attempted to distinguish a unique epistemological basis apart from medicine, by basing nursing
knowledge in the concepts of environment and health. Her efforts in defining nursing practice led to the formal education of young middle-class, white, women, however the basis for this training remained in an ethic of women’s caring (Rodgers).

As nursing care became more influenced by medicine, the need for more formal education in biology and anatomy became obvious and it was physicians who provided this content (Rodgers, 2005). Through nursing education, the language, goals, and scientific epistemology of medicine were incorporated into the knowledge base of nursing (Cronin & Rawlings-Anderson, 2004). By the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, young women who were admitted into nursing school, through social training, were already expected to know much of what Nightingale distinguished as nursing knowledge of the environment and health (Risjord, 2010). This knowledge was taken as ‘natural’ and thus was hidden in the practice of nursing where as medical knowledge was the subject of formal lecture (Risjord). Beginning in the post war era and continuing through the 1950s and 1960s, nursing continued to take on more technical responsibilities which was an impetus toward professionalization, more extensive education, and expansion of nursing education into universities (McPherson, 2003). Professionalization meant that nursing, as a discipline and profession needed to identify an epistemological base and build their knowledge base through research (Risjord).

Zander (2007) states that many in nursing consider Carper’s four ways of knowing as the epistemological base for nursing (Carper, 1978; Munhall, 2007; Schultz & Meleis, 1998). In the years since Carper’s seminal article, this epistemological base has been criticized. Criticisms of Carper’s ways of knowing include, that the epistemology was almost purely from a scientific perspective, that the ways of knowing lacked enough ontological depth, that they were not
integrated, and that the ways of knowing were exhaustive rather than subject to revision (Zander). Other perspectives on nursing’s ways of knowing that have been theorized are experience, intuition, unknowing, and sociopolitical knowing (Munhall; Zander). Donaldson and Crowley (as cited in Munhall, 2007) postulate three concerns of nursing, which are, “principles and laws that govern life processes, well-being, and optimal functioning of human beings, sick or well; patterning of human behavior in interaction with the environment in critical life situations; the processes by which positive changes in health status are affected” (p. 83).

Fawcett (1984) states that nursing is concerned with four metaparadigm concepts: person, who is the recipient of care; environment, which is comprised of significant other, the physical environment, and the healthcare setting; health, defined as the wellness or illness state of the recipient in the nursing situation; and nursing actions on behalf of or in conjunction with the person. Paterson and Zderad (as cited in Munhall) state that nursing knowledge emerged from researching the nursing situations of comfort, nurturance, clinical, empathy, and ‘all-at-once’.

The American Nurses Association postulate that the epistemology of nursing comes from concerns of “human experiences and responses across the lifespan” (American Nurses Association, 2003, p. 7). Fawcett posits that the three themes of nursing as stated by Donaldson and Crowley and the metaparadigm of nursing are linked together with Carper’s four ways of knowing. These multiple ways of knowing and perspectives lead to a rather large domain of inquiry for research.

Since Carper’s seminal article in 1978 there has been much change in the practice of nursing. In Carper’s time the ideal of building a distinct discipline of nursing with its own epistemological foundation was a goal to be reached. However, over the past 32 years the
epistemological foundation of nursing seems to be thin due to lack of complexity of those
original ways of knowing, lack of consensus on what nursing is, insufficient theoretical
development, the overwhelming weight of knowledge in nursing that is based on an empirical
way of knowing, and lack of critical critique to reveal underlying values, beliefs and
assumptions.

Currently, Evidence Based Practice (EBP) has gained a firm foothold in directing the
discipline of nursing (Porter, 2000). Porter states that, “the core of EBP is the utilization of
information concerning the most effective approaches to care that have been established using
the most rigorous methods available, ideally the randomized controlled trial (RCT)” (p. 5). RCTs
emerge from a purely naturalistic paradigm of science, which largely informs medical
epistemology.

This brief and incomplete overview gives us a glimpse at the complex nature of nursing’s
epistemological foundation. Munhall states that current perspectives in nursing research and
theory have evolved from rather eclectic thought (Munhall, 2007). Munhall goes on to state
that nursing is “all over the place”. I would have to agree that nursing, as a distinct
science/discipline has not unified due to its lack of a strong unique epistemological base; its
borrowing of fundamental knowledge from other disciplines, such as medicine; its continued
valorization of on-the-job training; anecdotal knowledge; and, considering the eclectic
evolution of nursing knowledge, the lack of critique of the epistemological origins of
knowledge. Further critique of the foundational epistemology that nurses currently use is
needed in order to direct research into the continued development of an epistemology that is
based in nursing’s themes and metaparadigm concepts. Particular to this literature review, a
critical feminist critique of past and present feminist influences shaping dominant
epistemologies used in nursing in Canada and the United States of America is necessary in order
to discover the relationship between feminism, nursing and the subjects of biology, anatomy,
and physiology.

**Historical Relationship Between Feminism, Nursing, and Biology**

Popular histories of feminism seen and heard recounted in magazines, movies,
documentaries and the plethora of ways of disseminating ‘news’, may state that feminism
began with the ‘hippy’ and ‘free love’ movement of the 1960’s, but Bunting and Campbell
(1990) place feminist thought much earlier. Perhaps the name was coined in the 1960’s, but the
feminist perspective was recorded beginning in the 1300s (Bunting & Campbell). Feminism has
been historicized by categorizing the focus of the movement at the time (Bunting & Campbell;
Chinn & Wheeler, 1985; Kane & Thomas, 2000). Beginning with French feminist Christine de
Pisan in the 1300s to Enlightenment feminist theory from 1770 to 1870, then Cultural feminism
in the 19th century, and finally Radical feminism as current. Chinn (1985) states there are four
‘types’ of feminism, one coming right after the other; liberal, Marxist, socialist, and radical.
Although each have a different focus they all endorse women, critique male thinking, challenge
patriarchal systems, and focus on creating self-love and self-respect among women (Chinn,
1985).

Despite nursing being identified in prehistoric time (Bunting & Campbell, 1990),
‘modern nursing’ is chronicled from when Florence Nightingale popularized it as distinct from
medicine and as a female profession concerned with the environment of healing (Holliday &
Parker, 1997). Bunting and Campbell, Chinn and Wheeler (1985), and Holliday and Parker agree
that Florence Nightingale had a feminist perspective, but she refused to participate in the feminist movement of her time. Chinn and Wheeler state that this tradition has been passed on in nursing and continues today.

The relationship between nursing and feminism is described as obscure (Chinn, 1999) and strained (Kane & Thomas, 2000). Historical nursing accounts state that the feminist movement ignored feminized professions such as nursing, which nursing saw as a lack of respect for the profession that lead to feminist nurses hiding their association with nursing (Kane & Thomas). Bunting and Campbell (1990) state that nursing also chose to align themselves with other socially powerful professions such as medicine in their path of professionalization efforts instead of joining the feminist movement of the 1960s and 1970s.

Although nursing and feminism share some philosophical views such as “reverence for life, the environment, and the individual’s uniqueness” (Kane & Thomas, 2000, p. 18) these similarities have not been acknowledged as a link to feminism because of the difference in expression of these ideals in feminism and in nursing (Kane & Thomas). Feminist scholars and leaders have criticized the patriarchal nature of science, including biology and medicine (Birke, 1986; Hubbard, Henifin, & Fried, 1979; Rosser, 1992). Feminist scholars’ chief argument is that the medical sciences take the position that women’s social position is grounded in their biology (Birke, 1986; Fried, 1979; Haraway, 1996; Leigh Star, 1979; Rosser, 1992). Thus if women’s ‘inferiority’ to men is placed in the female biology, then social change to rectify social inequalities is mis-guided (Birke, 1986). Where as feminists critiqued the male dominated medical sciences, nursing aligned themselves with medical knowledge in the move toward professionalization (Kane & Thomas, Bunding & Campbell). In this embrace of medical
knowledge they unwittingly “accepted ‘patriarchy in the guise of the medical model and rejected the intuitive knowledge founded in practice as unscientific and valueless’” (Wuest, 1993 in Kane & Thomas, p. 22). Thus, feminism focuses its philosophical views without deference to the existing male dominated social structure, but nursing has embraced it and is embedded in the existing male dominated sciences and practices their philosophy in a paternalistic healthcare system.

**Literature Search Stage**

At the heart of a quality and useful literature review is a well defined and informed literature search. Given the fairly easy and quick access to the mass of knowledge that is made available by the internet and computers, creating a literature source from which to draw data is an overwhelming task. To be able to think my way through all of this information and to be able to construct intelligent summations and unique conclusions, Hart (2008) suggests a questioning and critical attitude to the knowledge encountered. My first step was to become familiar with the topics of feminism and its relation to biology and to nursing as stated in the literature. As suggested by Hart, I began with generally accepted definitions of these topics as stated in encyclopedias, dictionaries, and text books and then moved on to a literature search of scholarly journals.

**Encyclopedia and Dictionary Definitions**

**Feminism.**

A key topic in my literature review that I needed to find a generally accepted definition for is feminism and feminist philosophy. The first source of background information came from the Encyclopedia Britannica via the UVic online source database. According to this source,
feminism is characterized as having 3 waves of modern fairly organized feminism. The first wave was in the late 19th and early 20th century in the US to gain the vote; the 2nd wave beginning in 1960 – 1970 to gain equal rights in the US; and the 3rd as a freedom of expression of rights. There are three “theories” or focuses of feminism. Liberal or Mainstream feminism, is known for its concrete and pragmatic change focus; Radical feminism includes the ideas of reshaping society and its structures to suit women; and Cultural or “difference” feminism which emphasizes the celebration of being a woman. Other fractures in a single theory of feminism have arisen from difficulties with race and class divisions (Encyclopedia Britannica, n.d.-b).

According to the Canadian encyclopedia (Eichler & Lavigne, n.d.), feminism is described as a social justice movement, characterized by the groups that were formed and the issues that were addressed. “The New Women’s Movement” began in the late 1960’s. During the 1970’s the movement went from a few radical groups to include women from varying classes and races. Main causes were “creating a just society for women means the elimination of sexism in all areas, particularly in the legal system, in the organization of social production, in the perception and treatment of women’s bodies, and in the arts, sciences, religion, education and the mass media” (Eichler & Lavigne, n.p.).

I looked to the Oxford Dictionary (n.d.-b) for definitions of ‘feminism’ and found, “1. The qualities of females, 2. Advocacy of the rights of women (based on the theory of equality of the sexes), 3. The development of female secondary sexual characteristics in a male” (n.p.). Webster’s New World College Dictionary (Neufeldt, 1988) defined it as “1. feminine qualities 2 a) the principle that woman should have political, economic, and social rights equal to those of men, 2 b) the movement to win such rights for women” (p. 498). Dictionary.com (n.d.-c)
defined ‘feminism’ as “1. the doctrine advocating social, political, and all other rights of women equal to those of men, 2. (sometimes initial capital letter) an organized movement for the attainment of such rights for women, 3. feminine character” (n.p.). These dictionary definitions assume a stable category of women, make a distinct sexual category of female, and conceptualize feminism as fighting for women to have the same rights as men. These definitions argue from a dichotomous standpoint, such as men vs. women and feminine vs. masculine and thus re-enforce the existing structure of Western society.

**Feminist Philosophy.**

The Encyclopedia Britannia (Encyclopedia Britannica, n.d.-c) describes feminist philosophy as having an emphasis on the role of gender. This encyclopedia states that feminist philosophy criticizes the man dominated history of philosophy and its constructs, such as rationality and objectivity, impersonal and abstract rights and principles in ethics. With the growing feminist movement in the 1960s women who were in philosophy became more critical of the role of gender in their discipline. Critiquing their professions from a feminist perspective brought forth philosophical topics for debate. Such topics were “independence and self-determination, domination or subordination, standards of knowledge, re-construction of philosophical, theoretical, and research questions, gender and how that relates to cultural and political norms” (n.p.). From these debates three types of feminism emerged: liberal feminism (equal rights), socialist feminism (labour and economic), and radical feminism (sexuality). Philosophical issues that have been taken up are: agency, ethics, and epistemology and philosophy of science. The Canadian Encyclopedia had no result for “feminist philosophy” and there were no results in either encyclopedia for “feminist theory”.
Also of central importance is the idea of nursing and how it is generally thought of as reflected in fairly enduring knowledge bases of encyclopedias and dictionaries. The first dictionary, Encyclopedia Britannica (Encyclopedia Britannica, n.d.-d) states, “nursing is work that is defined by categories of illness such as Diabetic nursing or by social structure, such as community health nursing or by age, such as children, women, geriatric nursing. Practice consists of health promotion, education, provider of health services and caring” (n.p.). The Canadian Encyclopedia (Jensen, n.d.) states, “nursing began in Quebec at about 1639 by nurses of religious orders (Augustinian Hospitallers from France, Grey Nuns)” (n.p.). They had hospitals built in various locations across Canada. The first school of nursing was begun in 1874 by Dr. T. Mack at the General and Marine Hospital in St. Catharines, Ontario. Then at the Toronto General Hospital and Montreal General Hospital the Victorian Order of Nursing began in about 1897 and served the sick in the West. The precursor to the Canadian Nurses Association (CNA) began the movement to gain a better educational preparation by moving nursing education into the universities and community colleges.

Dictionary definitions are also fairly enduring sources for knowledge. I have quoted two print dictionary and one online dictionary. The Oxford dictionary (n.d.) defines nursing as “The action of nurse v. (in various senses); The practice or profession of providing health care as a nurse; the duties of a nurse” (n.p.). The Webster’s New World College Dictionary states that nursing is “a woman hired to take full care of another’s young child or children; nursemaid, a person trained to take care of the sick, injured, or aged, to assist surgeons, etc.; specif., a registered nurse or a practical nurse” (n.p.). In addition, Dictionary.com states that nursing is “a
person formally educated and trained in the care of the sick or infirmed; compare nurse-midwife, nurse-practitioner, physician's assistant, practical nurse, registered nurse; a woman who has the general care of a child or children; dry nurse; a woman employed to suckle an infant; wet nurse; any fostering agency or influence” (n.p.). It seems clear from these definitions that nursing involves, for the most part, a woman caring for the ill or helping someone else to care for the sick or infirmed. Additionally there is a strong link between the domestic and professional definitions of nursing. With such enduring definitions of nursing and nurse, it is easy to understand why nursing is seen as a natural expression of a woman’s innate abilities.

**Body.**

The human body seems like a fairly uncontested entity, but there are various definitions. The Oxford Dictionary (n.d.-a) states the ‘body’ is “the material frame of man (and animals)”, and is “the whole material organism viewed as an organic entity” (n.p.). Webster’s states it is the whole physical structure and substance of a human being, animal, or plant. Dictionary.com (n.d.-b) defines it as, “the physical structure and material substance of an animal or plant, living or dead (n.p.). According to the Encyclopedia Britannica (n.d.) the ‘body’ is, “the physical substance of the human constructed of systems and parts” (n.p.). As a summary, ‘body’ refers to the body of man, human being, animal, or plant and is a physical structure that is made up of parts, but is viewed as a whole entity.

**Biology.**

The Oxford Dictionary (n.d.-a) defines ‘biology’ as “the study of living organisms, divided into many specialized fields that cover their morphology, physiology, anatomy, behaviour,
origins, and distribution” (n.p.). Webster’s New World College Dictionary (Neufeldt, 1988) states biology is “the science that deals with the origin, history, physical characteristics, life processes, habits, etc. of plants and animals” (p. 140). Dictionary.com (n.d.-a) states biology is “the science of life or living matter in all its forms and phenomena, esp. with reference to origin, growth, reproduction, structure, and behavior” (n.p.). Encyclopedia Britannica (n.d.-a) briefly states that biology is the “study of living things and their vital processes” (n.p.). The Canadian Encyclopedia (n.d.) describes biology as “is the science of life, embracing all studies of living organisms and, as such, is inherently interdisciplinary” (n.p.). As a summary, ‘biology’ is the study of a wide variety of life in all of its processes.

**Database Searches**

**Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL)**

As the name implies CINAHL is a database of nursing literature that encompasses the years from 1966 to the current year. In CINAHL I used the search terms related to the core concepts of interest for this literature review, which are, feminism, biology, anatomy, and physiology. Considering that I am interested in how nursing, from a feminist perspective, has engaged with biology, anatomy, or physiology, I used the term feminism in conjunction with biology and anatomy and physiology. I did not exclude any year because I wanted to investigate all records available. To improve the rigor of this literature review I only included articles from peer reviewed journals. I am only fluent in English and so I only included English as a language for the articles. I included “full text” as a limiter as well. My first search included the keywords ‘Feminism and Biology’ and received 10 articles. Because of the low number of articles I expanded my search terms and included ‘body’ which recovered 24 articles and ‘feminist
critique and biology’ recovered 1 article. After reviewing these articles, none of them engaged directly with human biology but did indirectly refer to biology through the body and discussed biology within the text of the article. Because of the lack of articles of direct interaction with biology I continued my search to the UVic topic databases for ‘nursing’.

**UVic Libraries Topic Index**

The databases I included in this set are, Academic Search Complete, Alt-Health Watch, Biomedical Reference Collection, Canadian Health Research Collection, Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, Cochrane Library, and Consumer Health Complete, Evidence Based Medical Reviews, and Health Source: Nursing Academic Edition. However, I excluded Electronic Health Library as this database is included in another database I am already searching. I also excluded the Humanities, Arts and Medicine because I was not able to search for topics, only authors and titles. The Journal Citation Reports were excluded because the database includes articles in the Web of Science database, which I have already included in my search elsewhere. Another duplicate database is Health Source Complete that is part of the Nursing Academic Edition of this database. Finally, other databases were not in the area of nursing, such as the Encyclopedia of Human Nutrition and the Encyclopedia of Stress. In this topic database search I included the word ‘nursing’ along with the other key terms of feminism, biology, anatomy, and physiology. There were three “hits”, which I had already found in the CINAHL database search.

**Google Scholar**

Whittemore and Knafl (2005) suggest using two to three strategies to find primary sources and so after searching CINAHL, and UVic Libraries Topic search, I headed to Google Scholar. I realized that in this kind of database I would not be able to search within nursing
knowledge specifically, but would need to find relevant articles using well thought out search terms. I knew this kind of search would take many hours, but again I needed to make sure I found any articles that might be of use to my review. I used the search terms ‘feminism, nursing, biology’ and received 16,900 hits! I looked through 13 pages of Google results and stopped when the focus of the articles were consistently off topic. I was looking for nurse scholar’s engagement with the topic of biology from a feminist perspective. The Google search, while providing a plethora of results, searches the body of the article and thus the terms “biology” and “feminism”, may be in the article body, but may be of little significance to the topic of the article. As I searched the list of hits I took note of authors and the frequency of their articles. I feel that if the article is of significance to the knowledge of feminism nursing biology, then they will be cited by other authors. This is why I will cross reference these Google search results with the “most cited” search results. I, for the most part, did not include books unless they were available from Google.com books and even then, they were only available in part. From that search I found 15 articles. Again I searched in Google Scholar using the terms ‘feminism, nursing, physiology’ and got 8,100 hits and found three that were relevant after searching for 18 pages. The total number of articles that I identified as being fairly relevant to my interest were 55 articles.

To help me discover the current knowledge in the field I did a citation analysis of my topic of interest (Hart, 2008). A citation analysis is a search in a special index called a citation index. A search in this index will tell me what authors are the most cited by other others within a topic and what authors are cited by those most popular authors. In reality, the web that is created is not between particular authors, but between particular works that the author
creates. The web will show the interconnectedness of knowledge from one article to the next. This can be useful in finding relevant articles from the reference lists of articles that are particularly important in the field you are interested in. For instance there may be seminal articles that authors throughout the years continue to reference. From a citation search an important article would become visually evident.

The UVic libraries Web of Science database includes the following sub-databases, Science Citation Index Expanded 1955 - present, Social Sciences Citation Index 1956 – present, Arts & Humanities Citation Index 1975 – present, and Conference Proceedings Citation Index – Social Science & Humanities 1990 – present. I grouped the search terms to discover relevant articles. These terms are, feminism nursing biology, feminism nursing anatomy, and feminism nursing physiology. I received no hits for any of these terms. While this was very discouraging I was not going to give up the search and so I entered the terms, ‘feminism nursing’. I knew that feminist nursing must engage with these topics at some level, thus I would have to search broader. Even though I knew it would take more time to hunt through articles individually, I was willing to search thoroughly. I received 55 records using the terms ‘feminism nursing’. The limiters were articles as opposed to books, English language, and I included only the topics of Nursing and Women’s Studies. From these 55 I did a citation analysis to see what authors/articles were cited the most. I included an article in my list of notable articles and notable authors if it was cited by another author at least once and was relevant to my literature review, which meant that it had to have some discussion from a feminist nursing perspective about some aspect of biology, anatomy, and physiology. I compared the list of authors with the
list of articles and authors I had retrieved from my database search and found that I had included many of the most cited authors and articles.

**Final List of Articles.**

**Table 1**

**CINAHL Articles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search term</th>
<th>Articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>feminist critique and biology</td>
<td>McDonald, McIntyre, Anderson ’03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feminism and biology</td>
<td>Kinser &amp; Lewis ’05, Cammer ’06, Kelly ’09, Rolls ’09, Campbell &amp; Bunting ’91, Chinn ’99, Duffy ’85, Sundby ’99, Gallop ’04, and Bullough ’96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminism and body</td>
<td>Bramwell ’08, Kattlow ’01, Atkins &amp; Gingrus ’09, Cosgrove &amp; Riddle ’03, Miers ’02, Cummins ’07, Sharp ’02, Munch ’04, Grant ’08, Smith ’00, Clarke ’07, Reiger ’06, Fox, Ward, O’Rourke ’05, Maine, Bunnel, Marx ’01, McDonald &amp; McIntyre ’01, Thorne ’00, Toombs ’97, Reese ’07, Kvigne, Kirkevold, Gjengedal ’05, Munch ’06, Saguy &amp; Riley ’05, Tiggemann ’95, and Soban ’06.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2**

**Google Scholar Articles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Term</th>
<th>Article</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feminism, nursing, and biology</td>
<td>Andrist &amp; MacPherson ’01, DeMarco ’93, Gortner ’93 &amp; ’00, Harding ’86, Im ’99, ’00, ’01, ’07, ’10, ’03, Kermode ’96, Kvigne ’02, MacPherson ’85, and William ’99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Evaluation Stage**

**Quality**
The data evaluation stage assesses the quality of the sources of data (Whittemore & Knafl, 2005). As part of my literature search I discovered that there were very few, if any, articles that met my specific search criteria. Due to this lack of data, I broadened the specificity of my inclusion criteria. This meant that I included articles which contained any reference to biology, physiology or anatomy and which included nursing and feminism in any part of the article, from any year, and from any database. I did this in order to be thorough in my search for knowledge. These 53 articles I will now assess, for not only the quality of the article, but also relevancy to this literature review.

Whittemore and Knafl (2005) discuss the question of quality in an integrated literature review. They ponder how it is possible to assess quality in such a variety of sources, which is inherent in an integrative literature review. They state that there is no “gold standard” to measure quality against and assessing quality can be a complicated and not a well defined process. Whittemore and Knafl allude to perhaps using an approach used in historical research, which includes “authenticity, methodological quality, informational value, and representativeness of available primary sources” (p. 550). These concepts of quality resonate with how I think of quality in literature and thus I will use these guidelines to evaluate the 53 articles identified in my literature search.

**Personal meanings and criteria for quality.**

I approached this stage of my literature review with much anticipation and also with a feeling of dread. As a nurse researcher I am personally involved in the topics identified. Nursing has been part of my life since I was in high school in 1977. I have depended on the financial freedom and sense of accomplishment that the profession of nursing has given to me and I
depend on it for much of my sense of worth. The topics of biology, physiology, and anatomy are areas of knowledge that I have engaged with throughout my nursing career, thus I know them well and depend on that knowledge. Feminism is fairly new knowledge for me, but I see a feminist perspective as an ethical perspective and have ‘taken it to heart’. As I approached this stage of the review I was hoping that nursing knowledge had developed a feminist engagement with the topics of biology, physiology, and anatomy, but that I just need to search deeper. My dread comes from the feeling that perhaps there may not be the knowledge I am looking for.

To narrow down the number of articles for my review I quickly read the article abstract to assess for “informational value” and “authenticity”. The article abstract needed to refer to the profession of nursing and to feminism to have informational value. To have “authenticity” the article needed to have arguments that were valid to the profession of nursing. To assess for “representativeness of sources” I noted whether the authors cited in the article, had been cited in other articles as documented through Google search and “Web of Science” citation reference database. (see Table 3). Research reports were reviewed for quality of methodological congruency with the research question. As an addition quality marker, I only included articles from peer reviewed journals. I further refined the search terms to only include the human body and biology of the modern human body (i.e. not evolutionary biology), and physiology of the human body.

Discussion of the final sources for data.

I evaluated the 53 initial articles from the searches and have removed the ones that did not meet the criteria for content and quality. What remain are 13 articles and 7 research reports to include in the data sample. Many of the articles in the initial sample were from
outside the discipline of nursing and/or did not address the topic of the body in any way. Because there are so few articles, if any, that met all my specific criteria and quality, I have included all articles and all research that has to do with a feminist view of the body in general. In other words I have not critiqued the quality of the feminist theory that is engaged in by the author of the article and have included any reference to the human body. These articles are a variety of format, including review, descriptive and research. Timmins and McCabe (2005) state that “review articles provide detailed accounts of particular topics through summarizing and evaluating research and literature relating to a particular topic. These articles also discuss the implications and recommendations for further development of the issues identified in the article” ... “Descriptive articles merely describes a topic with reference to current literature and is not discursive like a review article” ... “A research article includes a report of a completed piece of research relating to a particular phenomenon or topic” (p. 46). The appropriateness of the final sources for data was confirmed by the presence of authors that were recognized as most cited not only by myself, but through a Google Scholar search for the terms “nursing, biology, feminism”. The follow chart lists the source for the data of my analysis.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Citations/Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MacPherson</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Advances in Nursing Science</td>
<td>Critique/Analysis</td>
<td>Cited 71 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacPherson</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Advances in Nursing Science</td>
<td>Critique/Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeMarco</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Advances in Nursing Science</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morse</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Nursing Outlook</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kermode</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Key Note Address</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td>Author cited 6 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Methodology/Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carryer</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Thesis</td>
<td>Explore the experience of being obese</td>
<td>Feminist methodology, qualitative analysis, autoethnography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolls</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Thesis</td>
<td>Disrupt the biomedical discourse on heart failure</td>
<td>Critical feminist literature review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinn</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Perspectives on Philosophy of Science in Nursing</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Author cited 105 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im, Hautman &amp; Keddy</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Western Journal of Nursing Research</td>
<td>Critique research for gender bias</td>
<td>Feminist critique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Western Journal of Nursing Research</td>
<td>Critique research for gender bias</td>
<td>Feminist critique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrist &amp; MacPherson</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Annual Review of Nursing Research</td>
<td>Review of literature</td>
<td>MacPherson cited 71 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald &amp; McIntyre</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Nursing Philosophy</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td>McIntyre cited 33 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kvigne &amp; Kirkevold</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Nursing Philosophy</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td>Author cited 30 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCormick &amp; Bunting</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Health Care for Women International</td>
<td>Critique research for gender bias</td>
<td>Literature review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald, McIntyre, and Anderson</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Health Care for Women International</td>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallop &amp; Reynolds</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td>Author cited 29 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinser &amp; Lewis</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Health Care for Women International</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kvigne, Kirkevold, Gjengedal</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Journal of Clinical Nursing</td>
<td>Explore nature of nursing care and rehab. of female stroke pts, by hospital nurses</td>
<td>Phenomenological with feminist perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Nursing Philosophy</td>
<td>Research approach</td>
<td>Feminist critique</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Analysis Stage

The purpose of this literature review is to discover how nursing, from a critical feminist perspective has engaged with the chosen concepts. After carefully and thoughtfully reading over all the articles and research from my literature search, I found that the authors did not directly engage with the concepts of biology, physiology, and/or anatomy, however the authors indirectly referred to these concepts. The lack of direct engagement with the concept of biology, physiology, and anatomy did not mean that there was no relevant knowledge to summarize, analyze, and synthesis for this literature review. According to Boote and Beile (2005) a quality literature review distinguishes what has been done and what needs to be done, places the topic in the broader scholarly literature and in an historical context, discovers concept vocabulary, variables, and phenomena relevant to the topic, and synthesizes and gains a new perspective on the literature (p. 7).

As I read the articles, it became very evident that feminist nurse scholars were discussing the topics this literature review is interested in. In addition, as I read I became aware that the word ‘body’ was used in many of the articles to interact with the topic of biology in an indirect way. In order to capture the author’s interaction with biology, I will include ‘body’ as a focus of my analysis. To produce a quality literature review, I needed to further analyze the data to reveal the existing relationship between nursing, feminism, biology, physiology, and anatomy of the human body.
Whittemore and Knafl (2005) suggest using a “constant comparison method” (p. 550) to systematically analyze data that covers a broad range of sources. In the constant comparison method, data is placed into systematic categories in order to “facilitate the distinction of patterns, themes, variations, and relationships” (p. 550). The process consists of “data reduction, data display, data comparison, conclusion drawing, and verification” (p. 550).

Data Reduction

**Determination of an overall classification system.**

The first phase of data reduction classifies the data into categories of type, (Whittemore & Knafl, 2005) thus I have read over the sources of data and have moved them into either research or non-research. (see appendix for the Excel files for research and non-research articles).

**Extracting and coding data.**

The next data reduction technique involves extracting and coding data from my chosen articles. Whittemore and Knafl (2005) suggest using “predetermined and relevant data of each of the subgroup classifications” (p. 550). The subgroups are the non-research and research source groups. My initial concept was made up of the interaction between feminist nursing scholarship and biology, physiology, and anatomy, but there was no literature about this concept. However, I was able to find literature from a feminist nursing perspective that engaged in biology, physiology, and anatomy in an indirect way. From reviewing the articles I found that a major category of interaction in the literature was the body, thus I will include this category in my concept. I will not include nursing and feminism as a category because they have already been used as a category of inclusion in the literature source. The articles that I will
extract the data from are from a feminist nursing perspective as chosen in the literature search inclusion and exclusion criteria. For a discussion of these categories please see the Literature Search chapter of this review. Thus the predetermined and relevant data that I will extract from the sources will be the concepts of biology, body, physiology, and anatomy.

**Summaries of sources.**

The purpose of extracting and coding data is to organize it in order to make logical, reliable, and reasonable conclusions. I will attempt to organize the data to allow for the reader to be clear about how I have reached my conclusions. Each primary source will be reduced by review, which will include the concepts of concern (body, biology, physiology, and anatomy) (Whittemore & Knafl, 2005). The reviews will include my interpretation of what the author is relating concerning the concepts identified, direct quotes may be included, critique of the article or research report, and a full reference will be given. The summaries will be organized by year beginning with the oldest. The years are from 1985 to 2009. After the summaries I will display the extracted data categorized by concepts in a table and provide a comparison of the data, followed by conclusions.


In this article MacPherson engages in a feminist analysis of the medical treatment of osteoporosis. She states that menopause has been medicalized and has become a syndrome which includes osteoporosis. She feels that the ideology of patriarchal male scientific medical knowledge has blinded physicians into prescribing hormone treatment of this disease. Through feminist analysis she places menopause and osteoporosis under the social microscope. In her
introduction she presents the feminist’s nemesis of “biology as deterministic”. If osteoporosis, hot flashes, night sweating, and vaginal dryness are biological then they cause the socially created “disease” of menopause, which physicians treat with hormone replacement therapy. Thus, biology causes socially constructed diseases, however these social constructions only take place in the social world where women are oppressed and of inferior status. MacPherson used a feminist framework to address this issue. Her goal is to eliminate the oppression and thus allow women to lead a healthier life.

Macpherson’s goals are social in nature with a secondary intent of women’s health. Indeed her analysis puts the biology or health of the woman under the scrutiny of a social examination rather than putting the biology/health of the woman first and seeing how the social might affect the health. MacPherson frames biology as a means to affect social meaning on bodies. Because of the social goals of a feminist framework/research/theory, the social is placed in the position of power. The biological is but a pawn in the web of the social and thus it is not surprising that research using a feminist framework/view/theory/perspective creates this power dichotomy of social vs. biological. Even her nursing practice recommendations are social in nature. She states that “systematic nursing investigations would contribute toward a feminist science perspective on osteoporosis that would help to correct the dominant patriarchal science attitude” (p. 20). I whole heartedly believe that there needs to be a gender critique in science and in society, however I doubt that a practicing nurse’s goal is to “correct” people’s attitude toward science. I would hope that a feminist/gender critique would lead to recommendations for practice change that would lead to a better lifestyle for those who are afflicted with osteoporosis.

Macpherson states that the purpose of "this article [is to] examine and analyzes Cardiovascular Disease (CVD) in women and the use of non-contraceptive hormones in order to transcend the dominant patriarchal science model and to help emancipate both women and nursing from this perspective" (p. 34). The author’s purpose statement engages with biology as biomedicine and as a disease state and the goal of the examination and analysis is to free women and nursing from the idea that CVD in women can be treated with hormone therapy. Additionally in this purpose statement, Macpherson uses the word "transcend" to characterize what the knowledge from this critique will do for women and nursing. This word connotes both a hierarchy of knowledge and a dichotomous stance of knowledge.

The author uses a dichotomous relationship between the dominant patriarchal science model (aka biomedicine) and feminism to build her argument. MacPherson begins the article with what she sees as the rhetoric of CVD being caused by menopause and the “scientific” solution of hormone therapy. She includes epidemiological research stating that older women are basically fit and healthy at this time in their lives, but that women have social pressures on them to take estrogen replacement therapy or hormone replacement therapy (HRT) to prevent disease. MacPherson states that women feel healthy, but the biomedical community paints a dire picture for the future health of older women, unless they take HRT. Her argument is that patriarchal science is the basis of medicine and it overlooks the socioeconomic and political explanations of illness.
Macpherson’s application to nursing practice is social in nature. Macpherson (1992) suggests that nurses first empower themselves and other women. She states that a “basic knowledge is needed about the physiology of menopause, the development of CVD, and the medical model of treatment” (p. 46). This statement is a move away from the importance of the biological and moving toward the importance of social practice in nursing. The second application of the critique is also social in nature. She suggests that in order for nursing students to counteract the “menopause as illness” ideology, they need to be aware of the political context of CVD and ERT and HRT. Other suggestions include, that Master’s level education develop new models for treating menopause, taking into account the political and social context of healthcare. Additionally, doctoral students could use feminist research methods for investigation of CVD to give older women a voice, health promotion and CVD prevention through education could be researched, developed and tested, and critiquing patriarchal scientific methods. Macpherson suggestions that future researchers investigate women’s decisions concerning HRT and share their analysis of the medical model of menopause. Overall I found that the author’s goal of nursing interventions and research are basically social in nature. I did not read suggestions that nurses should be involved in any basic scientific research such as biology. Perhaps this is because of the patriarchal scientific methods used in such basic sciences as biology.


DeMarco, Campbell, and Wuest argue that nursing epistemology began from a “singular empirical search for objective truth” and now has moved toward multiple truths using diverse
methods. The authors also state that empirical research undergirds nursing’s current knowledge base, but that despite moving toward different methodology, nursing continues to use traditional scientific methods. The authors state that these traditional scientific methods are masculine in nature along with the disciplines of psychology, sociology, and physiology. It is surprising not to find biology in this list considering that much of nursing knowledge for practice is based on biology. DeMarco, Campbell, and Wuest state that nurses have used this paradigm of research to build nursing knowledge and thus nursing research needs to be critiqued for “the presence of race, class, or gender bias” (p. 27). DeMarco et. al. imply that nursing has a unique and separate knowledge base from the disciplines of psychology, sociology, and physiology, but do not include biology.

DeMarco et al. (1993) state that much of nursing knowledge is based on medical research, which is “dominated by the white, male, middle-class perspective” (p. 29) and call for a critique of nursing knowledge for male bias (p. 30). DeMarco et. al. state that critique is a necessary part of scholarship to create new research and ideas (p. 30). Feminist critique gives meaning to knowledge. It is not a means to construct a body of knowledge, but is a process of constructing meaning. A feminist critique includes not only gender, but class and race. It is a means of raising the issues of those studied because much of research done in Western society is based in a scientific tradition that is androcentric and ethnocentric. All parts of the research must be critiqued. “How the method is employed has the potential to minimize or maximize the bias of any method and is the main object of feminist critique” (p 36).
This article is a nicely done explanation of how feminist critique is valuable in all research. The authors do not create dichotomies between research designs, but include all research designs.


Morse’s stance is that medicine and the biomedical approach is oppressive to women and women’s health. Biological primacy is part of the biomedical approach that the authors state is inappropriate for women’s health research and clinical practice. The authors provide the biopsychosocial approach as an alternative, however do not explain the nature of this biopsychosocial approach.

The author speaks of using a feminist perspective in nursing education, but only in reframing women’s health. Women, according to feminist de Beauvoir, are created, not born and thus ‘women’ is also a social construction. In fact ‘health’ is also a social construction according to the Ottawa Charter. Health is a concept which refers to social, personal, and the body’s capacities to do things. Health does not refer to the biological functioning of the inside of the body, but rather the socially mediated abilities of the body as a whole. Thus, in this article health, woman, and gender are all socially mediated ways of thinking about the body.

Morse places a heavy emphasis on challenging traditional patriarchal practices and not enough on education. This heavy emphasis on challenge sets up a dichotomy in which one must make a choice between the biomedical approach or something else, which the authors suggest is the biopsychosocial approach. There is no clear connection between the social goals of feminism and how their accomplishments help promotion women’s health.

In this keynote address the author discusses what he sees as postmodernism and feminism replacing Science in nursing education. He sarcastically calls for a feminist deconstruction of a periodic table. I can only assume that he sees the periodic table as a representative of what he considers Science and feels it is humorous to call for a feminist critique of it. He states that this “practical joke” is a metaphor for the dilemma and the paradox of Science in nursing education. By framing this assignment as a joke he must see that there is an inherent contradiction between feminism and Science and thus, a practical joke because it can not be done.

His argument is that science in nursing education is coming under the critique of postmodernism and feminism and thus is being framed as an “adversary, an oppressor, and ... as irrelevant” (p. 1). He feels that postmodernism has thrown all of science out because of postmodernistic stance that there is more than one truth. Kermode gives us an indication of what he means when he says “Science”. His science is reflective of modernity and its idea that there is one single, universal, objective truth to be discovered. He further understands that the purpose of postmodernism’s critique of modernity is to “demystify and discredit science”...“to challenge its authority of knowledge” (p. 2).

Kermode has a hypersensitivity of any threat to Science when he states, “It is virtually impossible to pick up an Australian refereed nursing journal and not find at least one article espousing postmodernist dogma” (p. 2). He states that postmodernism is of no significance in nursing research and epistemology and of no importance to the practicing nurse. If what is of
importance to working nurses is Science, meaning the natural science, which includes biology
and physiology, then what is of importance to practicing nurses is the biological and
physiological body, not the social and cultural body.

In his disgust with postmodern dichotomies he sets up his own dichotomy between
Science and Postmodernism. This is a harsh stance to take because it eliminates any possibility
of new knowledge, such as nursing knowledge. He critiques postmodernism’s deconstruction
without providing an alternative. Kermode is clearly taking the side, which he has created, of
Science based in the Enlightenment as opposed to non-science.

He states that Science has been biased because it has excluded women from science
education, but in fact this is not one of the reasons for the bias. Feminist’s critique of science is
that women were not included as subjects and for the lack of investigation into women’s health
concern other than their reproduction functions. Having women in science does not make it
inherently feminist in approach because women are also indoctrinated into the same
Scientific biases.

His criticisms of postmodernism and feminism have some validity, but taking such a
single minded stance for something and against something else is not persuasive or reasonable.
This stance also precludes any critique of Science’s weaknesses. Overall this article uses
hyperbole and is a rant, rather than a scholarly discussion.

for nursing. *Massey University Theses and Dissertations.*

This research is a critical examination of the dominant medical discourse surrounding
the health effects of being obese, in women. Carreyer examines the social experience of a group
of women who are obese. This researcher not only takes a feminist perspective, but a feminist research methodology. This methodology is relatively rare in any research and thus is still being critiqued and its rigor being improved on. The researcher uses interview, reflection, and discourse analysis as methods to gather data. The goal is to illuminate the experiences of the subject women’s ‘largeness’. The methodology and structure of this research is consistent with a feminist framework and with DeMarco’s 1993 guide to feminist research. I did not find any other nursing research that used a feminist research methodology to compare this one with. In her conclusion she questions the autonomy and separateness from medicine that nursing professionals claim because nursing has adopted the same reductionist, individualist view of health for women who are obese.

This researcher engages with the body as a variable in an examination of human social behavior and how that might affect the 'health' of the woman experiencing this situation. By referring to 'health' this researcher is referring to a social construction of a socially created concept and not the biological functioning of the body. The feminist perspective, feminist methods, feminist research directs this researcher toward an emancipatory end (i.e. speaking for these oppressed, marginalized women to the medical and nursing community) rather than toward an end that would include a biological factor. She states that "the experience of bodily largeness emerges as a socially constructed disability in which women are denied the opportunity to be fully healthy through social sanctions rather than biological deficit" (p. 7). According to Carryer the biological state of a person's body is the true measure of health.

Biology as determinism is evident in parts of this research report. Examples are the following quote, “These author’s literature review suggests that the conflict between the
biological drive for food and the cultural drive for thinness has generated levels of binge or compulsive eating not seen in persons who have not engaged in deliberate manipulation of food intake” (p. 28). This quote conveys the sense that the biological body is independent from the social and in this research is a "drive"; something that is animal like. This type of argument brings in the nemesis of feminism, "biology as determinism" (p. 49). Additionally, she states that “disability which is not inherent in the biology of the person but constructed from the manner in which it offends socio-cultural and gender-specific requirements for women’s bodies” (p. 152). This statement implies that biology is set in nature and is distinct from the social body. This author assumes that the social body is able to be controlled and biological body is not controlled and thus natural, true, and good. Biology is the 'real' person inside the social person.


The intent of Rolls’s literature review is to disrupt the biomedical discourse about heart failure among women. She reviewed literature of the lived experience of women in order to accomplish her goal. Her thesis is that the biomedical view of heart disease silences the “women’s own voice and experiences, ideas, and needs” (p. iii). Rolls’s argument stands on the dichotomy of biomedical vs. social knowledge of cardiovascular disease (CVD) in women and women as opposed to men. Also the biological body vs. the social body is assumed as two distinct entities. A critical feminist approach is appropriate to the research question and is significant to nursing as she states that cardiovascular nursing is dominated by biomedical discourse.
Rolls (2009) states that she has found only four articles to review, which has been my experience of feminist research in nursing. Her critique, recommendations for research and nursing practice are practical and relevant. However, I do not see how doing the recommended research will disrupt the biomedical discourse or why you would want to disrupt it. Unless there is some alternative to biomedical knowledge I would suggest expanding the scope of knowledge about CVD in women to include both biomedical and phenomenological research. Instead of disrupting I would suggest creating new nursing knowledge about the biological body that is based in the discipline of nursing.


In this article, Chinn describes gender as a social category that reflects socially constructed trait of either the male or female. Here the author assumes the biological categories of male and female and the social categories of woman and man. She proposes that nursing, as a social category, has feminine gender traits. Chinn sees nursing as feminine and science as masculine and thus sets up a dichotomy between nursing and science as feminine and masculine respectively. Chinn explains specific ways that women are in their world of the feminine and calls on nursing to challenge the masculine assumptions of science and to do science from a feminine perspective. Chinn ends with a quote from *Notes on Nursing* by Florence Nightingale calling on nurses to not do something because it is what a man would do, such as medicine, but to do it because it is a good thing to do. Chinn dreams of a time when
there is no gender, but clearly puts nursing in a feminine place and medicine in a masculine place and does not put forward the non-gendered position.


Im, Hautman and Keddy’s (2000) argument is that the traditional, (over the past 150 – 200 yrs) natural science of modernity devalues women’s experience. She states that Western medicine has moved away from the traditions of feminine healing and towards a scientific medical model. In the scientific model the objectivity of the biological body is taken as truth and the social body cannot be proven. However Im et al. build the case for the direct influence that culture has on the body of the woman as a whole. A classic example is that women in Korean culture learn that the body is not something that you expose ‘in public’, such as during a mammogram. Because of this culturally taught modesty, women in a Korean culture are less likely to have breast cancer discovered at its early stages and thus are less likely to survive breast cancer.

Im et al. state that patriarchal and androcentric views and assumptions are prevalent in the research on breast cancer in general. The alternative option is a feminist perspective that values women’s experiences of life. Other dichotomies are Biomedicine/feminism, medical/social, men/women, biomedical perspective/lived experience.

In the conclusions drawn, these researchers bind together the social and cultural context of women’s lives with lower breast cancer survival rate of Korean women. Im et al. suggest that this research is useful in nursing practice through nursing education that emphasizes the potential bias that may influence nursing care for women from other cultures.
Nurse researchers need to identify assumptions, values, and beliefs and need to carefully examine themselves for androcentric and pathological views. Additionally nurses can advocate for their patients in the political and social arenas. The authors also state that nurses can provide information about the disease, options for treatments, and possible side effects. Teaching about diagnostic procedures and treatment options can be done while considering and respecting a women’s own views and values.


Im and Chee (2001) begin their article with a description of the epidemiological statistics about pain and pain experience. The authors state that 70% of cancer pain comes from cancer (tumors) itself, 25% from treatment, 10% from other sources. Over several statements they imply that pain comes from the biological body. The authors distinguish between the biological body and the experiencing body. Im and Chee state that “there are no biochemical markers” for pain, but the intensity is in the lived experience of the social body. The biological body is also the focus of treatment for the experience of pain such as giving analgesic therapy. Pain is spoken of as if it exists as an entity within the biological body. “It” can be assessed, monitored, managed, controlled, and documented.

Im and Chee recount how the social body can affect the pain the biological body causes. For instance, the social body can produce barriers to pain management through misconceptions, beliefs, expectations, gender and ethnic influence on pain description. Im and Chee’s main focus is why gender and ethnic differences have not been taken into consideration in cancer pain research. They approach the research from a critical feminist perspective and a
literature review method. Im and Chee propose that “the inadequate assessment of cancer pain does not only come from pure biology, but from continuous interactions with the environment” (p. 728). To me, Im and Chee are saying that biology does not determine pain, but that the social environment mediates the experience of the body living the pain. The subject of the biological body remains hidden in the body and is innocent of any bias because it is natural. Im and Chee solidly place their research in the social body and in the environment of that social body.

After their excellent and detailed critique, Im and Chee conclude that quantitative research does not include the participant’s perspective. They state that this does not mean that quantitative research is flawed, but that research on a particular topic, such as cancer pain needs to be investigated using methodology and methods from the qualitative paradigm. Im and Chee imply that it is up to nursing to bring together the knowledge created from such vastly different methodologies of research.


In this instructional chapter, these authors examine women’s experiences around menopause and how nurse’s feminist scholarship has contributed to re-conceptualizing menopause as something that is natural rather than a deficiency disease. They recapitulate the history of the Women’s Health movement and describe theoretical frameworks in Women’s Health. Feminist research is also described and then a historical review of menopause is told.
Recent research into menopausal experience is also detailed. As a conclusion, Andrist and MacPherson “chart a course for the future”. This is a lengthy chapter and thus I will not address issues that are not of concern to this review. I will highlight the points that are relevant. Such as, how the biomedical model deals with the biology of the body and disease of the body.

Women’s health scholarship, now over 20 years old, has a rich tradition in women’s studies, feminist theories, and nursing. Nurses as activists for social and medical reform was a radical notion at the time and lead to the concept that women’s health cannot be divorced from the social, political, and economic forces in society that impact health. The authors state, “The framework that addresses [women’s] issues has at its core women’s lived experience as the starting point for health efforts as well as scholarly inquiry” (Andrist & MacPherson, 2001, p. 32). This and other statements in this chapter imply that feminist nursing is moving away from the biological toward the social nursing; away from the biological body toward the social body.

These authors describe the history of building a nursing epistemology that is an alternative to the medical model of health care. This alternative includes the many social contexts of a woman’s life and how that might affect her health. There is a presumption that “woman” is a stable category of analysis and that health is social in nature. Their research begins with and focuses on the lived experience of the participant woman and their place in the social fabric.

In this chapter it seems that the goal of research is social in nature, not placed in the biology of menopause, but in the lived experience of menopause. These nurse researchers emphasize the social aspect of nursing practice, which may have been missing in research, but
it seems that they have disregarded the body in their over enthusiasm for the social. I would wonder how the researcher would respond to a woman who would like to know more about the biological processes that might be contributing to her body’s experience? The authors state that “the central theme of feminism is emancipation, social change is the heart of feminist research” (p. 34). Perhaps this focus on the social is the essence of the dichotomy created between the social body and the biological body.

A dichotomy used by these authors is between the biomedical paradigm, which focuses on biology as hormones and disease, and nursing as lived experience and understanding. These authors’ critique of the biomedical is that it does not include the social body in the research. The critique is not about the actual knowledge of biomedicine, but the lack of consideration to the social. The critique looks at women’s responses to a biological issue rather than the biological issue itself. The authors speak of holism in research and yet do not include the biology of menopause only the social. Here the assumption is that the biological knowledge is not the domain of nursing, but rather is firmly in the domain of medicine. There is no attempt to wrestle it away, but just to provide an alternative. The author implies that nursing research must “move beyond the estrogen-related menopause symptoms” experience (p. 45). Thus nursing research is not including the biological, but is leaving it behind. The authors see nursing moving beyond a reductionist perspective and embracing the social perspective, but does this not leave the body behind and therefore is not holistic?

The authors are proposing a dichotomy between medicine and feminist nursing. The research reviewed moves beyond the biological and is focused on the social, thus leaving the biological body behind and discarded as a focus of analysis. At the end of the review of research
the authors state that the research “open[ed] new areas for feminist research and scholarship-the concept of identity-continuity theory and the emphasis on multiple discourses...” (p. 51). Clearly these have to do with the social body and have left out the biological body. My concern with the normalcy of menopause focus is that women who do have an “abnormal” or symptomatically traumatic experience of menopause are left out of the feminist perspective on health research and thus are left with the only alternative given by this author; the biomedical paradigm of health care. A glaring insight into the authors’ bias against biology is in this quote “We could do well to follow feminist academic scholarship on menopause that has emerged from various disciplines, including philosophy, anthropology, sociology, history, psychology, psychiatry, and English” (p. 52). It amazes me that biology was not included here when there has been so much critique of biology by feminist biologists. Additionally the author cites Woods (1993), “…personal and social changes having health effects that are as important, if not more important, than the biological changes of menopause” (as cited in Andrist & MacPherson, 2001, p. 52). In the end, biology was mentioned as an area that cannot be ignored, but not taken up from a feminist perspective. This is telling because the researcher who is cited as doing research into “biobehavioral and physiologic changes”, Reame, does not take up her research from a feminist perspective. Perhaps the author could only cite this one nurse researcher because there was no published article from a feminist nurse researcher taking up biology.


McDonald and McIntyre’s assumption is that nursing knowledge develops from an empirical scientific paradigm and that while this way of coming to know is important to nursing,
it cannot answer all the questions that are important to nursing. Unlike Kelly (2009) who suggested bringing together two disparate paradigms, McDonald and McIntyre are suggesting that there are two distinct ways to approach two distinct types of research questions. They state that those questions that concern the “nature of nursing, the moral ground of nursing practice or the particular meanings of nurse-patient relationships” (p. 235) need to be answered by philosophy. These authors provide a “solution” to the dichotomous duality I have found in previous articles. They theorize that the likely origin of dichotomy emerged from philosophies debates about subject and object. Closer to this literature review I have found that the social goals of feminism inherently sets up a dichotomy between it and anything that gets in its way of the goal of emancipation of women. Thus, if in nursing the patriarchal biomedical paradigm is in contradiction of its goals, then there is an ‘either or’ argument. Throughout my readings for this literature review concerning feminism, nursing, and biology there have been various dichotomies that are repeated, such as female/male, feminine/masculine, biomedical/social, social body/biological body, object body/lived body, and feminism/Western patriarchal society. Feminism has a massive list of things that it is in opposition to and thus dichotomies are an inevitable result of a feminist argument. McDonald and McIntyre also point out that dichotomies are problematic because it sets up an either or situation, where one choice is better than the other and thus one side of the dichotomy is marginalized and the other valorized. McDonald and McIntyre suggest the deconstruction of dichotomy and instead see our differences not as disagreements, but “as struggles over how to see, how to interpret the world, and then we raise questions about what influences and shapes our understanding” (Ceci, 2000, p. 59 in McDonald & McIntyre, 2001). This is a true philosophical approach to this
problem of either or that is created in a feminist perspective. One that would be suitable for
open-minded people who do not have a stake in one position or the other. However, I feel this
is the exception judging from the rhetoric. I see that feminism is in a battle to gain all the
ground it can and that embracing both views to come to understand is not a part of the goal of
feminism.

When discussing the reinstating of the body in nursing, McDonald and McIntyre are
referring to the whole body from the outside surface, not the biological body. They discuss
embodiment, but this is the observable response a body has to an embodied experience of
their biology. These authors advocate a re-instating of the importance of the subjectively felt
experience of illness in the body and in providing nursing care alongside that of scientific
technical knowledge.

Kvigne, K., & Kirkevold, M. (2002). A feminist perspective on stroke rehabilitation: the relevance
of de Beauvoir’s theory. *Nursing Philosophy, 3*(2), 79-89.

The authors point out that despite a greater number of women being affected by stroke,
there is little research into considering gender differences in the rehabilitation process. Kvigne
and Kirkevold introduce the idea that disease and the experience and behaviour of disease are
more than biological, but that culture and personal experience are also a part. They state that
women live a different lifestyle than men and this experience affects how rehabilitation should
be done.

In the application of de Beauvoir’s theory in rehabilitation practice the author’s engage
with the biology of the body through the lived experience of the person going through
rehabilitation. de Beauvoir’s feminism places an emphasis on the female body and its particular
biological characteristics and reproductive functions. She theorizes that the body creates distinct situations that create challenges that women must deal with. This biological determinism has caused disagreements among feminist as to the centrality of the biology of being female to the social actions of the female. In this research report, rehabilitation is tailored to suit the lived reality of the patient rather than a purely biomedical regime. The dichotomies created in this report are the biology of the body vs. the lived experience of the body and the biomedical vs. the social. There is a nice emphasize on both the biological body and the social body.


McCormick and Bunting examine the effect that gender bias and research paradigms have on the care of women with cardiovascular disease. They begin their argument by statistically explaining the preponderancy of CVD in women. Through this explanation it becomes clear that disease is contained in the biological body and that the biological body is the domain of medicine and biomedicine. McCormick and Bunting examine the social body and how the social context of the social body affects the treatment of the biological body. The biological body is not questioned and seems to be mute and is objectified by describing it with statistics. Of course the researchers are taking a feminist perspective and thus the social factors of cardiovascular disease are a major focus.

The category of ‘women’ is critiqued and the multiplicity of feminist theory is acknowledged. The authors compare medical treatment of women up against that of men, such
as, “Women were two times more likely to die from a heart attack than men” (p. 822) and “Women have smaller hearts and, therefore, smaller coronary arteries” (p. 822). The historical discussion of CVD and women compare how women have been left out of research. This is understandable considering that this paper reports on a feminist critique and the exclusion is so blatant, but still it is a dichotomous argumentative stance. McCormick and Bunting discuss menopause as villain, ‘atypical’ symptoms, and women’s role in CVD.

The author’s recommendations are social in nature and focus on the experience of women’s symptoms of CVD. There is no call to do biology or physiology research or to critique the biological knowledge that underlies the symptoms and treatments for CVD in both men and women. As a side, McCormick and Bunting state “...the purpose of feminist theory is to view the world from an alternative perspective that places the woman at center stage” (p. 832). If women are at center stage, why is it that that view is an alternative? In 2002 they are still caught in the ideological dichotomy of male/female and feminine/masculine. The author’s call for nursing to remove gender biases in research and calls for nursing to take social action to have the voices of women heard in healthcare research.


McDonald and McIntyre propose that biology is not deterministic of gender. They contend that women’s health is more than the physiological experience of biology played out through the body. In addition, women’s experience of life is different than the way men’s lives are shaped. These authors are saying that while biology is distinct and important so are the social realities and forces that shape the health experience of women. They state that the
social, discursive and material realities of the lived lives of women literally causes changes to
the body. Such changes as “thinness, preoccupation with body size and shape, and surgical
intervention. These authors are describing how the social, material, and discursive realities of
women’s live can manipulate the health and health experiences of women on a physiological,
biological and psychological level.

These authors make a clear link between the social determinants of health and the
impact those determinants have on the physiological/biological health of a person. There is no
dichotomy here between what other authors have called the biological body and the social
body. The authors state that nurses are well placed to provide a safe space for the health of
those who are placed outside the dominant social structures and ideologies of the society we
live in.

understanding of the human condition. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health
Nursing, 11*, 357-364.

Gallop and Reynolds draw on their experiences to discuss their understanding of the
human condition. They engage in discussion of biological sciences, psychodynamic theory and
socio-cultural theory. They feel there cannot be one unitary theory to explain the human
condition, but multiple perspectives. These authors call for a complexity perspective of the
human condition. Throughout this article the nurses assume that nursing knowledge is based
on the biological, psychological and social knowledge bases. I do not see a nursing knowledge
base here. The words they use, as they describe their view of the human condition from a
nursing perspective, include vocabulary borrowed from other disciplines to help put together a
nursing perspective. They do not draw on nursing theory or nursing knowledge. Gallop and Reynolds both include the voice of race/ethnicity, gender, and class and state that most of the scholarship in this area come from feminist theorists. The authors take a middle of the road between the dichotomy of biological determinism and socio-cultural meaning. “When we are able to hear all the voices then nurses will be able to frame research and practice in a ways [sic] that can profoundly impact on their clients’ lives” (p. 363).


The authors are not specifically focusing on nursing, but rather on health care workers, however one paragraph does address nursing. These authors postulate that as the number of women increase in the scientific disciplines, including nursing, then science may be re-conceptualized as a whole and that negative assumptions, which science upholds in discourse, will dissipate. Kinser and Lewis also call for a feminist perspective on science to create awareness in the scientific community. They hope that insight into the construction of masculine and feminine in medical practice and scientific institutions will bring about change toward a more gender neutral society. The assumption is that any woman will be able to take on a feminist critique because they are female.

In this research the authors interview hospital nurses to come to understand how the gender of their patients affect their nursing care. They come to discover that the nurses had not thought too much about how the gender of the person affects their physical recovery from stroke. The nurses state that they do not have time to sit down and discuss the context of their life in order to give individual therapy. However, it also was discovered that the nurses, although not knowingly, did alter their therapeutic plans by considering the connection between their experiences as women and their female patients.

The researchers assumed a dichotomy of women and men as difference. Different roles at home and in public, leading to different life experiences, values and life goals. The category of ‘Women’ was not examined. The subject nurses’ focus was on the physical and pathophysiological processes as they endeavored to meet the stroke-survivor’s fundamental physical needs and to regain normal functions, which indicates the nurse’s preference for the object body.

The research report authors provided integration between the nurse’s care of the biological body and added the awareness and approach of the lived experience may enhance the nurse’s ability to enhance the stroke victim’s healing.

The critique of this research took place within the scope of the exterior of the body and within nursing practice. It did not include a feminist critique of the biological knowledge that the nurses used.

Repeated statements that nursing is more concerned with the biomedical view of nursing rather than a phenomenological, social, or contextual view shows a dichotomy of nursing knowledge between biomedical and phenomenological. Another example of the
dichotomy is that the authors found that nursing students preferred knowledge about anatomy and pathology. The authors conclude that nurses are caught in a patriarchal, biomedical ideology and thus cannot see gender differences that might affect care.


Im begins her argument from a feminist perspective that states women’s experiences of menopause are being masked by the biological explanation of menopause and thus women are not getting the proper care they have a right to. This perspective seems to express the “biology as determinism” nemesis of feminism. Im contrasts the biomedical view of menopause with the social view of the menopause experience.

Im contrasts the feminist view that women choose self-care of the menopausal experience and that of the ‘medical model’ would prescribe hormone therapy. What Im does not address is that the science of biology and physiology underlie the understanding of the biological body that is supposedly causing the menopausal symptoms. Im addresses the social aspect of menopause and the social aspects of the management of symptoms. Im suggests that the biomedical view of menopause is dominant in nursing research and if a feminist view was used the research would look into the experience of menopause. So here, again, the biological vs. the social body. Im points out the differences in approaches to research in menopause but tries to lessen the impact of the dichotomy by placing value on both types of knowledge created from the disparate paradigms, however the dichotomy still exists. Im implies that it is up to nursing to bring together the knowledge created from such vastly different methodologies of research.
The studies that Im cites all focus on the lived experience of menopause and do not include any biological or physiological research. I am assuming here that there are no biological or physiological research reports that are from a feminist nursing perspective. In the end Im calls for feminist nursing research into the menopausal experience since feminist approaches have been rarely used in any discipline when looking at the lived experience or symptoms of menopause. Again, Im calls for both quantitative and qualitative research on menopausal symptoms, but I wonder, again, how is a practicing nurse to bring together the knowledge created from these two disparate paradigms. This research report is an excellent example of feminist critique of existing research.


Kelly discusses the difficulty of integrating a social science aspect of research, in this case feminist intersectionality, into biomedical research of inequities of health. Kelly calls for the integration of feminist intersectionality and biomedical paradigms in eliminating health disparities via research. Her goal is to provide an integrated approach to health disparities research to “improve health through social action and knowledge development” (p. E44). Kelly states that the two paradigms are played out in nursing intervention of a psychotherapy group of women. While Kelly explains how this research might be done I do not see a critique of either paradigm. The two methodologies crowd out any unique nursing knowledge or goal. Kelly seems to have forgotten nursing knowledge as a guide to research. The lack of nursing knowledge and/or research used in this report is striking and thus does not inform nursing practice. The knowledge from medicine and from feminism is subsumed into nursing without
creating unique nursing knowledge based on nursing as a discipline. The research process
seems to be a watered down version of both paradigms. I would say that Kelly has not
addressed nursing’s concerns with a biomedical approach to health research. Kelly states that
the only ground for a nurse clinician to stand on in nursing research is between the biomedical
and the social paradigm of research. Kelly only sees nursing as an intervention not a knowledge
base. She addresses this lack by stating that “nursing literature rarely considers the feminist
intersectionality paradigm” (p. 154) and that “the discipline of nursing and nursing scholarship
are absent in the feminist intersectionality literature” (E54). Kelly acknowledges the inability of
combined research to meet the theoretical demands of each paradigm, however there must be
movement toward each other to help eliminate health disparities. While I applaud her attempt
at bringing these two very different paradigms together I see nursing knowledge as a ground to
stand on to address health disparities.

**Data Display**

The next step in the data analysis stage is to display the data in a format that can be
used to “visualize patterns and relationships within and across primary data sources and as a
beginning point for interpretation” (Wittemore & Knafl, 2005, p. 551). The preceding
interpretation of the sample articles is an interpreted reality of what the authors wrote. I do
not claim to have accurately recounted all that the article and research report authors
intended, but have critiqued for how the author interacted with the concepts of body, biology,
anatomy, and physiology from a feminist nursing perspective. From this critique I have gleaned
the themes of ‘Dichotomy’, ‘Moving Away and Toward’, and ‘Assumptions of Nursing
Epistemology’. Additionally I have critiqued the author’s arguments and research design.
The table below will display data from each source article regarding the concepts of interest listed above. The concepts of anatomy and physiology have not been extracted due to lack of content regarding these concepts.

Table 4

Concept: Biology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Data for the concept “Biology as...”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MacPherson 1985</td>
<td>as deterministic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as a means to affect social meaning on bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as causing a social construction of the menopause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacPherson 1992</td>
<td>as biomedicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as a disease state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeMarco, Campbell, Wuest 1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morse 1995</td>
<td>as difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kermode 1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carryer 1997</td>
<td>as a deficit of health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as independent from the social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as a ‘drive’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as determinism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as able to contain disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolls 2009</td>
<td>as a social actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as ‘a woman suffering with heart disease’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinn 1999</td>
<td>as fixed and stable category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im, Hautman, &amp; Kelly 2000</td>
<td>as the disease of breast cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im &amp; Chee 2001</td>
<td>as affecting the social concept of pain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrist &amp; MacPherson 2001</td>
<td>biomedical model deals with the biology of the body and disease of the body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald &amp; McIntyre 2001</td>
<td>as causing experience of the body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kvigne &amp; Kirkevold 2002</td>
<td>as going on in the body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCormick &amp; Bunting 2002</td>
<td>as a disease state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald, McIntyre, Anderson 2003</td>
<td>as not deterministic of gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as influencing health</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gallop & Reynolds 2004 as affecting the social world
Kinser & Lewis 2005
Kvigne, Kirkevold, & Gjengedal 2005 as an object
Im 2007 as a disease process
as difference
as an experience of a disease state
as menopausal symptoms
as experience
Kelly 2009

Table 5

Concept: Body

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Data for the concept “Body as...”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MacPherson 1985</td>
<td>as a social construct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacPherson 1992</td>
<td>as a lived experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeMarco, Campbell, Wuest 1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morse 1995</td>
<td>as a social construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the male body with physiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the female body with gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kermode 1996</td>
<td>as biological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carryer 1997</td>
<td>as a social body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as a biological body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as nature and true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolls 2009</td>
<td>as a lived experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinn 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im, Hautman, &amp; Keddy 2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im &amp; Chee 2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrist &amp; MacPherson 2001</td>
<td>a physiologic process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as a lived experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as a social actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald &amp; McIntyre 2001</td>
<td>as an experience of its biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as a whole that is covered over and contains another body that is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>created by science and medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kvigne &amp; Kirkevold</td>
<td>as an experience of the world</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FEMINIST CRITIQUE LITERATURE REVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>as an experience of biology within it as a biological reality as a socially and historically constructed entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCormick &amp; Bunting 2002</td>
<td>as a social construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald, McIntyre, Anderson 2003</td>
<td>as an experience of illness as a mediator b/w the biological and the social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallop &amp; Reynolds 2004</td>
<td>as a social body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinser &amp; Lewis 2005</td>
<td>as a lived experience of illness as a whole functioning unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kvigne, Kirkevold, &amp; Gjengedal 2005</td>
<td>as a social body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im 2007</td>
<td>as an experience as a social body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6

Dichotomies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dichotomies used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MacPherson 1985</td>
<td>medicine/feminism, biology/social construction women/patriarchal science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacPherson 1992</td>
<td>dominant patriarchal science model, biomedicine/feminism medicine/socioeconomic, political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeMarco, Campbell, Wuest 1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morse 1995</td>
<td>medicine/nursing, biomedical/biopsychosocial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kermode 1996</td>
<td>postmodernism, feminism/science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carryer 1997</td>
<td>medicine/nursing, men/women, social body/biological body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolls 2009</td>
<td>biomedical/lived experience, women/men, biological body/social body,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinn 1999</td>
<td>male/female, woman/man, feminine/masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im, Hautman, &amp; Keddy 2000</td>
<td>biological body/social body, patriarchal and androcentric perspective/feminist perspective,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im &amp; Chee 2001</td>
<td>biological body/experiencing body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrist &amp; MacPherson 2001</td>
<td>lived experience/medicalization, biological nursing/social nursing, nursing/medicine, social body/biological body, biomedical/lived experience, medicine/feminist nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald &amp; McIntyre 2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Moving Away and Toward...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kvigne &amp; Kirkevold 2002</td>
<td>women/men, biological body/lived experience, biological body/social body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCormick &amp; Bunting 2002</td>
<td>biological body/social body, women/men,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald, McIntyre, Anderson 2003</td>
<td>women/men, social body/biological body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallop &amp; Reynolds 2004</td>
<td>biological determinism/socio-cultural meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinser &amp; Lewis 2005</td>
<td>feminine/masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kvigne, Kirkevold, &amp; Gjengedal 2005</td>
<td>women/men, biological body/lived experience, biomedical nursing/social nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im 2007</td>
<td>biomedical body/social body,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly 2009</td>
<td>feminism/biomedical, qualitative/quantitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6

Theme: Moving Away and Toward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Moving Away and Toward...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MacPherson 1985</td>
<td>Moving from biology toward the social body Nursing practice moving toward social action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacPherson 1992</td>
<td>Moving away from the importance of the biological and toward social practice. Goals for nursing are basically social in nature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeMarco, Campbell, Wuest 1993</td>
<td>Moving from building knowledge to constructing meaning Moving from medical knowledge to critique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morse 1995</td>
<td>Moving from biomedical approach to biopsychosocial approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kermode 1996</td>
<td>Moving away from biology science toward social science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carryer 1997</td>
<td>Moving from medicine to social theories moving from medicine/biology to subjective approach of research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolls 2009</td>
<td>moving from biomedical to critical feminist approach to research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinn 1999</td>
<td>Moving away from biology and toward social nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im, Hautman, &amp; Keddy 2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im &amp; Chee 2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrist &amp; MacPherson 2001</td>
<td>Moving from the biological to the lived experience as a starting point for health Moving away from biological health to a lived experience of health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Assumptions of Nursing Epistemology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacPherson 1985</td>
<td>includes social and political knowledge as it applies to the care of particular people i.e. women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacPherson 1992</td>
<td>includes a basic knowledge of physiology, disease process, medical treatment. Knows the social, political, cultural, economic, and historic contexts of patient’s health and health care. Nursing has a particular standpoint about social issues, nursing students can critically interpret medical research and apply it to practice, nurses use medical knowledge to inform practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeMarco, Campbell, Wuest 1993</td>
<td>knowledge comes from empirical nursing research and critique. Much is based on medical research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morse 1995</td>
<td>addresses the whole person and is person centered, is based in a biomedical approach and knowledge, includes biological, social, and behavioral sciences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kermode 1996</td>
<td>is based in science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carryer 1997</td>
<td>is based on medical teaching, unique body of knowledge, holistic approach, theoretical knowledge is diverging from practice knowledge, practice of knowledge is socially mediated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s) (Year)</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolls 2009</td>
<td>comes under the metaparadigm of nursing, nursing theory contributes to nursing knowledge,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinn 1999</td>
<td>is feminine in character, are grounded in values of intersubjectivity and meaning, comes from practice and contains the physical and human sciences, from research and scholarship, is ethical and moral, is embedded in social and political contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im, Hautman &amp; Keddy 2000</td>
<td>social and cultural knowledge is important to nursing research and practice. Reflection builds the nurse’s knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im &amp; Chee, 2001</td>
<td>can do quantitative and qualitative research to build nursing knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrist &amp; MacPherson, 2001</td>
<td>is based in the social, experiential, environmental aspect of health and healthcare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald &amp; McIntyre, 2001</td>
<td>includes embodied experience (subjective experiences of physicality and emotions), focused on empirical scientific paradigm, based on a relational experience of care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kvigne &amp; Kirkevold, 2002</td>
<td>nursing knowledge about the body is based in the social and environmental. (feminism’s aversion to biology is explained)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCormick &amp; Bunting, 2002</td>
<td>nursing research knowledge of CVD applies to the exterior of the body, its responses, its experience, and social context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald, McIntyre, Anderson 2003</td>
<td>the biological body is emphasized while the social life of the body is under theorized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallop &amp; Reynolds 2004</td>
<td>comes from the integration of biological sciences, psychodynamic theory, and socio-cultural theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinser &amp; Lewis 2005</td>
<td>(women’s biology as historically inferior and rejection of biomedical; biological determinism pervasive) no discussion, much about medicine and science, but no nursing knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kvigne, Kirkevold, &amp; Gjengedal 2005</td>
<td>is to promote functional and anatomical health, little attention to the social aspects in nursing practice knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im 2007</td>
<td>greatly influenced by biomedical views, little on the experience,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly 2009</td>
<td>biomedical conceptualizations of health predominant with nominal consideration of social forces.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Comparison**

The next step in data analysis is data comparison. This involves a revisiting of data to identify patterns, themes, or relationships (Whittemore & Knafl, 2005). The primary relationship I am examining in this literature review is between how feminist nursing interacts with the concepts of body and biology. I have not included the additional concepts of
physiology and anatomy because they were not used in a repeated manner in the sources.

Above, I have the data tables which lists how each author(s) conceptualized the concepts of ‘Body’ and ‘Biology’, the themes of ‘Dichotomies’, ‘Moving Away and Toward’, and ‘Assumptions of Nursing Epistemology’.

**Biology and Body in Relation.**

As I read over the table and thought about how the conceptualizations of biology and body were clustered I realized there were commonalities among the individual concepts of ‘body’ and ‘biology’. In addition, I looked at how the common understandings of ‘body’ and ‘biology’ were related. After dwelling on the data extracted, my overall impression was that biology causes disease and the body experiences the disease. Not all the articles stated this exactly, but as I read through the articles again, this was the underlying assumption.

‘Biology’ was seen as a natural entity that did not have a mind of its own (Carryer, 1997; Chinn, 1999; Kvigne, Kirkevold, & Gjengedal, 2005). ‘Body’ was seen as something outside of the biological and in the sphere of social influence (Andrist & MacPherson, 2001; Carryer, 1997; Im, 2007; Kinser & Lewis, 2005; Kvigne & Kirkevold, 2002; K. MacPherson, 1985; K. I. MacPherson, 1992; C. McDonald & McIntyre, 2001; Carol McDonald, McIntyre, & Anderson, 2003; Morse, 1995; Rolls, 2009) and the ‘body’ lives its ‘biology’ (Gallop & Reynolds, 2004; K. Kvigne & Kirkevold, 2002; C. McDonald & McIntyre, 2001). Because the ‘body’ is in the external world and in the social world, it seems to have a will of its own. The ‘biological’, being a natural entity, was in the domain of medicine or biomedicine (Andrist & MacPherson, 2001; K. I. MacPherson, 1992) and the ‘body’, especially the social body, is in the domain of nursing. Being in the medical domain of knowledge, biology was seen as causing illness (Carryer, 1997; Im,
Dichotomies.

Throughout the articles, dichotomy was used in the construction of the arguments with only three exceptions. McDonald and McIntyre (2003) also note the use of dichotomy or dualistic thinking in academic arguments and warn against the pitfall of excluding knowledge by providing only two choices for the reader in an attempt to seem like a conclusion is met. I found that in the source articles, which are written from a feminist perspective, the possibility of choosing “both sides” of the argument was not an option. The authors were also not willing to let there be an ambiguous conclusion to their argument.

Dichotomous construction of argument may be an easy framework to fall into when speaking from a feminist perspective because all but the most recent works engage with ‘female’ and ‘woman’ as a stable category for argument. Although the articles do not mention ‘male’ and ‘man’ in any degree, merely speaking from the category of ‘woman’ the author implicates that there is ‘man’. All but McDonald and McIntyre (2001), McDonald, McIntyre, and Anderson (2003), and Carryer (1997) leave the category of ‘woman’ uncontested and unexplained. Perhaps coming from a feminist perspective inculcates a dichotomous argument.

Moving Toward and Away From.

Feminism is often characterized as a ‘movement’ and this force is evident in the theme of ‘moving toward and away from’ in these articles. Feminisms have a common goal of the emancipation of women that it is moving toward and is moving away from the oppression of
women. Within these feminist nursing articles there is also movement away from and moving toward, but what nursing is moving toward and away from are not the same as in feminism.

The movement to and away from in these articles are within the category of nursing rather than the category of ‘women’ as with feminist writers. ‘Women’ is included, but the goal is for the betterment of nursing as a practice and a discipline. The practice of nursing is moving toward social body work, political work, and social contextual needs and away from body work and physical needs (Andrist & MacPherson, 2001; Chinn, 1999; Kvigne, et al., 2005; K. MacPherson, 1985; K. I. MacPherson, 1992). The discipline of nursing is moving toward lived experience, critique, and holism and away from medical and biological knowledge (Andrist & MacPherson, 2001; Kvigne & Kirkevold, 2002; C. McDonald & McIntyre, 2001; Morse, 1995). The epistemology of nursing is moving toward constructing meaning, social theories, subjective research approaches, social/contextual focus, feminist paradigm and biomedical paradigm. Nursing is moving away from nursing knowledge, building objective, empirical knowledge and medical theories (Carryer, 1997; DeMarco, Campbell, & Wuest, 1993; Im, 2007; Kelly, 2009; Kermode, 1996; C. McDonald & McIntyre, 2001; Rolls, 2009). In summary, nursing’s focus is moving toward a social body and away from a biological body.

**Nursing Epistemology Assumptions.**

According to the authors of these articles and research reports, nursing epistemology is either based on or is highly influenced by the biomedical and/or medical view of health, the body, and nursing practice. Additionally, the authors state there is little attention given in nursing epistemology to the social contextual influence on health (MacPherson, 1992; DeMarco, Campbell & Wuest, 1993; Kermode, 1996; Carryer, 1997; McDonald & McIntyre,
2001; McDonald, McIntyre & Anderson; Gallop & Reynolds, 2004; Kvigne, Kirkevold & Gjengedal, 2005; Im, 2007; Kelly). This finding is not surprising given the focus in feminist theory on the social construction of gender and the social and cultural influences on the health of the body. Embedded in the arguments of these authors is a refusal of knowledge that is created using the biomedical and/or medical view of science (Andrist & MacPherson, 2001; DeMarco, 1993; Im, 2002, 2007; Kelly, 2009; Kinser and Lewis, 2005; MacPherson, 1992, 1985; Rolls, 2009). It is also not surprising that given these distinct views of knowledge that the dichotomy of the biological body vs. the social body is created. Kinser and Lewis (2005) state that women’s biology has historically been cast as inferior and that biomedical knowledge assumes, for the most part, that the biology of women determines their feminine characteristics and thus their inferiority. Kvigne and Kirkevold (2002) also describe feminism’s historical aversion to biomedicine, biological sciences, medicine, and scientific research because the assumption in these viewpoints is that women are inferior and this inferiority is determined by their biology. Throughout these narratives are woven this history of suppression and othering of the body of women and thus the rejection of any knowledge that comes from the traditional scientific paradigm.

Many of the authors critique the biomedical and scientific view of women and provide feminism as a way to think about women outside of the biological and in the social context of lived lives (Andrist & MacPherson, 2001; Chinn, 1999; E. Im, M. Hautman, & B. Keddy, 2000; Im, 2007; Kelly, 2009; Kinser & Lewis, 2005; Kvigne & Kirkevold, 2002; K. MacPherson, 1985; K. I. MacPherson, 1992; McCormick & Bunting, 2002; C. McDonald & McIntyre, 2001; Carol McDonald, et al., 2003). Of relevance to the critique of biomedicine and medicine is that the
authors state nursing knowledge is either directly based on biomedical knowledge and medical
knowledge or is highly influenced by it (Carrey, 1997; DeMarco, Campbell & Wuest, 1993;
Gallop & Reynolds, 2004; Im; Kelly; Kermode, 1996; Kvigne, Kirkevold & Gjengedal, 2005;
MacPherson, 1992; McDonald & McIntyre; McDonald, McIntyre & Anderson). What is implicit
in many of the author’s arguments is that nursing knowledge is not built on biomedical and
medical knowledge but is directly subsumed into nursing knowledge without translation. The
authors discuss and critique biomedical and medical knowledge extensively as if it were the
substance of nursing’s knowledge about the biological body. Although Kermode takes a rather
harsh stance on any epistemology that is not based in traditional science coming out of the
Enlightenment, he agrees with feminist nursing authors when he states that “[nursing’s]
knowledge base and practices have traditionally been viewed as a poor relation to those of
medicine” (p. 2) and “there appears to be no tangible evidence of postmodernist thought
permeating the workplaces of practicing nurses” (p. 2). The feminist stance that biomedical and
medical knowledge excludes the biological body of women or any other race or class that is not
dominant in Western society, is problematic when considering that these same authors state
that much of nursing knowledge is based in that same knowledge. Just as feminist nursing
authors tend to dismiss biomedical and medical knowledge, Kermode takes an equally radical
stance and states that “if science is antithetical to nursing’s interest…then the overwhelming
bulk of health and medical research would automatically be dismissed from the purview of
nursing” (p. 5). The only authors who acknowledged the contribution of medical knowledge to
nursing was McDonald and McIntyre (2001). They state that scientific inquiry is extremely
important in generating nursing knowledge, but that this paradigm of inquiry cannot answer all
the questions of nursing and propose a philosophical inquiry.

Gaps in Knowledge

The gap I see in the knowledge of nursing is the lack of engagement with the biological
body in nursing from a feminist perspective. However there is not just a gap in the knowledge
of the biological body from a feminist perspective, but even when the nurse authors engaged
with the biological body, it was not the biology of the body that was seen, only the whole
biological body. The biology of the body was assumed to be beyond nursing’s epistemological
fence and thus was not questioned and yet the biomedical was questioned. However, in this
questioning the authors also assumed that once the ‘medical’ was removed from the equation
or a ‘psycho’ and/or ‘environmental’ prefix was added on then that somehow changed the ‘bio’
in ‘biomedical’ into nursing knowledge. It is logical, however, for the authors not to remove the
‘bio’ from their critique because with medical biology is removed from nursing knowledge,
there is no biology, thus there would truly be an empty space in the assumed base of nursing
knowledge. In other words, without the medical knowledge that nursing has subsumed, what
knowledge about the biology of the body would be the base for nursing practice and for nursing
education?

Application to Nursing Education

The result of this literature review indicates that nursing knowledge of biology, anatomy
and physiology lacks a feminist critique, which includes nursing knowledge used in nursing
education. I have also discussed the lack of any critique or translation of biological and
biomedical knowledge used in nursing practice and by extension, nursing education. My
investigation into the history of feminism and nursing shows that feminism has not had much influence within the profession of nursing. However, the scientific professions have been a focus of feminist critique since the feminist movement that began in the 1960’s and 1970’s. In particular, biology and feminism have been associated since the women’s movement of the 19th century (Rosser, 1992). Rosser (1992: 2009) indicates that the number of women educated and employed in biology has had substantial growth. This long interaction with feminism may indicate that biological knowledge is most likely value neutral and does not continue to contain androcentric bias. However in Rosser’s 2009 analysis of women in science she states that those in the positions of power and influence have not changed considerably due in part to social issues. These issues include women’s roles in the bearing and caring of children and lack of networking and women mentors (Rosser, 2009). Given that these social issues have not been resolved as of Rosser’s 2009 article, how can the knowledge from the biological and biomedical disciplines be uncritically subsumed into nursing knowledge and used to teach nursing students and inform nursing practice?

Knowledge used in nursing education and practice needs a feminist critique in the process of translation because of the social context in which that knowledge is borrowed. Risjord (2010) criticizes the construction of distinct and separate “pyramids” of disciplinary knowledge. He indicates that disciplinary knowledge should be readily shared or borrowed between disciplines. While I agree with Risjord that knowledge needs to be shared in order for that knowledge to better service the health needs of the people of our society, I feel that the field in which that knowledge exists is not a level. As Rosser (1992) pointed out, the traditions of our society continue to exist and are perpetuated by current male dominated society and re-
enforce the power structure of science created by men, thus women’s influence in society remains small despite progress made. Although it is an unknown and thus a tenuous assumption, nursing, being made up of women almost exclusively may be better positioned than feminist biologists to affect change in nursing’s positions of leadership and power. Risjord states that nurses are in a privileged position to critique current social order due to their unique role in a male dominated society. This position gives nurse educators an opportunity to affect continued social change by not only using feminist pedagogy, but also using a feminist critique in the translation of biological knowledge used in nursing education.

Further Research

The “theory/practice gap” in nursing has increasingly been an issue of discussion beginning in the 1980’s and I bring it up here again (Risjord, 2010). The argument is that nursing theory is either difficult to use in practice or that it is of no use to the practice of nursing. Risjord states that nursing theory in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century was thought of as “models of human biology and anatomy, theories about disease etiology, etc.” (p. 8). At that time there was no discussion of a ‘theory/practice gap’ because theory was relevant to practice as long as nursing remained subservient to physicians (Risjord). Thus, why is there now a ‘theory/practice gap’? It is theorized that as nursing moved toward professionalization and thus to research in order to underpin the discipline, nursing theory was created and introduced into the profession of nursing. It is this ‘nursing theory’ that is being referred to in the ‘theory/practice gap’, not medical theory. Medical theory still guides nursing practice. Whether they know it or not, nursing practice remains under the authority of physicians even when nurses are supposedly practicing autonomously.
Hospital policy and procedures base nurse’s ‘autonomous’ skill practice on the unseen authority of the physician’s knowledge. For instance, in the Cardiac Care Unit (CCU) I worked in, I was able to monitor IV infusions of hemodynamic medications not based on my nursing knowledge, but only if I had been instructed by a physician about how to administer and monitor the medication. This medical knowledge was embedded in the clinical orientation to the CCU that was carried out by the clinical nurse educator. I found this knowledge very relevant and useful to my practice of nursing in the CCU. In Kvigne et al. (2005), the authors found that the nurse participants “perceived nursing care primarily in terms of practical actions to promote the body’s functional and practical abilities” (p. 897). Additionally, in their report they state that nursing students prefer “knowledge of anatomy and pathology in order to understand disease” (p. 904). Kvigne et al. conclude that the nursing students are victims of dominating ideologies and values that prevent them from acting on phenomenological knowledge of the lived experience of the patient. However, I would ask if the phenomenological knowledge is relevant to the lived experience of practicing nursing in that situation.

Medical knowledge is very valuable to nursing practice, but medical knowledge is not nursing knowledge although it is an integral part of nursing practice. Indeed, most lay people I speak to about my nursing education do not know what nursing knowledge is, they assume it is medical knowledge. It is also unfortunate that this misconception is also true of nurses because medical knowledge is subsumed into nursing practice from the first years of nursing education to orientation in their place of practice. The beginning step to address this issue is for a critical feminist critique for gender, class, and race bias in knowledge presented in nurse education on
the topics of biology, anatomy, and physiology. If nursing is using medical knowledge in nursing practice then it needs to be critiqued so that nurse educators may interpret medical knowledge into nursing knowledge and to not perpetuate injustices based on gender, class, and race. This is but the beginning of research that needs to be done to provide nursing theory and knowledge on the biological body for use in nursing practice.

Conclusion

My search for knowledge about biology, anatomy, and physiology from a nursing critical feminist perspective revealed that there was no readily available knowledge in the scholarly journals I searched. Despite much critique of biology by feminist biologists and science by feminist philosophers, there is no engagement from nursing with what makes up a large part of their practice’s knowledge base. This literature review has brought me to an understanding of the historical possibilities to explain this lack of knowledge development.

Nursing, at its very basic conception was an outgrowth of people caring for one another when they were ill. Throughout the centuries there have been various occupations that have included a caring role. However, Nightingale has historically been credited with raising the caring occupation of nurse to social acceptability and professional status by identifying the unique domain of nursing, unique knowledge base, and nursing theory (Risjord, 2010). Chinn (1999) tells us that Nightingale refused to endorse the feminist movement of her time, but she, herself was a feminist in her perspective of a woman’s role in society. Just as Nightingale refused feminism, for 40 years the American Nurses’ Association would not endorse the women’s suffrage in the US, citing a desire to remain neutral. Kane and Thomas (2000) tell us that in the 1970’s the nursing profession was a target for criticism by feminists because it was a
feminized profession. At about that time nursing was continuing to move toward professionalization and aligned itself with the medical profession in order to bolster their political power. Currently, nursing in the US and Canada remain closely aligned with medicine through their knowledge base and through their close, integral working relationship. It seems that nursing, despite being mostly a profession made up of women, still rejects the feminist’s philosophy. It is this continued social incongruence of nursing and feminism that has led to a lack of feminist nursing research and thus a lack of feminist perspectives of nursing knowledge.

In the available nursing feminist literature, I found that the research questions were socially based. The questions focused on the examination of the social environmental and thus left the biological body behind. A feminist framework or a feminist research methodology lends itself to questions about the social body rather than the biological body and to social solutions. This literature review has helped me to identify how a research project using a feminist perspective might guide my question, methods, analysis, conclusions, and recommendations. In the literature I reviewed I found that in the feminist nurse researcher’s zeal to promote the ‘social woman’ in nursing knowledge and to critique medical or any other traditionally based scientific knowledge for gender, race, and class bias, is the lack of translation of other discipline’s knowledge into unique nursing knowledge. Kelly’s (2009) proposition to integrate biomedical and feminist intersectionality paradigms in nursing research to address persistent health disparities is an explicit example. Kelly implies that nursing knowledge and practice is partway between feminism’s social action and justice and biomedicine’s cause and treatment of health problems. She is at a loss to find adequate nursing research and thus draws on other disciplines knowledge and then applies it to a nursing situation. What is not said in this article
and others is how are other disciplines knowledge translated into nursing knowledge for use in practice?

Carryer (1997), in her examination of the experience of ‘largeness’ questioned “nursing’s autonomy and separateness from medicine” (p. ii). She found that despite nursing’s stated unique holistic approach, nurses in practice unquestionably adhered to medicine’s reductionist, individualistic views of obese people. Kvigne, Kirkevold and Gjengedal (2005) also found that even though nursing “espoused commitment to individualized care” (p. 898), they were more interested in “promot[ing] the body’s functional and practical abilities” and “little attention was directed to the stroke survivors’ experiences of their life body” (p. 897). Carryer postulated that because nursing is in a social environment that values the goals of the biomedical view of nursing care, the uniquely holistic, contextual nursing view of care is marginalized. Carryer states that there is a “profound schism” between nursing’s medical knowledge and their more holistic approach to nursing practice. It is my opinion that biomedical and medical knowledge has not been critically examined by nursing and translated into nursing knowledge, but rather has been subsumed into nursing knowledge and practice and thus this schism that Carryer referred to, is apparent in nursing practice. Nursing is using the knowledge of medicine carte blanche and thus it is no wonder that it does not mix with the holistic, contextual nursing knowledge. My proposal is that nursing engages in creating unique nursing knowledge about the biological, physiological, and anatomical functioning of the human body in order to inform nursing practice. At the very least nurse researchers need to critique other discipline’s knowledge and through theoretical and philosophical discussion postulate how to appropriately apply it to the unique discipline of nursing.
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## Appendix 1

### Table A1

Inclusion and Exclusion for Non-research Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accepted</th>
<th>Author &amp; Year</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Nursing?</th>
<th>Feminism?</th>
<th>Biology/Physiology/Anatomy?</th>
<th>Exclusion Reason</th>
<th>Inclusion Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Andrist &amp; MacPherson 2001</td>
<td>Annual Review of Nursing Research</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atkins &amp; Gingrus 2009</td>
<td>Canadian Journal of Dietetic Practice &amp; Research</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not Nursing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bramwell 2008</td>
<td>Journal of Reproductive &amp; Infant Psychology</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not Nursing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bullough 1996</td>
<td>Journal of Sex Research</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not Nursing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cammer 2006</td>
<td>Thesis University of Saskatchewan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not Nursing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campbell &amp; Bunting 1991</td>
<td>Advances in Nursing Science as reprinted in Perspectives on Philosophy of Science in Nursing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No concepts included</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Chinn 1999</td>
<td>Perspectives on Philosophy of Science in Nursing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clarke 2007</td>
<td>Journal of Women &amp; Aging</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Nursing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cosgrove &amp; Riddle 2003</td>
<td>Women &amp; Health</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Nursing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cummins 2007</td>
<td>Eating Disorders</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Nursing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>DeMarco 1993</td>
<td>Advances in Nursing Science, 16(2)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duffy 1985</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not Relevant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fox, Ward, O'Rourke 2005</td>
<td>Sociology of Health &amp; Illness</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Nursing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Gallop &amp; Reynolds</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gortner</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>International Journal of Nursing Studies</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>No concepts included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gortner</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Nursing Outlook</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Feminism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Nursing Inquiry</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No concepts included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harding</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Signs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Advances in Nursing Science</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>No concepts included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Nursing Outlook</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>No concepts included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kattlow</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Nursing Philosophy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No concepts included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Kelly</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Advances in Nursing Science</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Kermode</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Key Note Address</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Kinser &amp; Lewis</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Health Care for Women International</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Kvigne</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Nursing Philosophy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A MacPherson</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Advances in Nursing Science</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A MacPherson</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Advances in Nursing Science</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine, Bunnel, Marx</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Eating Disorders</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A McDonald &amp; McIntyre</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Nursing Philosophy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald, McIntyre, Donaldson</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Health Care for Women International</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>No concepts included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miers</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Journal of Advanced Nursing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No concepts included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Morse</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Nursing Outlook</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munch</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Women &amp; Health</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Journal Title</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>Key Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munch</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Social Work in Health Care</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not Nursing</td>
<td>Not Nursing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rees</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Medical Education</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not Nursing</td>
<td>Not Nursing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reiger</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Health Sociology Review</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not Nursing</td>
<td>Not Nursing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saguy &amp; Riley</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Journal of Health Politics, Policy &amp; Law</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not Nursing</td>
<td>Not Nursing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharp</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Disability &amp; Society</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not Nursing</td>
<td>Not Nursing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Journal of Perinatal Education</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not Nursing</td>
<td>Not Nursing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soban</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>International Journal of Men's Health</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not Nursing</td>
<td>Not Nursing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundby</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Scandinavian Journal of Public Health</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not Nursing</td>
<td>Not Nursing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorne</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Health Care for Women International</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not Nursing</td>
<td>Not Nursing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiggemann</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>International Journal of Eating Disorders</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not Nursing</td>
<td>Not Nursing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toombs</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Hastings Center Report</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not Nursing</td>
<td>Not Nursing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams &amp; Mackey</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Health Care for Women International</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not Relevant</td>
<td>Nursing aligns itself with the medical view of health.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A2

Research Literature Analysis (all research literature was included)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Kvigne, Kirkevold, Gjengedal</td>
<td>Journal of Clinical Nursing</td>
<td>Explore nature of nursing care and rehab of female stroke pts, by hospital nurses</td>
<td>Hospital nurses</td>
<td>Phenomenological with feminist perspective</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Im</td>
<td>Western Journal of Nursing Research</td>
<td>Critique research for bias</td>
<td>469 studies</td>
<td>Feminist critique</td>
<td>Critical analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Im</td>
<td>Western Journal of Nursing Research</td>
<td>Critique research for bias</td>
<td>82 nursing articles</td>
<td>Feminist critique</td>
<td>Critical analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Im</td>
<td>Nursing Philosophy</td>
<td>Research approach</td>
<td>Nursing research</td>
<td>Feminist critique</td>
<td>Critical analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>McCornick, Bunting</td>
<td>Health Care for Women International</td>
<td>Critique research</td>
<td>9 research articles</td>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>Critical analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Rolls</td>
<td>Thesis University of Victoria</td>
<td>Disrupt the biomedical discourse on heart failure</td>
<td>Literature about heart failure</td>
<td>Critical feminist lit review</td>
<td>Critical analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>