



**ADDRESSING GENDER EQUALITY AND FEMINISM IN FEMINIST FOREIGN
POLICIES: EXPLORING GERMANY FEMINIST DEVELOPMENT POLICY**

**Valérie Daniel
300254295**

**Graduate School of Public and International Affairs
Supervisor: Rebecca Tiessen
Major Research Paper – API 6999**

University of Ottawa

Fall 2023

Abstract: Despite the growing adoption of Feminist foreign policies (FFPs) by several states, concerns have arisen regarding their potential for “genderwashing” and their failure to address underlying power imbalances and structural inequalities. Critics have pointed out several issues with FFPs, including the absence of a clearly defined feminist framework, a failure to recognize diverse feminisms, an instrumentalist approach, and limited practical impact, all of which contradict the “feminist” label attached to these policies. This paper conducts a critical examination of the language used in Germany’s feminist development policy (FDP) to comprehend how states communicate their ideas of feminism and gender equality. The study utilizes critical discourse analysis and qualitative content analysis to assess Germany’s FDP, shedding light on missed opportunities and limitations in addressing fundamental issues of gender inequality. Acknowledging Germany’s enhanced commitment to gender equality and its responsive approach to critiques, this research underlines challenges that persist in embracing a transformative feminist approach, offering insights into the discursive lenses of FFPs for the broader community of state and non-state actors and emphasizing the necessity for ongoing efforts to refine concepts in FFPs to effectively address gender inequalities.

Keywords: Feminist foreign policies, critical discourse analysis, content analysis, transformative feminism, gender equality, women’s rights

Table of Contents

<i>Abstract</i>	2
<i>List of acronyms</i>	4
INTRODUCTION	5
CHAPTER 1: Literature Review and Theoretical Analysis	8
Plurality of Feminisms	9
Neoliberal Feminism	10
Transformative Feminism	10
Feminist Foreign Policy	12
Feminist Foreign Policies Shortcomings	13
Unveiling the Limitations: A Critical Analysis of the FIAP	15
1. Missed Opportunity to Define Feminism and Adopt a Transformative Approach	15
2. Economic Instrumentalization	18
3. Essentialization of Women, Gender and Absence of Intersectional Lens	19
4. A Paternalistic Approach to Women and Girls	21
CHAPTER 2: Methodology	22
Research Strategy	23
Discourse Analysis	24
Critical Discourse Analysis	25
Limitations of Critical Discourse Analysis	26
Content Analysis	27
Qualitative Content Analysis	28
Procedural Guidelines for Content Analysis	29
Limitations of Qualitative Content Analysis	32
Combining Discourse and Content Analysis	33
Self-Reflection	34
CHAPTER 3: Findings and Analysis	35
Adapting Research Methods to Address Diverse Critiques	36
Qualitative Content Analysis Results	37
Emergent Key Themes in Content Analysis	37
Defining Feminism	40
Missteps in Embracing a Feminist Transformative Approach	41
Ambiguity Surrounding Colonialism, Patriarchy and Capitalism	42
Unaddressed Gendered Burdens: Unpaid Care Work and Mental Load	45
Involving “Men and Boys”	46
Instrumentalization of Women's Rights, Gender Equality and Feminism	48
Narrow Perspective of Women and Gender Equality	51
Essentialization of Women as a Monolithic Category	51
Intersectional Lens	52
Uncovering the Gaps	53
Paternalistic Approaches to Women and Girls	55
CONCLUSION	57
Exploring the Boundaries: Limitations and Implications	59
Bibliography	61
Appendix	69
TABLE 1: Themes Used for Analysing Germany’s FDP	69
TABLE 2: Frequency of Key Term References in Germany’s FDP	71

LIST OF ACRONYMS

BMZ = The German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development

CDA = Critical Discourse Analysis

FIAP = Canada's Feminist International Assistance Policy

FDP = Feminist Development Policy

FFP = Feminist Foreign Policy

SOGI = Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity

SOGIESC = Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity and Gender Expression, and Sex
Characteristics

WW1 = World War 1

WW2 = World War 2

ADDRESSING GENDER EQUALITY AND FEMINISM IN FEMINIST FOREIGN POLICIES: EXPLORING GERMANY FEMINIST DEVELOPMENT POLICY

Patriarchal systems have perpetuated gender inequality for centuries, with men holding disproportionate portions of power, authority and decision-making influence. The fight for gender equality has been undertaken by various stakeholders over many years, including NGOs, civil society, international organizations, academia and more. Most recently, a growing number of governments have implemented feminist foreign policies (FFPs) as strategies for promoting women's rights questioning the conception of gender equality often referred to in terms of equality among all individuals, regardless of gender, valued and realized through equal rights, opportunities, and treatment in a fair and just society.

The first FFP was introduced in 2014 by the Swedish government with the principal objective of achieving equal access to rights, representation, and resources for all individuals. A few years later, Canada, led by Trudeau's government, was the second state to introduce a feminist foreign policy explicitly focused on feminist international assistance. Since then, Spain, France, Mexico, Libya, and Luxembourg, among other nations, have also followed suit by establishing FFPs (L. Thompson, Ahmed, et Khokhar 2021). This new orientation in foreign policies and how politicians introduce them in global affairs offers a possible realignment of international relations on gender imbalances and power structures while challenging the socio-cultural, political, and economic understanding of gender equality and feminism. However, many individuals, including Prime Minister Trudeau, a self-proclaimed feminist, advocate for gender equality, women's rights and women's empowerment as part of these feminist foreign policies without acknowledging the underlying structural inequalities that need to be addressed to achieve a just and equal society (Tiessen 2023).

Foreign policies and feminist development policies, in particular, must account for power imbalances in North-South relationships and the postcolonial, patriarchal and economic structures that perpetuate gender inequality. As more countries adopt FFPs, explicitly focussed

on international assistance and development, questions arise pertaining to the potential for “genderwashing” that can contribute to colonial continuities. Therefore, it is crucial to examine the extent to which self-proclaimed “feminist” policies genuinely address power relations, embrace a transformative approach to systems of inequality by adopting a feminist and intersectional approach and tackle the persistent challenges of oversimplifying or generalizing the experiences of women (Nylund, Håkansson, et Bjarnegård 2023, 257).

A growing set of scholarly critiques have emerged to demonstrate examples and implications of “genderwashing” through the adoption of FFPs. Among these critiques is the absence of transformative policy approaches that tackle the fundamental causes of gender inequality, which is a persistent challenge to feminist foreign policies and analyses of the instrumentalist approach used to advance other priorities, such as economic growth, security and peace, or gender equality diplomacy. Other studies highlight the limited impact of policy in practice, insufficient resources, lack of transparent funding allocations, the absence of collaboration with actors from the Global South, and poor coordination between the ministries involved in foreign policy (Zilla, 2022; Tiessen 2023; Parisi 2020; Cadesky 2020). Furthermore, there is a lack of recognition and understanding of the plurality of feminisms among FFPs as well as a failure to provide a feminist social critique that addresses the patriarchy, the colonial history, capitalism, and heteronormativity that perpetuate systemic, structural, and institutional inequalities within and between countries (Morton, Muchiri, et Swiss 2020; Mason 2019; Scheyer et Kumskova 2019; L. Thompson, Ahmed, et Khokhar 2021; Nylund, Håkansson, et Bjarnegård 2023; Cadesky 2020).

These critiques are an essential starting point for considering the underlying intentions of policies, their efficiency and goals, and the groups targeted by these policy frameworks. Critical discourse analyses of FFPs in the scholarly fields of international relations have scrutinized the core values and conceptions of gender equality embodied by these narratives to

assess their capacity to support equality among all individuals, their objectives, and their ability to dismantle global inequalities and power dynamics that affect marginalized groups.

As part of the growing body of scholarship that has critically analyzed FFPs, specific development-related critiques have also emerged in relation to Canada's Feminist International Assistance Policy (FIAP) published in 2017. Between 2017 – 2023, a large number of feminist critiques documented the discursive shortcomings of the FIAP, a body of scholarship that overlaps with and is connected to broader scholarship and critiques of FFPs. Since then, Germany has also released its version of a feminist development policy (released in English in May 2023). This research considers whether Germany's FDP - introduced six years after the FIAP and with the benefit of an important body of scholarly critiques arising from Canada's FDP – offers a more comprehensive and feminist-informed policy document to address gender inequality. The analysis considers whether the critical insights gained from the FIAP's reviews can also be applied to Germany's FDP. Specifically, this paper studies whether Germany's 2023 FDP offers a stronger discursive lens for feminist development policy-making compared to Canada's FIAP. If so, why and how? What are the broader implications and ongoing limitations of improvements in policy discourse, and what challenges remain?

Discourse and content analyses of policies offer valuable insights into the guiding priorities, and these directive frameworks have potential impacts on practice. The critical discourse analysis and qualitative content analysis carried out for this paper allow for uncovering underlying intentions and priorities through language and guiding principles and offer a more careful and empirical examination of Germany's conceptions of feminism, gender equality and women's rights. Policy assessment sets the foundation of social actions and holds governments accountable for agreements and statements regarding achieving gender equality. Such analysis provides valuable perspectives into power relations, uncovering implicit assumptions such as norms, values, and beliefs that this paper's research question aims to discuss. This paper seeks to highlight insights about FFPs from existing narratives and

examines the feminist ideas that inform policy documents. It aims to contribute to the academic discourse on FFPs, as the existing literature on this subject remains limited in scope and depth. Lastly, this research intends to provide insights into the discursive lenses of FFPs to the broader community of state and non-state actors.

The first chapter offers an overview of key concepts related to the FFP scholarship by exploring the notions of feminism and gender equality conceptualized by feminist academia. It provides the theoretical foundation for discussing neoliberal and transformative feminisms and delivers an overview of FFPs' scholarship. The first chapter concludes with an analytical framework that arises from the scholarly evaluations of Canada's FIAP, highlighting several missed opportunities. The second chapter presents the research strategy and methodologic approaches guiding the study for this paper. Employing discourse and content analysis methods provides a distinct process that guides an in-depth and comprehensive analysis of Germany's FDP. The third chapter explains the alignment of the methodologies with the analytical framework drawn from the FIAP, offers the content analysis's quantitative results, and delves into the discursive research inferences. The paper concludes with a summary of the findings, the research limitations and future considerations for governments to fully embrace transformative FFPs that will have more significant impacts on tackling gender inequality.

CHAPTER 1: Literature Review and Theoretical Analysis

Since Sweden introduced the first foreign policy oriented on feminism, FFPs have come under increasing scrutiny. Among the emerging critiques are questions about the usage of the term 'feminism' in these so-called feminist policies and how, why and by whom these policies were introduced and implemented. This chapter begins with an overview of different definitions of feminism, focusing on neoliberal and transformative feminism particularly, two perspectives profoundly linked with the development of FFPs. It follows with a review of central critiques of FFPs while highlighting the lack of a common approach among FFPs. The chapter concludes

with an outline of the FIAP's missed opportunities to address structural gender inequalities and systemic power dynamics as an analytical framework on which this research builds.

Plurality of Feminisms

Feminism and gender equality are deeply interconnected, yet their definitions and priorities vary significantly across scholarships, institutions and societies. This paper does not seek to address the definition of feminism nor the question of whether it should be defined, but rather to establish foundations for common theoretical grounds building from the feminist scholarship for the analytical framework. Largely, feminism has been seen in various ways as a social, ethical and political engagement advocating for women's and girls' rights in all their diversity and equality between all individuals. Some continuities among scholars associate gender equality with the transformation of the structures that sustain unequal power and gendered relations within all aspects of societies and the treatment of women in all their diversity equally to men in all their diversity (Cadesky 2020, 303; Fraser 1994). As Thompson (1994) notes, feminism can be "centrally concerned with questions of power, power in the sense of relations of domination/subordination, and power in the sense of ability, capacity and opportunity to control the conditions of one's own existence" which condemns all gender-based inequalities (p. 173).

Feminism remains centrally characterized by numerous ideological iterations and approaches that seek to challenge and dismantle oppressive, discriminatory and unequal systemic structures that women have faced and continue to face in all aspects of life (Thompson 1994, 173; Offen 1988). The contextual reality of feminism has pushed the development of a variety of feminisms offering different and sometimes overlapping core values that also come to question traditional schools of Western feminism, such as black feminism, Marxist feminism, queer feminism, and more (Zilla 2022, 3). Acknowledging the plurality of feminisms and their distinctive contexts represents a first step in rightfully assessing policy narratives that put forward an agenda that reaches populations and individuals worldwide and interacts with their

interpretations of feminism and gender equality (Nylund, Håkansson, et Bjarnegård 2023, 258-60).

Neoliberal Feminism

Various states and non-state actors have embraced different feminist orientations in recent decades. The late 20th century saw the rise of neoliberalism, leading to the erosion of social rights and protections. The convergence of interests between neoliberalism and second-wave feminism, the emergence of third-wave feminism challenging the universalism of its predecessor, the influence of post-feminism, and the rise of celebrity culture gave rise to neoliberal feminism (Rottenberg 2018; Schuster 2022).

Neoliberal feminism advocates market citizenship as the primary means of attaining gender equality and refrains from criticizing neoliberalism's underlying principles (Parisi 2020, 164). Liberalism has been used to create a new feminist subject central to the rise of neoliberal feminism. This subject is very individualistic, aware of gender inequalities but also taking full responsibility for its well-being and work-life balance, turning gender inequality into an individual issue. As a result, neoliberal feminism does not consider societal, cultural, and economic factors as central to gender disparities and as contributors to these inequalities, neglecting the systemic roots of the issue (Rottenberg 2018). By operating this change of focus, the neoliberal conception of feminism promotes "an integrationist or instrumentalist rather than a transformative approach to feminism," which translates in development aid into the exacerbation of gender inequalities and continuities of unequal power structures (Tiessen 2023, 6).

Transformative Feminism

Transformative feminism emerged in the late 80s when academics such as Mohanty (1988) started challenging the homogenizing and essentializing tendencies of feminist movements. Scholars such as MacArthur et al. (2022) ground its core to the "desire to see

revolutionary changes in the ‘deeply ingrained nature of gender inequality’” (MacArthur et al. 2022, 6). Transformative feminism places power dynamics and systems of inequity at the core of development initiatives. It aims to tackle the root causes of gender disparity while challenging traditional gender roles, cultural norms, and socially accepted power structures perpetuating inequality, marginalization, and unfairness (Tiessen 2023; Thompson 2021). A transformative feminist approach intends to address biased laws and customs, uncover colonial continuities, and confront harmful stereotypes (MacArthur et al. 2022, 6-8). Development programs that aspire to the ‘feminist’ label must also actively involve men and boys in the reshaping of social dynamics, attitudes, and behaviours. They should ensure equal access and control of resources for women and address discriminatory practices through educational campaigns (Tiessen 2023, 5-6).

Adopting the term ‘feminist’ within policymaking holds significant discursive weight. This shift in politics modifies the commonly understood emphasis on gender mainstreaming to an approach that meaningfully challenges and aims to deconstruct power hierarchies and gendered structures that shape global institutions and foreign affairs. Some scholars describe the transformative character of FFPs as “norm-based policy, primarily focusing on achieving long-term norm change” (Nylund, Håkansson, et Bjarnegård 2023, 259). It involves engaging with local actors, adopting an intersectional lens and avoiding sole focus on the state. Valuing local knowledge and intersectionality within a holistic discourse by integrating postcolonial and feminist perspectives supports adopting a so-called feminist policy in development work (Nylund, Håkansson, et Bjarnegård 2023, 258-59). A feminist foreign policy implies intentions and requirements to move beyond a common understanding of gender mainstreaming in which gender equality issues are often part of the agenda without fundamentally modifying existing systemic and structural inequalities and toward a transformative approach that uses the achievement of gender equality as the final purpose in all sphere of society (Parisi, 2020).

Feminist Foreign Policy

Despite a growing number of governments across the world adopting different forms of FFPs, there is an absence of a unified understanding of what constitutes FFPs as the UN Women (2022) notes, “There is no agreed definition of what constitutes a feminist foreign policy” (UN Women 2022, 1). The various feminist perspectives have been drawn to different contexts and currents, which is also reflected in the variety of FFPs. Some governments seek to base their perspective of the concept on empirical contexts, while others consolidate their theoretical grounds by building on academic scholarship. Others fail to define feminism or offer a vague illustration of their feminist perspective (Thomson 2020; Zilla 2022, 3-4). Few states, such as Sweden, aim to conceptualize feminism around a specific framework that positions gender equality as an objective in itself in reference to the three “Rs (Rights, Representation, Resources),” where men and women hold equal “power to shape the society and their personal life” (Thomson 2020, 429). Others have favoured a more neoliberal perception of feminism. Despite these, to some extent, guiding insights, FFPs generally fail to offer a clear conception of feminism or to adopt a transformative approach that addresses the root causes of gender inequality, discrimination and oppression. This blurs the possibility of understanding a state’s vision of gender equality and within which theoretical framework they aim to achieve it while allowing state actors to modulate and shape feminism according to other interests. Moreover, the common and frequent absence of recognition of plural feminism by state institutions prevents the establishment of theoretical frameworks that would set the grounds for the consequent plurality of FFPs (Thomson, 2020).

The failure to adopt a universally agreed-upon definition of feminism or to understand FFPs provides scholars with the opportunity to define FFPs themselves. Thompson, Ahmed, et Khokhar (2021) describe FFP as a state’s approach to its interactions with other states and non-state actors, prioritizing peace, gender equality, environmental protection, and human rights, challenging oppressive power structures, and encompassing cooperation with feminists

domestically and internationally (L. Thompson, Ahmed, et Khokhar 2021, 25-26). Others, such as Cheung et al. (2021), adopt a conceptual characterization-based approach by unravelling FFPs into five distinctive principles going from intersectionality to empathetic reflexivity, substantive representation and participation, in addition to accountability and active peace commitment (Cheung et al. 2021; Thomson 2020).

Moreover, some research shows that despite countries with similar socio-economic, political and cultural backgrounds, FFPs' definitions and understandings remain distinct among states. European governments with FFPs have put forward distinctive perspectives of feminism and gender equality, including different ways to achieve it. The conceptualization of gender equality among European states such as Sweden, Germany, France, and Spain demonstrates that where some states consider equality as an aim, others see it as a means for sustainable development or an instrument for peaceful and prosperous societies (Cezilly Fernandez De Liger 2023). Despite adopting feminist-oriented foreign policies, research reveals state-centred security approaches put forward by governments prevail as opposed to human security approaches that emphasize the protection and promotion of human rights for all individuals from which feminist approaches stem from (Cezilly Fernandez De Liger 2023, 26-28). This variance in FFPs across governments affects the capacity to conduct relevant assessments of the policies due to the absence of standardized criteria for evaluation. Without a consistent framework or set of principles that state actors adhere to, it becomes challenging to compare and assess the effectiveness of these policies in achieving so-called feminist goals.

Feminist Foreign Policies Shortcomings

This recent integration of feminism as the core topic of foreign policies unveils distinctive challenges, shortcomings and silences within the resolution and the policy frameworks. The gap between policy rhetoric and practice, as well as the failure to recognize plural feminisms, are observed as core issues hindering the effective adoption of a feminist approach within FFPs. Many scholars criticize the distance between the theoretical policy

aspirations and the practical applications of the policy: “Governments may use FFP to present a progressive face while propagating light-weight, uncontroversial versions of feminism” (Zilla 2022, 6; Tiessen and Swan 2018). This gap between policy and practice also demonstrates an instrumentalization of feminism and women’s rights for economic, security, peace, or political purposes (Cadesky 2020).

Few governments, such as Sweden, followed by Germany, have set common grounds to approach gender equality by defining its fundamental equal access to rights, resources and representation (Zilla 2022; Tiessen 2023). Despite this policy approach used as a framework that other institutions can build upon, scholars critique the failure to adopt clear and substantial directives on how to achieve gender equality and to address colonial and patriarchal systemic structures that maintain these inequalities (L. Thompson, Ahmed, et Khokhar 2021, 26). Indeed, Tiessen and Swan point out the absence of recognition of the pervasive nature of gender inequality at all levels, from grassroots level to state institutions and international levels and the necessity to adopt “the policy and practice ... based on a feminist epistemological foundation” to effectively address gender inequality (Tiessen et Swan 2018, 198).

This absence of a comprehensive feminist approach in all aspects of foreign policy combined with the insufficient investments in gender equality affects the capacity to link the rhetoric to the practical reality (L. Thompson, Ahmed, et Khokhar 2021; Zilla 2022, 6). The poor distribution of appropriate resources, programs, funding, and staff to implement FFPs in line with their core policy principles remains incoherent with the used label of feminist policy. The lack of vigorous and independent monitoring, evaluation, research, and learning frameworks tied to policy outcomes is also a current issue in FFPs (Thompson, Ahmed, et Khokhar 2021, 23-24; Tiessen et Swan 2018).

Furthermore, the lack of alignment between policy sectors and FFPs raises tensions and limits the efficient implementation. The poor coordination and coherence among various sectors makes it challenging to effectively address the objectives of FFPs and results in

conflicting priorities, duplication of efforts, and a fragmented approach to policy implementation. The absence of meaningful dialogue between civil society actors, NGOs, and local organizations conflicts with efficient FFP policy-making processes. The need to grant stronger support to feminist organizations is essential to FFPs' success. Without active engagement and collaboration with these stakeholders, there is a missed opportunity to collect their expertise, perspectives and valuable on-the-ground knowledge (Zilla 2022; Thomson 2021; Tiessen 2023). Finally, various forms of oppression experienced by different individuals based on their gender and perpetuation of inequalities by gender norms are not addressed nor recognized within several FFPs. The misunderstanding of women and women's needs, the socially constructed gendered roles and the absence of structural changes in gendered systemic power imbalances within gender-informed foreign policy remain central to the critiques of FFPs (Zilla 2022).

Unveiling the Limitations: A Critical Analysis of the FIAP

Drawing on critical analyses of neoliberal feminism and the failure to adopt transformative feminism as the vision for FFPs, the next section uncovers some of the central critiques of Canada's FIAP. In line with the analyses noted above, the FIAP remains an example of a missed opportunity to define feminism and advance a transformative feminist approach. Other common critiques of the FIAP include the instrumentalization of women and women's rights, ongoing challenges of essentializing women while failing to incorporate intersectionality, and paternalistic language in development pertaining to women and girls.

1. Missed Opportunity to Define Feminism and Adopt a Transformative Approach

Canadian policymakers have faced significant criticism from the feminist scholarship in their handling of the FIAP due to their failure to provide a clear definition of feminism and to adopt a transformative feminist approach (Tiessen 2023; Parisi 2020; Cadesky 2020). There is no comprehensive definition of feminism or normative text to frame the concept within the

policy document. However, as foreign policy has predominantly been shaped and implemented by male-dominated institutions that uphold traditional, patriarchal power structures, the FIAP leans on, as many other FFPs do, neoliberal conceptions of feminism favoured by these institutional power dynamics. Canada relies heavily on the language of women's empowerment and the neoliberal vision of gender equality (Parisi 2020; Cadesky 2020; L. Thompson, Ahmed, et Khokhar 2021, 25). Following Cadesky's reflections, the FIAP endorses a liberal conception of feminism that focuses primarily on economic development and political participation. In general, the humble aim of the policy that advocates for a more equitable world fails to structure its core values around a fundamental change of the status quo.

Critical analyses of neoliberal conceptions of feminism point to the individualistic nature of such perspectives and the lack of discussion for structural and transformational approaches to gender equality geared to tackling the root causes of inequality. This liberal feminist approach focuses on women's inclusion and subsequent improved participation in development programs. The FIAP places greater emphasis on the private sector using it as a key driving force to achieve gender equality and falls short of addressing structural gender inequalities maintained by underlying systems like patriarchy or capitalism (Thomson 2020). This approach also reinforces a state-based framework within an outdated view of the international order, which emphasizes the influence of state relationships while neglecting to recognize the significant contributions of connections between civil society movements, multinational corporations, non-state actors, and other entities to the shaping of the global order (Cadesky 2020; Parisi 2020; Tiessen 2023, 5; Thomson 2021, 25).

The absence of a definition of feminism leaves the policy open to interpretations that rarely address structural and systematic gender inequalities and encourages a neoliberal orientation of feminism. This alignment limits the adoption of a transformative agenda and overlooks issues related to masculinities and patriarchal structures, particularly in economic development (Cadesky 2020). It leaves room for a gender-standardized conception of feminism

where heteronormativity is assumed to be the social norm and gender binary the acknowledgement of women and men as the two sole genders within society, failing to consider “an inclusive understanding of feminism [that] also embraces further identities such as LGBTQIA+” (Zilla 2022, 3). The social understanding of gender equality needs to deconstruct the cis-gendered men and women vision that dominates social life in order to adopt an intersectional position toward equality and an inclusive approach to feminism.

The lack of a transformative approach to gender equality that stems from the absence of defined feminism fundamentally limits policy capacity to tackle gender inequality. The term ‘feminist’ features the distinctively transformative potential of FFPs’ policy approach, which must challenge the existing status quo in a manner that other approaches do not address, focusing on “discriminatory laws and practices, uncovering colonial continuities, and challenging toxic masculinities” (Tiessen 2023, 5). A feminist approach also emphasizes the intention to exceed simple efforts towards gender equality to incite a commitment to reform existing structures and persuade structural disruption and transformation. The FIAP’s sole focus on development aid exposes the lack of a comprehensive, cohesive, and unified approach to the entire spectrum of foreign policy and international relations that reach the exhaustive domains such as aid, trade, defence and immigration, in addition to diplomacy and domestic policy to advance in consistent matter equity for all (Thompson, Ahmed, et Khokhar 2021; Tiessen 2023). Swan (2021) presents a compelling case by examining the development aid provided to Gaza. The humanitarian initiatives often overlook the political dimensions, leading to a complete detachment from the reality of the prevailing power dynamics and tensions, such as the occupation and blockade. This detachment has significant implications for the lives of women and girls, whose experiences are profoundly impacted by these factors and oppose the application of feminist commitments to international development. The absence of a feminist framework within the FIAP demonstrates the failure to account for a transformative approach

to gender equality and address power dynamics in complex international political systems (Swan 2021; Zilla 2023; Zilla 2022).

2. *Economic Instrumentalization*

A second central theme across the scholarship analyzing the FIAP is the instrumentalization of women for other development purposes. More specifically, feminist scholars critique the economic instrumentalization of women's rights and the conflation of gender equality with women's empowerment (Morton, Muchiri, and Swiss 2020, 336; Parisi 2020; Cadesky 2020, 302-304; Thomson 2020b, 435; 2020a, 1). The neoliberal conception on which the FIAP draws its feminist approach illustrates the instrumentalization of feminism, gender equality and women's rights, which limits the adoption of a transformative approach and the pursuit of development purposes. The notion of women's empowerment is conceived in terms of economic outcomes rather than human rights priorities. The FIAP centers its core principles around economic and political life and lacks an ethical normative framework that prioritizes a human rights-based approach (Cadesky 2020, Morton, Muchiri, et Swiss 2020, 334). Women's empowerment, as framed by the Canadian government, emphasizes a "focus on women's individual processes of harnessing and mobilizing various resources," promoting the individual agency of women and using them as a "vehicle to deliver the larger development goal of poverty reduction" (Cadesky 2020, 304). The FIAP pushes forward the integration of women and girls into the global economy with the aim of reducing poverty (Cadesky 2020; Thomson 2020, 435). It thereby instrumentalizes women's and girls' development as a means to an end rather than a rights-based approach as an objective in itself.

Gender equality is not conceived as an end in itself but used as an instrumentalist approach to ensure women are "conduits of policy or a means used to pursue other ends" (Cadesky 2020, 304). The instrumentalist approach reinforces neoliberal ideas of feminist development without attention to the structural changes needed through more transformative approaches. The FIAP's conceptualization of feminism grounded on neoliberalism adopts core

values that align with traditional gender mainstreaming approaches rather than transformative ones. The FIAP's discourse on poverty, the private sector and trade prioritizes global economic norms over gender equality while conceiving feminism and inequality as "the key barrier to economic growth and poverty eradication" (Parisi 2020, 165, 170, 172). The policy is ideologically grounded in the concept of gender equality as a neoliberal capitalist expansion goal within the Canadian foreign policy agenda. It adopts an integrative approach, positioning women within the framework of market citizenship, rather than a transformative approach that would address the deconstruction of unequal gendered relations (Cadesky 2020; Morton, Muchiri, et Swiss 2020, 336; Parisi 2020). The government approach fosters a hierarchization of rights, emphasizing peacebuilding, sexual and reproductive rights, unpaid care work reform and property rights as necessary for successful economic growth (Parisi 2020, 173).

Therefore, the FIAP's main rationale arises from a desire to transform gender roles to foster growth and prosperity (Parisi 2020, 177; Tiessen 2023, 4). The policy narrative anchors its focus solely on women and girls and tends to view them as tools for achieving other development goals, such as economic growth, poverty reduction, or peace and security (Thomson 2020). Cadesky, Parisi, and Tiessen, among other scholars, have reached similar conclusions in their examination of the FIAP whereby women's rights, gender equality and feminism have been framed as instrumentalist, construed as a means to an end rather than as an inherent objective. This flawed approach raises significant concerns regarding the application of the feminist label in foreign policies.

3. Essentialization of Women, Gender and Absence of Intersectional Lens

Women have been essentialized and depicted as a monolithic category in several sectors of life, including in the growing body of FFPs and the FIAP. The essentialization of women favours a gender construction of women where "gender is interpreted as women, and where women are defined by their differences relative to men" (Cadesky 2020, 300). This approach to gender generalizes women as one monolithic group, often characterized as vulnerable. It fails

to recognize the diversity of different groups of women or men that are more advantaged or disadvantaged depending on their social class, age, ethnicity, disability, or other characteristics. The essentialization of gender echoes the critique pointing to the absence of intersectional understanding observed in the FIAP highlighted by Morton, Muchiri, and Swiss (2020), among others (Cadesky 2020; Rao et Tiessen 2020, 365; Mason 2019; Tiessen 2023).

Morton, Muchiri, and Swiss explore intersectionality as the “recognition of multiple interlocking identities, defined by relative sociocultural power and privilege that shapes people’s individual and collective identities and experiences” (Morton, Muchiri, and Swiss 2020, 335). The failure to embrace an intersectional approach within the FIAP underscores the lack of prioritization of gender as a social category, neglecting other significant categories like class, age, sexual orientation, ethnicity, economic status, ability, and more. The neoliberal conception of feminism adopted by the policy and the specific groups of people around which the narrative is centred demonstrate the absence of understanding of plural feminism and intersectionality (Morton, Muchiri, and Swiss 2020). In so doing, several minorities are not accounted for, including the sexual and gender minorities that received very little recognition: “ ‘LGBTQ2I’ groups are only mentioned in three of the six Action Area Policies and in an equally cursory fashion” (Morton, Muchiri, and Swiss 2020, 336). The FIAP marginalizes and suppresses groups that do not align with its objective of uplifting women and girls into the “global middle class” and misses the opportunity to recognize the specificities of LGBTQ+ people. Therefore, there is no effective guidance to address these issues discussed. The funding granted to LGBTQ+ rights also only supports specific singular commitments as opposed to a comprehensive strategy included within a transformative approach to feminism (Aylward et Brown 2020, 326-327).

Gender equality is often used in a generalized way that does not take into consideration the variety of gender identities and sexual orientations and promotes the gender categories of women and men as a binary, distinctive, and exclusive group. Yet, “gender is a more

encompassing term including diverse characteristics corresponding to feminine and masculine identities” (Husband-Ceperkovic et Tiessen 2020, 401). The policy narrative emphasizes mainly the increased involvement of women and girls in development activities while overlooking the inclusion of the LGBTQ2+ community and gender variance. The failure to address challenges faced by the LGBTQ+ community and advocate for their rights demonstrates the misunderstanding of a comprehensive intersectional approach and the essentialization of women as a monolithic category of gender and sexual orientation (Morton, Muchiri, et Swiss 2020, 336; Mason 2019).

The use of a heteronormative lens to describe feminist priorities reflects a narrow cis-centred focus on women and girls in which the FIAP promotes a fundamental binary view of gender by dividing the populations of the Global South between men and women (Zilla 2022, 5; Morton, Muchiri, et Swiss 2020; Mason 2019, Aylward et Brown 2020, 317-318). The document lacks an inclusive discursive approach that employs terms supporting an inclusive understanding of sexual orientation and gender identity, such as “sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression and sex characteristics (SOGIESC).” Hence, the mainstream liberal feminist perspective favoured by the FIAP essentializes women as a monolithic category, neglects to address intersectionality, and exclusively endorses a binary view of gender.

4. *A Paternalistic Approach to Women and Girls*

Another critique of feminist development practices is the paternalistic approach taken to addressing women’s and girls’ needs, particularly women in the Global South, by states and non-state actors of the Global North. This is observed when nations in the northern hemisphere adopt condescending or patronizing attitudes towards actors, specifically women and girls, in developing countries. This manifests in various ways, such as imposing values, norms, or policies without considering the diverse needs and perspectives of women from the Global South while assuming a position of authority over their issues and rights. This behaviour treats women and girls from the Global South as passive, helpless, and dependent victims who need

to be protected and guided by the Global North and dismisses their agency, diversity, and complexity (Ruppert, Scheiterbauer, et Lutz 2020).

Morton, Muchiri, and Swiss (2020) have emphasized the FIAP's undertones that paternalize women and girls from the South within its content, structure and vocabulary. The policy approaches and retains them as victims, showcasing a Western desire to educate them while disregarding their advocacy and capacity and assuming they are in need of help and education from the Global North. Examples of this include the need to "... help women and girls achieve the economic independence they need to take control of their lives" or "...help to increase women's representation in the security sector" (Canada 2017). The "help" approach assumes that women and girls are helpless victims and are neither involved nor taking active roles in economic or security issues, limiting the Canadian government to embrace plural feminisms and cultures across the Global South (Morton, Muchiri, et Swiss 2020, 346).

Employing "empowerment" in the FIAP or FFPs also implies understanding women and girls as having limited involvements, implications, and power over their lives. As traditionally understood, empowerment implies that individuals or groups lack power and need it to be bestowed upon them from an external source. In this case, Western states seem to be "helping" women and girls from the Global South. On the other hand, marginalized groups already possess some form of power, and true empowerment should come from them as self-generated. The FIAP also paternalizes women and girls by supporting an empowerment that is solely centred around economic and political emancipation and fails to focus on power dynamics and women's existing power and what that power enables them to achieve (Morton, Muchiri, et Swiss 2020, 333-334).

CHAPTER 2: Methodology

The literature review offers a crucial analytical framework for scrutinizing foreign policy documents, particularly changes in policy narratives over time. Returning to the question this research paper seeks to address: Do the critiques that emerged from the FIAP also apply to

Germany's 2023 FDP, and does Germany's FDP offer a stronger discursive lens for feminist foreign policy compared to Canada's FIAP? This section provides an overview of how the assessment of changes in policy rhetoric occurs if changes occur at all. To do so, I consider the critiques of the FIAP in relation to Germany's FDP policy narrative. This chapter first outlines the methods used within this paper, namely discourse and content analysis, and delves into the specific approaches used for this qualitative analysis, namely critical discourse analysis and qualitative content analysis. The chapter also provides an overview of these methods' limitations and explains the value of combining these two methodologies to assess Germany's FDP effectively.

Research Strategy

The FIAP's missed opportunities to address a feminist framework within its development policy can be categorized into four themes: (1) the failure to define feminism and adopt a transformative approach; (2) the absence of plural feminism acknowledgment translating into the essentialization of women as a monolithic category of individuals and the complementary failure to address intersectionality; (3) the instrumentalization of feminism, gender equality and women's rights for other purposes; and (4) the employment of paternalist undertones toward women and girls from the Global South. These fundamental missteps observed in the FIAP highlight the failure to embrace a feminist-labelled policy and feminist discursive lens that effectively addresses systemic gender inequalities while challenging structures that perpetuate discrimination and oppression.

The research question examines the understanding of Germany's feminist discourse in development aid and the critiques made from the scholarship regarding FFPs and the FIAP. The combination of this theoretical approach and distinctive analytical framework, in addition to this specific research orientation, is well-suited to combining the two research methods. This paper employs a flexible approach, sometimes utilizing discourse analysis alone and at other times combining both discourse and content analysis. This mixed-methods technique offers a

more nuanced and comprehensive analysis, leveraging the strengths of each method to gain a holistic understanding of the FIAP critiques in relation to Germany's FDP. By combining both methods, I aim to validate findings in different ways and ensure the robustness and legitimacy of the research outcomes.

Discourse Analysis

This section starts with an overview of discourse analysis and follows with the outline and justification of employing critical discourse analysis (CDA) to assess themes, social relations and power dynamics displayed in Germany's FDP. Continuous theoretical advancements have forced scholars to rethink and reshape our understanding of knowledge and its means of production while raising questions about the traditional ways of analyzing policies and the possibility of new methods. The role of language and discourse in shaping policy and constructing the human vision of the world has been taking a larger place within policy analysis. It has become more recognized within the discipline by the growing body of literature exploring ways of applying discourse analysis to policy research (Cummings, Haan, et Seferiadis 2020; Paul 2009; Hewitt 2009; Fischer 2003).

Discourse analysis can be broadly defined in terms of studying interactions between different actors to gain new information (Hewitt 2009). Nevertheless, there has yet to be a consensus in social science regarding what ought to fall into a discourse analysis approach. Due to this academic domain's large and broad scope, scholars underline the research project variation within their assumption, methodology, and overall research aims (Paul 2009; Hewitt 2009). Paul (2009) highlights the variance in this methodological approach that considers interpretations and conceptualizations of language and their roles in different contexts. Thus, "discourse-analytically oriented researchers focus on texts and meaning therein. Importantly, however, language and its functions in human interaction and society at large are conceived of in different ways" (Paul 2009, 241).

The flexibility of the wide range of methods employed in discourse analysis expresses the flexibility of its approach for which “the truth is constructed within a discourse and, therefore, is relational to the knowledge and practices of that discourse. The relational nature of truth means that methodological choices made in any research project are driven by the problem at the centre of the research” (Hewitt 2009, 3).

Critical Discourse Analysis

CDA is a multi-disciplinary approach drawn from discourse analysis and popularized by Fairclough (1989). It embodies a flexible combination of linguistic-based approaches aimed at analyzing written and spoken language while underlying conventional norms that result from power dynamics and conflicts (Alqunayir et Ali 2019, 44-45). The primary focus of CDA does not stem from policy solutions but rather from uncovering the fundamental motivations of policy discourse and understanding how it shapes social constructions of the world. It highlights the relationship between political rhetoric and how the discourse is created and sustained while demonstrating which dominant narratives are produced and marginalized (van Leeuwen 2006; Hodges, Kuper, et Reeves 2008). Scholars such as Bloor & Bloor (2007) demonstrate the multi-disciplinary character of CDA that arises from the absence of a common direction for employing CDA, as well as the lack of a theoretical or methodological framework. CDA utilizes different methodologies common to various disciplines studying social groups, structures, and fields focused on human cognition and behaviours (Catalano et Waugh 2020, 247; Mogashoa 2014, 110).

As discourses change over time and contexts, including within policy frameworks, it is crucial in policy analysis to examine the meaning conveyed and the social constructions pictured by the authority that governments are and emphasize the importance of understanding how as “elected politicians ... those “in power,” ... take actions on behalf of all, or groups of, the population that they govern” (Hewitt 2009, 4). Questioning the legitimacy of those governing is essential to ensuring the operation of democracy and the accountability of state

actors that shape the social practices and power relations (Hewitt 2009; Paul 2009). Investigating FDPs from a CDA perspective allows insights from the maintained social inequalities to arise while uncovering the perpetuation of dominance and the power imbalances, manipulation and exploitation (Johnson et McLean 2020; Cummings, Haan, et Seferiadis 2020). Additionally, CDA places great importance on reflexivity by encouraging the analysis of the rules and power dynamics within policies while simultaneously considering the researcher's own position and biases. The method pushes researchers to take an external point of view and assess their own biases and personal interests that can compromise the research conclusions by addressing the power relations and ideological assumptions embedded in their own discourse (Warburton 2016). Therefore, CDA offers a profound understanding of social practices and norms put forward by the policy narrative while ensuring researchers' adoption of a self-reflective stance (Hewitt 2009, 4-5).

This paper employs CDA to assess the language used by the German government against a set of norms or values to highlight potential issues or concerns related to feminism. It examines the themes and relationships within the discourse to gain a more profound understanding of how policy language is used to construct meanings of gender equality, women's rights and North and South interactions and adopt a normative stance to evaluate language employed based on specific ethical or ideological principles (Hewitt 2009; Hodges, Kuper, et Reeves 2008). Therefore, the utilization of discourse analysis enables highlighting the German government's portrayal of gender equality and feminism, revealing the privileged and normalized frames that shape these ideologies and the implicit intentions.

Limitations of Critical Discourse Analysis

One of the CDA's main limitations is the lack of empirical evidence to support the analysis of discourse practices, which becomes particularly significant when discussing the sociocultural implications of the discourse derived from textual analysis (Schröder 2006). CDA sometimes favours a specific perspective of social issues or power dynamics while neglecting the social

implications of another, which could be translated in this research by focusing mainly on binary-gender-based inequalities in development aid and omitting to adopt an intersectional stand to gender inequalities. This aligns with another critique of CDA that highlights the subjectivity of the method. Despite the importance of reflexivity within CDA, scholars argue that “CDA practitioners conduct their research with a predetermined political or social stance” (Alqunayir et Ali 2019, 47). Therefore, some of the assumptions carried out by CDA can be flawed and unreliable, impacting the credibility and validity of the overall findings (Frantz 2003, 1).

Furthermore, despite the methodological flexibility that arises from the absence of common grounds, CDA also lacks methodological rigour as “each tradition has its own epistemological position, concepts, procedures, and a particular understanding of discourse and discourse analysis” (Mogashoa 2014, 111). The CDA’s casualness of qualitative data collection and unsystematic nature can lead to partial analyses of texts, where researchers selectively choose portions that they believe hold ideological significance while potentially ignoring contradictory parts, highlighting CDA’s lack of a rigorous approach (Alqunayir et Ali 2019, 49-51). To address these limitations, I consider the language of the policy documents within the context of the broader policy for a more systematic and comprehensive approach to discourse analysis and ensure strong reflexivity and transparency in the research process by establishing a clear analysis process.

Content Analysis

Content analysis is “a family of systematic, rule-guided techniques used to analyze the informational contents of textual data” (Forman et Damschroder 2007, 39). It involves the categorization and organization of the communication content to describe the topics, themes, and context conveyed by the policy and examine the significance embedded within a message. It is “an interpretive approach that allows a researcher to describe the topics and themes that are most meaningful to the research objectives of the study” (Stemler 2000, 1). Content analysis

enables the examination of large volumes of data in a systematic technique. It allows uncovering an individual or group's social, institutional, or cultural understandings of relationships and dynamics. It underlines patterns and trends while providing an empirical basis for monitoring opinions and ideologies advanced by others (Stemler 2000). Multiple perspectives within content analysis methodology involve different examination levels of abstraction and interpretation. Content analysis carried out by scholars such as Krippendorff (1980), McLaughlin and Marascuilo (1990), and Weber (1985) emphasizes measurement, sampling, coding, and statistical analysis of the data. This orientation in content analysis adopts a more quantitative technique and a specific knowledge of coding that involves operational and logical conceptualized work (Mayring 2004).

Qualitative Content Analysis

Critiques of classical content analysis outline the superficial considerations and the ignored hidden meanings and contexts while emphasizing the reliance on simplified and distorted quantification methods (Mayring 2004). Oppositely, qualitative content analysis, which answers these critiques, originates from a quantitative approach that involves the quantification of data by measuring the frequency of topics using word counts and statistical methods (Williamson, Given, et Scifleet 2018, 461; Drisko et Maschi 2015). This sub-method prioritizes a more in-depth, subjective and contextual assessment of a message while favouring the identification and interpretation of concepts, patterns and relations within a text (Downe-Wamboldt 1992, 314; Elo et al. 2014).

More precisely, qualitative content analysis prioritizes the information and meaning conveyed in one piece of content and focuses on the substance of the communication by the policy rather than the structure or form (Williamson, Given, et Scifleet 2018). Therefore, terms, keywords, phrases, and ideas expressed in the policy are analyzed to understand the underlying themes or topics introduced by the message. Qualitative content analysis recognizes that the meaning of the communicated data is constructed within the specific context of the research

questions and aims to explore social phenomena, cultural interactions and subjective situations (Elo et al. 2014; Williamson, Given, et Scifleet 2018). Employing qualitative coding techniques also allows scholars to interpret the content of the data while recognizing that the interpretation is subjective and influenced by the researcher's perspective (Williamson, Given, et Scifleet 2018).

Circling back to the question this research paper seeks to address: "If the same critiques that emerged from the FIAP are also applied to Germany's 2023 FDP, and does Germany's FDP offer a stronger discursive lens for feminist foreign policy compared to Canada's FIAP?", the conceptualization of feminism, gender equality, and women's rights put forward by Germany's FDP and shaped by the various stakeholders involved in the policy process require a more comprehensive and global understanding of Germany's FDP narrative that qualitative content analysis can offer within the analytical framework of this research question. In addition, the more profound and contextual understanding favoured by qualitative content analysis encourages the emphasis on socio-cultural, political and economic implications arising from the establishment of political perspectives on feminism.

Procedural Guidelines for Content Analysis

While there are no standard or widely accepted techniques for content analysis, some scholars have developed a specific route outlining a particular application of the methodology (Stemler 2000, 2). Williamson, Given and Scifleet's findings (2018) sought to offer an outline of the common principles of qualitative content analysis. This section explains the step-by-step methodologic footpath based on Williamson, Given and Scifleet and how it applies in the context of Germany's FDP assessment and the related research questions.

1. First, the research project must draw content from a selected communication content. A research problem that guides the selection of the communication to study and a unit of analysis from this communication need to be determined.

- a. In this paper, the growing number of so-called FFPs among the states that employ transformative frameworks to foreign affairs and embody fundamental principles of feminism recognized by feminist scholarship, international organizations, NGOs, civil society actors and more represent the problematic. FFPs are the designated communicative content.
2. Second, the researcher must determine the research frame representing the specific analysis perspective and guide the qualitative content analysis.
 - a. This research framing of feminism and gender equality defines its social and systemic issue nature. FFPs, as a means of promoting gender equality, emphasize the importance of FFPs in addressing issues such as women's rights and gender equality. Within this research framework, FFPs are also framed as a tool for challenging traditional power structures and promoting social justice on a global scale by deconstructing patriarchal norms, advocating for marginalized groups, and promoting a more inclusive and equitable society.
 3. Third, the selection of the unit analysis must be established. The unit of analysis refers to the level at which the communication content is studied, such as individual documents, discourses, messages, etc. and should be guided by the research objectives. Researchers can use statistical or purposeful sampling techniques to select the research materials and use different coding approaches to analyze communications.
 - a. In this research, Germany's FDP represents the unit of study selected from a purposeful sampling technique out of the communication content that represents the growing body of FFPs. The coding approach used to analyze the communication piece is "frequency analysis coding," which involves calculating the occurrences of specific words or phrases within the text and categorizing them based on predetermined categories (Mayring 2004, 4,7; 2015).

4. Fourth, creating content categories needs to showcase the listing of “key concepts and categories emerging from the research problem” (Williamson, Given, et Scifleet 2018, 465). Including the immediate context of the surrounding text assigned to a specific category is often observed. This practice ensures that the meaning of the analyzed section is preserved and “[b]y documenting the key concepts as they emerge and applying these during analysis, the researcher develops a sequence of categories that can grow” (Williamson, Given, et Scifleet 2018, 465). There are different ways of deciding on the method to define the categories in content analysis. Some scholars refer to two main approaches as the “inductive category development” and the “deductive category application.” Inductive category involves the formulation of defined criteria’ derived concepts, categories and themes from the data itself. Quantitative aspects, such as the frequencies of coded categories, can be analyzed from this technique within the research question framework. The deductive category involves the application of structured or unstructured analysis framework based on existing theory, literature or research questions (Mayring 2004, 3-5; Williamson, Given, et Scifleet 2018; Elo et Kyngäs 2008).
 - a. The setting grounds theoretical approaches to feminism, and the literature review surrounding FFPs permitted the identification of key concepts emerging from the problematic and the subsequent creation of categories. Both inductive and deductive categorizations are utilized to establish the analyzed categories as they provide a more comprehensive frame to analyze the problem.
5. Fifth, reliability needs to be established. Despite researchers’ inability to confirm that both the original sender and the message’s recipient will adopt a common understanding of the message, the adequate employment of categories to represent the research purposes and the consistently applied method can assess the research reliability. Reliability is established through the process of category definition and the procedures used for assigning codes to content.

- a. The adequate reading of Germany's FDP and the consistent application of the selected coded categories based on the literature review used to identify terms align with the research purposes and attest to the study's reliability.
6. Finally, the last procedural stage of qualitative content analysis involves performing the data analysis and formulating the findings. The researcher must acknowledge the variety of techniques for assigning content to categories and consider that no single technique is recognized within the academic (Williamson, Given, et Scifleet 2018, 463-66). Researchers use the "pen and paper" technique or sophisticated software programs to assist in the data analysis and the preparation of the findings.
 - a. In this research paper, software programs were not employed to analyze the data. Expanding on the "pen and paper" technique, I utilize Excel software to enhance data collection consistency and employ a more rigorous analysis technique.

Limitations of Qualitative Content Analysis

There are some limitations when using qualitative content analysis, starting with the assumption of correlations between terms frequency and the level of concern or importance attached. While the assumption may seem true in certain cases, it's important to consider specific factors when drawing conclusions from it, as the assumption can be inaccurate when indicating the lack of connections between concepts. As scholars outline, synonyms can be used for stylistic reasons and influence the significance of particular concepts, impacting the resulting conclusions. Certain words have multiple meanings, emphasizing the necessity to verify in which context the terms have been employed (Stemler 2000, 2-5). Furthermore, words do not always represent a specific category or concept. Researchers must consider this and acknowledge it as a limitation when conducting word counts. "Faulty definitions of categories and non-mutually exclusive and exhaustive categories" can take away the value of the content analysis (Stemler 2000, 2, 5).

To overcome these challenges, I carefully read and reviewed the context in which terms are employed at various times to draw an accurate understanding of their definitions and meanings conveyed by the German government within the policy framework. I remained mindful of the impact of synonyms on the significance of concepts and the resulting conclusions while being conscious of the words' multiple meanings and ensuring clarity, distinction and precision in their category definitions. Additionally, I reflected on the assumption of the correlations between term frequency and the importance level attached, considering the relationships may only sometimes be exact.

Combining Discourse and Content Analysis

Some scholars have investigated the advantages of using two approaches in social science research, showing that the employment of one method serves as a foundation for drawing initial conclusions, which can then be further validated or confirmed by gathering additional data through a different methodological approach (Bennett 2015; Herrera et Braumoeller 2004). The amalgamation of CDA and qualitative content analysis demonstrates itself as a fitting methodology for policy analysis and theoretical framework, where the limitations of one method are balanced by the strengths of the other (Bennett 2015, 985). CDA remains essential for the thoughtful understanding of contexts and relationships but offers little statistical findings as empirical evidence of policy narratives. CDA is also criticized for its biases and influences from the political and social agendas of the researchers. Combining CDA with qualitative content analysis allows the researcher to complement and support the results with empirical findings while balancing the subjective character of CDA (Frantz 2003). It allows the policy assessment to benefit from CDA's emphasis on conceptual analysis that is complemented by an in-depth empirical examination of meaningfully identified policy text (Bennett 2015, 986; Herrera et Braumoeller 2004). Furthermore, despite CDA's limited objectivity, scholars have argued that analysts' interpretation of the findings remains valid

despite the researcher's subjectivity if well-documented and self-aware and reflexivity rigorously performed (Alqunayir et Ali 2019, 48; Warburton 2016).

CDA's narrow perspective of certain debates, which hinders uncovering other social issues and power dynamics, is also countered with qualitative content analysis that encourages different perspectives to emerge from the research. Its lack of rigorous data collection technique and methodologic transparency is overcome by qualitative content analysis specific outline and empirical collection of categories by terms used (Warburton 2016).

Finally, where qualitative content analysis might provide quick assumptions of correlations between term frequency and their importance, CDA can set the grounds to confirm these presumptions by providing a more comprehensive understanding of the social and cultural context in which the discourses occur. Where specific categories or concepts may not always represent word usage, CDA allows for a more flexible and interpretive approach to qualitative data collection. Therefore, combining CDA and qualitative content analysis helps strengthen the reliability and credibility of the conclusions arising from the research (Stemler 2000, 1).

Self-Reflection

Despite the inherent nature of the socially constructed world, wherein deeply ingrained beliefs and values intricately shape every facet of human existence, research aims to provide valuable, objective, and dependable analyses of the phenomena that surround us. I recognize that self-reflection is an ongoing and iterative process and that my biases and assumptions may not be fully accounted for. While perfect scientific objectivity remains an indefinable ideal due to the prevalent influence of subjective perspectives and societal constructs in the research process, reflexivity enables research to mitigate this subjectivity (Mortari 2015, 7). The feminist scholarship has taken reflexivity as a fundamental theme in feminist research, favouring the open questioning of the researcher's "social location and the roles they play in co-creating data and in constructing knowledges" (Doucet et Mauthner 2006, 41).

As a researcher, I acknowledge my biases and assumptions that may influence how I conduct and interpret the findings. My identity as a middle-class Caucasian woman and my own positionality as a feminist and left-wing researcher impact how I approach policy discourses and interact with the concepts and dynamics put forward by Germany's FDP (Mortari 2015). By engaging in self-reflective practices, I desire to enhance the quality and credibility of my research. Mauthner and Doucet (2003) propose "retrospective reflexivity" as a method for seeing research and the resulting knowledge as an ongoing and open-ended process that evolves throughout the researcher's reassessment of their data and as new researchers reanalyze old data sets. Revisiting and continuously assessing Germany's FDP themes and categories of analysis drawn from the methodology allowed me to reflect on my assumptions and conclusions.

CHAPTER 3: Findings and Analysis

The CDA and qualitative content analysis of Germany's FDP (in relation to the critiques emerging from the FIAP) employ the following components of the analytical framework: (1) the inclusion or omission of feminism as a defined concept and the adoption of a transformative approach; (2) the instrumentalization of women's rights, gender equality and feminism; (3) the essentialization of women paired with the lack of intersectional lenses; and (4) the paternalistic approach to women and girls in development. In the first section of this chapter, I explain the chosen methodologies for the different thematic assessments of Germany's FDP based on the literature review. I justify the usage of CDA for critique (1) and the combination of CDA and qualitative content analysis for the assessment of (2), (3), and (4). Following this explanation, the quantitative results drawn from the qualitative content analysis for themes (2), (3), and (4) displayed in Appendix Table 1 and Table 2 are described. Then, I begin with the findings analysis of critique (1) and follow with the findings analysis of critique (2), (3), and (4) while

considering them in relation to the theoretical framework drawn from the feminist scholarship and the FIAP.

Adapting Research Methods to Address Diverse Critiques

One principal critique arising from the FIAP is the missed opportunity to define feminism and adopt a transformative approach (1). Examining whether or not a feminist framework and a transformative approach to development aid have been adopted within Germany's FDP requires the identification of dominant structures, power dynamics, and social constructions of relationships. CDA focuses on the policy narratives' implicit dynamics and highlights "inner biases and claims in a systemic, structured way, revealing their hidden pre-occupations and how they reflect different discourses: dominant, marginal, oppositional or alternative" (Cummings, Haan, et Seferiadis 2020, 100). Coding specific terms into specific categories as qualitative content analysis functions remains harder to employ when analyzing the presence of feminism and transformative approach. These intrinsic and implicit relationships of power dynamics and social inequalities that can assess the conceptualization of feminism and the adoption of a transformative approach that are difficult to capture through traditional content analysis methods can be uncovered by CDA.

The instrumentalization of women's rights and feminism (2), the essentialization of gender and women and the absence of an intersectional lens (3) and the presence of paternalistic language (4) within the German policy narrative are analyzed from a CDA and qualitative content analysis perspective that offer an observational statistical examination and a systematic rigorous approach to analyzing textual data, allowing for the identification of patterns, themes, and implicit meanings within the content while determining causal relationships, contextualizing concepts, and making explanatory or interpretive claims about the message conveyed (Bennett 2015, 985).

Qualitative Content Analysis Results

In this section, I introduce the categories and terms corresponding to the thematic critiques, which constitute the central focus of the qualitative content analysis. Deductive category development has been employed to define the terms associated with the categories. The specific words are drawn from the feminist scholarship critique of the FIAP and FFPs. Additionally, the selection of the terms also emerges from the policy text following the analysis of the thematic critiques throughout the reading, including for the thematic analysis of the feminist transformative approach within Germany's FDP. I first assessed Germany's FDP in search of the specific terms associated with the identified thematic FIAP critiques, as illustrated in Appendix Table 1. Prior to and over the course of the reading, the four areas of analysis (noted above) were linked to the theory and research question. These four areas of study serve as standards or principles used to select certain elements of text for analysis and to guide the process of working through the material, deducing categories, revising them, and eventually reducing them to main categories, namely themes (2), (3), (4), that will form the baseline of the content analysis (Mayring 2004, 4; Forman et Damschroder 2007, 48). The inductive or data-driven approach revealed patterns emerging from the text within all thematic critiques, including the categories of analysis that emerged for the theme (1). Both methods are complementary, allowing inductive analysis to generate categories and deductive analysis to organize categories according to specific theoretical grounds (Graneheim, Lindgren, et Lundman 2017, 30). The list of the terms selected within each of the four areas of analysis is summarized in Appendix Table 1. Following this step, I counted the references to these terms associated with the categories, as illustrated in Appendix Table 2.

Emergent Key Themes in Content Analysis

This section offers a narrative discussion of the content analysis findings illustrated in Appendix Table 2, providing insights about key terms that emerged from the policy narrative and how the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ),

responsible ministry of the policy process, framed and conceived them. The lack of definition of feminism and the absence of a transformative approach to feminism within policy are interconnected concepts interrelated to systems that maintain and foster gender inequalities such as colonialism, patriarchy and capitalism. As illustrated in Appendix Table 2, the analysis reveals that the term “discrimination” appears 46 times across the data, “Global South” 26 times, “colonialism/colonial/post-colonial” 15 times, “patriarchy/patriarchal” 11 times, and “anti-racist” 10 times. Moreover, the terms “gender role,” “stereotype,” “oppression,” “exploitation,” “exclusion,” “privilege,” “European colonization,” “German colonization,” and “anti-discrimination” appear less than 10 times and the words “capitalism/capitalist,” “imperialism,” “decolonization,” and “empire” are absent from the data.

Regarding the economic instrumentalization of women’s rights, gender equality or feminism, the analysis reveals that the terms “economy/economic development” appear 35 times across the coded data. Additionally, the word “potential” appears 11 times, “women empowerment” nine times, “poverty reduction” eight times and “sustainable development” is found four times. These word counts indicate the salience of these concepts within the dataset. Further examination of the coding context reveals that the words “economy/economic development” were in most of the occurrences not used in context instrumentalizing women’s rights for economic growth. The word “potential” sometimes appears in contexts employing women’s rights or equality for potential economic development. The term “women empowerment” was rarely linked to the conception of empowering women for a means of growth or prosperity, while “sustainable development” emerged solely in contexts instrumentalizing women’s rights and equality to foster sustainable development.

Appendix Table 2 gives valuable insights into the essentialization of women analysis and reveals that the terms “women and girls” appear 71 times while being employed more than half of the time in instances reducing women to a fixed set of essential characteristics or qualities. Furthermore, out of the 28 instances in which the term “role” is utilized, in four of these

occurrences, the word is employed to essentialize women confining them to traditional, stereotypical expectations or functions based on their gender and the term “vulnerable” is employed once.

Germany’s FDP engages with a wide range of terms to adopt intersectional lenses. The terms “disabled/disabilities” appear 16 times, “LGBTQI+” 14 times, “sexual orientation” 11 times and “gender identity” 10 times. The analysis discloses that words such as “young/youth,” “ethnicity,” “religious,” “age,” “classism,” “indigenous,” and “children” appear less than 10 times throughout the policy in most of the times to embrace an intersectional approach. The following terms have been employed and counted as follows: LGBTQI+ (14), “gender identity” (10), “sexual orientation” (7), “transgender” (2), “intersex” (2), and “non-binary” (2). The terms “bisexual,” “gay,” “lesbian,” “queer,” “asexual,” “pansexual,” “homosexual,” and “heterosexual” have been counted once only. The data also shows that the words “rural/remote/urban,” “elders,” “informal sector workers,” and “migrant/migration” appear once and “pregnant/pregnancy,” “refugee,” “heteronormativity,” and “two-spirit” are absent from the text.

Finally, Appendix Table 2 provides an important discursive picture of how women and girls are treated and considered by the policy narrative and its use of paternalistic undertones. The data shows the word “protection” appears 12 times across the data while being used four times in discussions where women and girls are paternalized. The term “educating” is recorded 12 times, and other words such as “guidance,” “risk,” and “defend/defence” are employed less than 10 times in instances that do not condescend or paternalize women and girls. Terms such as “helping” and “save/saving” remain absent from the text. The following section introduces the discourse analysis findings of the thematic critiques in combination with the discussion of the content analysis results. The findings from the content analysis are summarized within each of the sections below.

Defining Feminism

While Canada's FIAP is highly criticized for not defining feminism and adopting a transformative approach, this oversight is partially addressed in Germany's FDP. The absence of a clear definition of feminism often accompanies the inability to embrace a transformative approach. Germany's failure to articulate a precise definition of feminism and to adopt a specific operational framework has implications for its ability to adopt a comprehensive and fully transformative stance towards feminism within its policy narrative.

Germany's FDP dedicates a section of the policy to the concept of feminism, offering definitions of different feminist approaches, including Black feminism, socialist feminism, or reproductive justice feminism. The BMZ confers half a page to recognizing the variance in feminist movements. It acknowledges the different categories of human characteristics featuring different categories of feminism, with one common feature: "opposition to discrimination and oppression and their commitment to gender-equitable power relations" (Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development 2023, 5).

While the attention to different feminist approaches is an improvement compared to Canada's FIAP, Germany's FDP still falls short in terms of adopting a particular feminist approach. Germany's approach to feminism lacks specificity regarding the particular feminist framework it aligns with and refrains from explicitly stating its chosen feminist approach. This perception of feminism supports superficial scope to addressing gender equality and shares the perception of a feminism that any actors can easily adopt. As feminism is understood across different boundaries, it is essential to address these questions and discuss its absolute character. Defining feminism is also crucial for addressing fear and hesitation that prevent potential supporters from embracing the label of feminism despite their alignment with feminist goals (Offen 1988, 119-20).

Germany's FDP fails to solely aim for gender equality as the ultimate goal of its message as it bases its principles on the normative conception of justice and the advantage of

inclusion. As Zilla (2023) highlights, this approach employs two elements; “one intrinsic-normative and the other extrinsic-utilitarian in nature – justifying why equal participation should be made possible for all people” (Zilla 2023, 3). This demonstrates how Germany’s FDP fundamental principles employ feminism as a means to some ends, the ones of reaching more peaceful societies while reducing poverty and hunger worldwide. Furthermore, despite avoiding the adoption of a liberal feminist orientation as a common approach observed among many FDPs, the German government employs feminism as a noun and fails to address the economic system (Cadesky 2020, 299-300; Tiessen et Swan 2018, 196). The vagueness of the feminist conception, its framework and what it means for the German government allows state representatives to better manipulate and shape gender equality according to national interests. It also blurs the basis of a clear implementing framework for development activities. These findings confirm those of previous scholars, such as Tiessen (2023) and Zilla (2023), who demonstrated similar challenges to adopting a so-called feminist policy.

Missteps in Embracing a Feminist Transformative Approach

Germany’s FDP gives attention to power inequalities and deep-rooted structural systems by mentioning patriarchy, racism, sexism, ableism, and classism while discussing a post-colonial and anti-racist approach. It promotes a diverse and marginalized perspective and adopts an alternative discursive framework that moves beyond instrumentalist language and links to transformative feminist approaches, power relations, and structural inequalities. The BMZ adopts a similar approach to Sweden FFP’s strategy, focusing on the three “Rs”: Rights, Resources and Representation (Tiessen 2023, 4). This emphasis on a right-based orientation demonstrates that gender equality and women’s rights are not solely seen as a means to an end and have, to some extent, a value of their own.

However, Germany’s FDP right-based approach only partly aligns with the one of a transformative approach to feminism, falling short of adopting a comprehensive framework that takes inclusive consideration of colonial, racist, patriarchal and male-dominated power

structures. Additionally, the absence of a coherent structure across all of its levels of influence illustrates these missteps in adopting a transformative feminist approach (Zilla 2023; Thompson, Ahmed, et Khokhar 2021, 25-26; Tiessen 2023, 5-6). It also fails to address the engagement of men and boys in deconstructing structures of power and omits the concepts of unpaid care work and mental load, which perpetuate systemic gender imbalances and are fundamental aspects of feminist approaches in international development (Tiessen 2023, 5).

Ambiguity Surrounding Colonialism, Patriarchy and Capitalism

The unequal distribution of power between genders, discriminatory systems, and racist structures that uphold gender inequalities have been sustained by colonial, patriarchal, and capitalist systems worldwide. The power disparity between the Global North and the Global South from colonialism and imperialism and its persisting continuities over centuries maintains unequal distributions of income and wealth and limits opportunities for political influence in international institutions for nations of the Global South. Indigenous people must also be acknowledged when referring to colonial structures, and the roles that states like Germany have played in orchestrating and sustaining these colonial, discriminatory and racist systems must be emphasized. Colonialism, patriarchy and capitalism are global systems intrinsically linked, feeding each other while exacerbating gender inequality and violation of women's and girls' rights that clashes with the adoption of a transformative approach to feminism in international development (Mohanty 1988; Schuster 2022; Nylund, Håkansson, et Bjarnegård 2023).

The German government makes meaningful advancements in acknowledging the roots of colonial continuities and patriarchal structures intrinsically linked to gender inequality, emphasizing statements such as: “In the countries of the Global South, they are also associated with European colonialism and a colonial mindset which continue to have effects today” (p.8), “colonial continuities and racist thinking are still present in development policy and cooperation to this day” (p.10) and “[t]he BMZ's feminist development policy aims to eliminate discriminatory structures to build a society which enables equal participation by all people”

(p.11) expressing an intention to address the colonial past and rectify the colonial legacies (Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development 2023). Additionally, the BMZ confers a section of the policy to explain post-colonial and anti-racist development policies and addresses indigenous people by promoting indigenous priorities in decision-making processes or underlining the neglect of indigenous people's knowledge. The policy also introduces side boxes where comments from local actors are presented, which underscore an intention to involve local communities in development activities.

Nevertheless, the superficial references to post-colonial and anti-racist ideologies highlight the BMZ's failure to embrace a transformative feminist approach that prioritizes the reconfiguration of fundamental structural norms and systems (Nylund, Håkansson, et Bjarnegård 2023; Zilla 2023; L. Thompson, Ahmed, et Khokhar 2021). Following the qualitative content analysis of Germany's FDP, words related to colonialism and patriarchy emerged from the reading and are presented in Appendix Table 2. The terms "European colonization" or "German colonization" have been used twice, and terms such as "imperialism" and "empire" have not been employed. "German colonization" was employed when referring to comments from the civil society such as: "Consultation with civil society – the key messages we heard. The BMZ should confront Germany's colonial past and identify and transform colonial continuities in its current structures" (Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development 2023, 16). This approach distances the German government from adopting a role as an active participant who took part in the colonial past and recognizing its current legacies. The BMZ also fails to account for the imperial system and its current continuities or to address World War 1 (WW1) and World War 2 (WW2). Other statements, such as "In many places, corruption or terrorism is also associated with a patriarchal social system," do not distinguish a direct link between patriarchy, corruption and terrorism, nor does it recognize that the patriarchy and men have been playing and are playing a direct role in corruption and terrorism (Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development 2023, 12).

In development aid, “local actors represent themselves and are the ones to define pressing issues and desirable development” (Nylund, Håkansson, et Bjarnegård 2023, 260-261). Actively engaging with and incorporating local actors and giving them the place to speak for themselves is central to adopting transformative discourses. As noted by other scholars, the insufficient consideration of post-colonialism and vague inclusion of local actors’ opinions or active participation unveil a lack of will and understanding of a transformative approach to feminism (Zilla 2023, 2; Nylund, Håkansson, et Bjarnegård 2023, 261). Furthermore, the dismantlement of patriarchal, colonial and discriminatory systems, central to the appropriate recognition and identification of social and systemic structures, requires an increased amount of gender data collection and analysis. The BMZ affirms taking part in this piece of work: “to collect and make greater use of gender data that capture the lived realities of women and marginalized groups [...]. Wherever possible, efforts are made to build the statistical and data analysis capacities ...” (Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development 2023, 29). The policy lacks specificities on what type of data will be collected and in which ways, leaving room for arbitrary interpretation. It misses the opportunity to specify the situations in which it applies and in which it would not be considered possible to collect such data.

Similarly to the FIAP’s neglect of the patriarchal and colonial structural gender inequalities, the BMZ’s limited recognition of the patriarchy and colonial dynamics hinders the comprehensive understanding of their inherent interconnections with feminism and gender inequality, thereby impeding the necessary deconstruction of these structures (Haider 2016; Cadesky 2020, 299). This lack of acknowledgment of historical injustices and exploitation that continue to impact societies today perpetuates inequalities and hinders the employment of the feminist approach. Implementing FDPs or FFPs mainly led by male decision-makers and within male-dominated structures sustains patriarchal structures, traditional norms and unequal power dynamics. These unchanged and unaddressed male-dominated areas prevent the employment

and understanding of concepts and vocabulary essential to addressing gender inequality from a feminist labelled policy (L. Thompson, Ahmed, et Khokhar 2021, 25).

The failure to discuss the German colonization history in addition to WW1, WW2, or imperialism, as pointed out by other scholars, underlines holes in Germany's FDP and questions the nature of the transformative approach to feminism (Zilla 2023, 5). The absence of discussions regarding the necessity for fundamental socio-economic and cultural change also represents missed opportunities for the BMZ to address the deep-seated roots of gender inequalities and embrace a transformative approach to feminism in international development.

Unaddressed Gendered Burdens: Unpaid Care Work and Mental Load

For centuries, women and girls have carried the burden of domestic labour, household management, and the cognitive dimension of work that translates in the form of unpaid care work and the mental load. This fundamentally unequal expectation put on women and girls' shoulders restricts their time, energy and capacity, preventing them from having the opportunity to attend school, hold careers, collect an income, or get socially, culturally and politically involved in communities and enrich their lives in all the suitable types of ways (Reich-Stiebert, Froehlich, et Voltmer 2023).

The CDA of Germany's FDP underlines the absence of mention of the household cognitive dimension that translates into the mental load and the intersectional roots with unpaid care work, alongside the double standard concept. Despite referring to the redistribution of equal responsibilities at home between the spouses, which includes the management and division of the work "enabling equal and self-determined participation by all people in social, political and economic life," the analysis findings underline the lack of meaningful inclusion of household management concepts and unpaid care work also highlighted by Zilla's study (2023) (Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development 2023, 5). Furthermore, the policy fails to address the double standards that shape societies, particularly in neoliberal and capitalist systems. The double standard occurs when a particular set of principles or

expectations is applied differently to various groups or individuals, allowing certain behaviours or actions for one group but not for another (Thomas 1959; International Women's Day s. d.). As women have increasingly been encouraged to participate in the workforce, a double standard has emerged, imposing additional expectations on women to simultaneously fulfill the roles of working women and housewives. Double standards integrated into sociocultural, political and economic structures hinder equal access to equal rights for all women and girls (Lóránd 2019).

Women, particularly those from marginalized groups encompassing other identity factors such as ethnicity, socio-economic status, gender identity, sexual orientation, disability, and rural and urban backgrounds, have to bear the weight of these responsibilities from unpaid care. The adoption of a feminist approach to international development necessitates the recognition and deconstruction of these concepts that sustain systemic gender inequality in all spheres of society. This lack of acknowledgment, as also seen in the FIAP in relation to unpaid care work, to the demands on women in terms of mental burdens perpetuates double standards and gender inequality, which are exacerbated by colonial, patriarchal and capitalist structures. The German government, therefore, misses a vital opportunity to translate its understanding of feminism and gender equality into a transformative approach (Tiessen 2023; Cadesky 2020).

Involving "Men and Boys"

Often left aside but crucial in battling structural systems of gender inequality is the focus on actively engaging men's and boys' perspectives and behaviours in the movement for equality, which involves deconstructing gender roles and stereotypes, eliminating toxic masculinity and machismo, and inspiring dynamic participation of all members of the community. Engaging men and boys is, therefore, fundamental to adopting a transformative approach to feminism in international development. Yet, several of these concepts are left out of the policy narrative. Toxic masculinity, misogyny, and machismo are absent from the text and the terms "men and boys" appear four times. Misogyny, homophobia, violence from men,

and machismo stemming partly from toxic masculinity are issues that need to be discussed and accounted for when addressing gender equality (Harrington 2021, 347-49; Haider 2016).

Addressing gender inequality must involve changes in the behaviours and state of mind of men and boys and other individuals who may maintain unequal power dynamics. Omitting to include them in these policy processes or failing to involve them in an active manner limits the possible transformative framework. Leaving the burden of responsibility for change on women and girls illustrates how unequal power dynamics and gendered structures are still in place and the ways that discriminatory and unequal systems are sustained. The BMZ fails to include social expectations and behaviours stemming from traditional masculinity and archaic stereotypes that perpetuate gender roles, sexism, violence and mental health issues.

In sum, colonialism and colonial continuities reinforce gender roles and power dynamics that favour men, and patriarchal systems perpetuate these power relations of gender inequality. The failure of FFPs to fully engage with gender power dynamics means that shifts in social dynamics, mindsets, and behaviours are not explored. Unpaid care work and the mental load shaped by traditional gender roles and stereotypes have been maintained by systemic frameworks such as patriarchy and capitalism. Capitalism has shaped these unequal power dynamics by emphasizing productivity and profitability at the expense of recognizing and valuing unpaid care work. Therefore, large systemic structures, such as colonialism, patriarchy and capitalism, have historically placed the responsibility of caregiving and household management on women while undervaluing unpaid care work and the unequal distribution of the mental load (Schuster 2022; Nylund, Håkansson, et Bjarnegård 2023; Mohanty 1988; Rottenberg 2018; Cadesky 2020, 299). Germany's FDP falls short of meaningfully acknowledging these systems, which are deeply interconnected and rooted in the perpetuation of gender inequality. The BMZ's neglect to articulate a specific definition of feminism underlines the failure to adopt a transformative feminist approach. This omission leaves

Germany's FDP susceptible to diverse interpretations, thereby creating opportunities for the manipulation of the concept of feminism in practical implementation.

Instrumentalization of Women's Rights, Gender Equality and Feminism

While other FFPs have been highly criticized for instrumentalist approaches that treat women as tools for meeting other development priorities, such as economic development and growth, Germany's FDP shows some elements of these persistent challenges. The BMZ begins with a discussion that instrumentalizes women's and girls' rights for socio-economic purposes. The FDP notes that "strengthening the rights, the resources and the representation of women and girls brings dividends" (Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development 2023, 2). Gender equality is instrumentalized to serve the greater stated purpose of improving societies and economic growth instead of being employed as an end in itself. Germany's FDP utilizes women and girls as the means to the ultimate end of stabilizing the household, societies and peace among people rather than as the inherent rights themselves. This instrumentalization diminishes the importance of gender equality while maintaining a cost-benefit approach that undermines the fundamental principles of justice and empowerment (Cadesky 2020, 301, 304).

Other sections of the policy also demonstrate the BMZ's usage of women's rights, gender equality and feminism as a means to an end for the promotion of poverty reduction, economic development, or productivity rather than as an end in itself in statements such as: "Closing the digital gender gap in low and lower-middle income countries would make a significant contribution to sustainable development and would deliver an estimated USD 524 billion increase in economic activity by 2025" (Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development 2023, 14).

Following the content analysis findings, the terms illustrated in Appendix Table 1 associated with an economic instrumentalization of women have been selected according to the studies of scholars assessing the FIAP and general critiques of liberal feminism. Cadesky (2020), Tiessen (2023), and Parisi (2020), among others, have highlighted the frequent use of

terms such as “poverty,” “hunger reduction,” “women’s empowerment,” “economic development,” to which policy narratives referred to in terms of gender equality, or overly emphasized “women and girls” leading to a depoliticization of key concepts to feminist policy such as gender equality. The words shown in Appendix Table 1 have been collected and numbered as observed in Appendix Table 2 during careful readings of the policy document. The total number of times the words have been used is contrasted with the number of times the terms have been employed in ways that demonstrate an instrumentalization of women’s rights, gender equality or feminism for other development purposes. In these instances, these concepts were used as a means to an end rather than an end in themselves. Examples of how the policy narrative has instrumentalized women’s rights, gender equality and feminism when employing these terms go as follows: “Gender equality is a key pillar of sustainable development” (p.2), “If women have equal rights and bear equal responsibility, there is less poverty, less hunger and more stability in the world” (p.14) or “adequate participation by women and girls in the agricultural sector would increase agricultural productivity and that when women manage the household finances, they are more likely than men to invest in improving their families’ nutritional status and health” (p.38) (Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development 2023).

These policy segments give insights into the BMZ’s conception of women’s place in sustainable development, the agricultural industry and its responsibilities in the household. In addition to the stated benefits of women joining the agricultural sector to improve market productivity, it leads to understanding women’s rights and gender inequalities in terms of economic means. It imposes the path of joining the workforce market while simultaneously managing the household and bearing the mental charge that goes with it. These statements encourage women to take on financial responsibilities because they are more likely to improve the family’s well-being as opposed to encouraging all members to gain the capacity and ability to manage the household equally. These dominant social, gendered norms that expect women

and girls to take care of the household demonstrate the instrumentalization of women, women's rights and gender equality for the later goal of carrying the sustainable development of communities while expecting them to improve the agricultural productivity and financial household management (Cadesky 2020, 300; Parisi 2020, 171). As opposed to encouraging men and boys to develop similar characteristics to reach an equal distribution of responsibilities in the household, women and girls are given another set of duties.

Despite these highlights drawn from the CDA and content analysis, Germany's approach avoids the instrumentalist approach as observed in the FIAP. It remains distinct from the intensive usage of these terms and its neoliberal orientation of the feminist approach to development aid. Gender equality and women's rights are, in some occurrences, referred to in terms of productivity, dividends or tools to achieve more stable societies, but these do not address a comprehensive instrumentalist approach to Germany's FDP. This corresponds with findings from the qualitative content analysis of the document that revealed the slight usage of terms associated with economic instrumentalization and an improved language employed, a vital first stage in successfully putting policies into action. This outcome also resonates with other scholars' analyses such as Tiessen's analysis (2023) outlining that "Germany's FDP presents an alternative discourse framework that goes beyond the use of instrumentalist language. Instead, it employs strong language that connects policies to transformative feminist approaches, power dynamics, and structural inequalities" (Tiessen 2023, 6). Germany's FDP demonstrates the BMZ's adoption of an ideologically progressive policy that aims to enhance a somewhat fairer existing state of affairs, with some parts demonstrating a will to fundamentally alter it while others maintaining the status quo. Yet, the examination of documents related to feminist international aid policies must take into account broader issues of exclusion and instrumentalization at all levels, along with the national efforts of branding policies as feminist (Tiessen 2023, 6-7).

Narrow Perspective of Women and Gender Equality

Women have often been essentialized as one monolithic category of women within FFPs and condemned to the label of caregivers, mothers, vulnerable victims, or civilians, an approach explained by Susan Willett (Cadesky 2020, 303-5). Morton, Muchiri, et Swiss (2020) and Mason's (2019) analysis of the FIAP have also offered propositions for examining terms related to intersectionality. It is based on this body of feminist scholarship that I identified the thematic category of women's essentialization and lack of intersectional lenses to select specific terms that rise from the previous critiques.

Essentialization of Women as a Monolithic Category

The selection of terms related to the essentialization for the content analysis has been inspired by Cadesky's (2020) analysis of the FIAP, which addresses the essentialization of women through the constant framing of women as vulnerable humans. The continuous employment of "women and girls" and failure to acknowledge the multiple levels of discrimination demonstrates the absence of intersectional lenses and serves as the basis for defining the category of analysis and the associated terms. Based on previous research and throughout the reading of Germany's FDP, the following terms illustrated in Appendix Table 1 were selected and analyzed: "Women and girls," "vulnerable," "mothers," "caregivers," "civilian," "oppression" and "women and children" used as a concept juxtaposition which refers to Puechguirbal premise of the social and patriarchal conception of women "as the only role is that of mother and caregiver" (Cadesky 2020, 300; Rao et Tiessen 2020, 365).

As illustrated in Appendix Table 2, the BMZ uses "women and girls" to refer to feminist development policy and gender equality. Occurrences where the BMZ essentializes women as a monolithic category have been counted 35 times; therefore, more than half of the times it is employed in instances such as: "Women have an important role to play in sustainable development" (p.2), "for women and girls to be more at risk of violence" (p, 4), and "[t]hey make up half of humanity. Women and girls are entitled to be treated equally at last" (p.5)

(Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development 2023). The conception of women as caregivers in the way Puechguirbal intends it has been noted once in the following context: “Or a woman’s right to decide for herself if she wants children, and if so, when, and how many” (Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development 2023, 6).

The BMZ made progress in avoiding the essentialization of women as a single entity, adopting inclusive lenses in instances such as the following: “women and girls, and also for marginalized groups” (p.5) and “women, girls and others in vulnerable situations, such as people with disabilities, the young and the elderly, informal sector workers and displaced persons” (p.12) (Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development 2023). In so doing, BMZ recognizes the diversity and individuality of women, acknowledging that they are not all the same and should not be reduced to a set of essential characteristics. Furthermore, the terms “vulnerable,” “civilian,” or “mother” have been employed once or remain absent from the data, and caregivers have not been used in a way that refers to women as having the sole responsibility to care for others. These conclusions from the content analysis of Germany’s FDP stand out as significant advancements compared to Canada’s FIAP, for which ‘women and girls’ are treated largely as a monolithic category of individuals (Cadesky 2020).

Intersectional Lens

Germany’s FDP acknowledges women and girls in all their diversity and recognizes the intersectionality of the challenges of gender inequalities, feminism, and all women and girls’ human rights to some extent. The policy adopts a clear and direct approach from the beginning and dedicates a section of the policy to define “Women and marginalized groups in all their diversity” and “intersectionality” (Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development 2023, 8, 16). The document employs a wide range of terms to demonstrate the intersectional approach of the policy and the intention to embody intersectionality within the conception of gender equality in international development. The specific terms regarding the content analysis related to intersectionality have been selected according to the previous work

of Morton, Muchiri, and Swiss (2020) and Mason (2019) on intersectionality, as well as critical scholarly analyses of FFPs (Tiessen 2023, Zilla 2023, Thompson 2020).

Appendix Table 2 records the total number of times these terms appear in the text, as well as the total number of times the words are used in contexts that demonstrated the adoption of an intersectional approach, such as in the following: “Due to the vulnerability of their situation, children and youths, women, LGBTQI+ persons, people with disabilities and Indigenous Peoples are particularly impacted by droughts and floods” (Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development 2023, 12). Moreover, Germany’s FDP favours an inclusive, non-binary approach to gender identity and recognizes the variance in sexual orientation. The policy’s glossary defines multiple terms such as gender identity, LGBTQI+ and sexual orientation. The qualitative content analysis attests to the BMZ’s awareness of the sexual orientation, gender identity expression, and sex characteristics (SOGIESC) community. Throughout the policy document, the BMZ employs LGBTQI+ when referring to people identifying as part of the community in instances discussing “women and girls in all their diversity.”

While Canada’s FIAP is criticized for failing to “account for the ways in which different groups of women—and some men—are both multiply marginalized or advantaged depending on their ethnicity, religion, age, (dis)ability, and other factors of identity” (Cadesky 2020, 301-2), in contrast, Germany acknowledges the intersectionality of feminist movements and their embodiment into a transformative approach to gender equality. The inclusion and significant mentions of SOGIESC communities, youth, indigenous and disabled people, as also outlined by Tiessen (2023) and Zilla (2023), suggest a more progressive feminist approach within Germany’s FDP (Tiessen 2023, 4-5; Zilla 2023, 4).

Uncovering the Gaps

Despite the inclusive policy narrative and understanding of the plurality of marginalized people facing intersectional discrimination, some groups have been given very little attention

or none at all. For example, the words “refugee” and “pregnant/pregnancy,” “sex-worker,” “drug-using” or “incarcerated” are absent from the policy document; “migrants/migration,” “rural/urban/remote,” “informal sector workers,” and “elders” have only been mentioned once when speaking about the intersectionality of discrimination. Yet, women and girls represent a significant proportion of refugees and migrants worldwide and consistently face various challenges and disparities regarding access to international assistance, income, and physical protection (Callamard 2002, 138-39; Lombardi 2017). Pregnant women are significantly more at risk of dealing with socio-economic and cultural struggles, often discrimination, especially in the workplace (Eaton 2019). Women from rural or remote areas are disproportionately disadvantaged, less likely to access higher education, in addition to safe financial formal employment and more at risk of physical and psychological violence (Kabeer 2005, 16-17). The informal working sector is largely composed of women and girls who are unable to go through legal systems of employability and have to rely on financially insecure jobs and often dangerous workplaces, including lower quality, irregular employment (Chen 2001; Bahna et Sekulová 2019; Chant et Pedwell 2008; Chen 2001). Female elders, predominantly rural and remotely based women, are also facing significant intersectional discrimination and have to deal with severe financial struggles, limited access to social support and services, and lack of community support (Slack et Jensen 2008; Kim 2007).

Sex workers are mostly women who often lack economic opportunities, who face social stigma and discrimination, and who have to live with accentuated unequal gendered power dynamics in the sex industry. Like others, incarcerated and drug-using women face multiple forms of oppression and marginalization and must be accounted for in development aid but also in all spheres of society: an absence of inclusion that has been highlighted by other scholars (Morton, Muchiri, et Swiss 2020, 340-41). These individuals categorized by their marginalized characteristics are more likely to experience sexual and gender-based violence, HIV/AIDS,

poverty, reproductive injustice, and exclusion (Morton, Muchiri, et Swiss 2020, 335-40; Mason 2019, 205-7). These omissions underline gaps in Germany's FDP intersectional approach.

Paternalistic Approaches to Women and Girls

This research paper uses CDA and qualitative content analysis to evaluate the presence of paternalistic discourse in the policy document. The selection of the terms associated with paternalizing women is derived from the methodology and findings of Morton et al. (2020) for the FIAP. The terms illustrated in Appendix Table 1 have been counted in contexts when employed in ways that paternalize women and girls. The words "protection/protecting" have been counted four times as using paternalistic undertones in instances such as the following: "They often work in poor conditions, without decent pay, without protection from exploitation, for up to 14 hours a day" (Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development 2023, 4). The terms "defend/defence" and "educating/education" are not employed in a paternalistic way, and the terms "helping" and "save/saving," often associated with discursive ways to paternalize, condescend or control women, are absent from the policy text.

Similarly, Morton et al. (2020) highlight instances of paternalism in the FIAP noting the "paternalistic undertones in the policy: Canada wants to 'help' Afghan women assert their rights; empower women to be 'full' participants of economic life, assuming that women in the Global South are not already involved in economic activities" (p.346). In the analysis of Germany's FDP, the BMZ assumes that women from the Global South are not advocating for protection. Moreover, the assumption that women need protection from exploitation or any protection is wrongfully constructed. The root causes of labour exploitation are associated with capitalist principles of the means of production ideals and other factors. As Germany's FDP does not address capitalism and how it affects women and girls while sustaining and nourishing systemic inequalities, the depiction of working women in need of protection is framed as a responsibility of the Global North to provide this protection. This pattern reminds us that gender inequalities are globally and systemically integrated within all aspects of societies and are

visible within both hemispheres as much as the economic interdependence created by globalization. Behaviours, social norms and standards at the source of this complex system that favours labour exploitation and disproportionately affects women and girls in all their diversity need to be accounted for and changed to address gender inequalities and to avoid employing paternalistic undertones.

Furthermore, the policy narrative adopts a paternalistic approach to women and girls when employing the word “risk.” The analysis reveals that four times out of five, the term is employed in contexts that paternalize and promote overprotective behaviours in contexts such as follows: “For too long, it was considered normal [...] for women to be excluded from decision-making processes; for women to hold just 25 percent of parliamentary seats worldwide [...] for women and girls to be more at risk of violence” (p.4); and “In many countries, the human rights of LGBTQI+ persons are under threat, and their safety is at risk” (p.24) (Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development 2023). Along the same lines of the critique of the “protection” term usage, employing “at risk” to describe contexts where women and girls in all their diversity have higher chances to experience gender inequalities or injustices such as violence underlines the passive and paternalistic tones of the BMZ toward women facing such behaviours. Conversely, the focus should be brought on the actions and behaviours of people orchestrating acts affecting others, such as men being violent toward women. The policy emphasizes how this marginalized group that represents women is at risk of dealing with inequalities. This approach encourages the social construction that women and girls need “protection” or “help” and does not push forward a change in behaviours in men that might cause these ‘risks’ and where the roots of the problem truly lie. Similar conclusions are drawn from the second example, where the BMZ emphasizes that LGBTQI+ rights are at risk as opposed to deconstructing how certain states, populations or people discriminate against LGBTQI+ and threaten their rights.

The term “guidance” was recorded twice, in one instance where the BMZ employs the word with a paternalistic approach: “Feminist development policy [...] serves as the frame of reference for the activities of the organizations which implement German development cooperation and should also provide guidance for the BMZ’s grant recipients” (Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development 2023, 22). Recognizing the power asymmetries that arise from Germany’s FDP also requires acknowledging the degree of power the actors hold, including the power of resistance (Frantz 2003). This section that envisions Germany’s policy as a guide for the Global South actors is problematic. It assumes that Global South actors lack the knowledge and intelligence to know what is good for them while neglecting their advocacy and capacity. Additionally, the term “helpful” was employed twice, defined as a useful tool for understanding feminism; “Intersectionality is thus a helpful tool in gaining a holistic overview of social inequalities and assists in addressing them” (Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development 2023, 16). Employing the term intersectionality as a “tool” simplifies and downplays the importance of an intersectional approach to feminism and feminist policies (L. Thompson, Ahmed, et Khokhar 2021, 25). Despite the problematic perspectives on interactions between genders and the lack of accountability for the behaviours highlighted by the discourse analysis, the content analysis suggests a minimal use of paternalistic tones and expressions. This accounts for the BMZ’s mixed record of success and missed opportunities in relation to avoiding the paternalization of women.

CONCLUSION

There have been significant changes in feminist development policy discourse that are worthy of mention between 2017, when Canada’ released its FIAP, and 2023 when Germany introduced its FDP. The language used in policies remains critical to understanding how states communicate and conceive their ideas of feminism and gender equality. The improved commitment to gender equality and equal access to rights, representation, and resources is an

important start to renewed and transformative commitments. It highlights a capacity to respond to emerging critiques and a responsive approach.

Germany seems to have addressed some substantial criticisms pointed out by scholars about FFPs in general and Canada's FIAP. It acknowledges the remarks brought up by the body of feminist scholarship by including a more comprehensive and inclusive feminist approach that focuses "on power-oriented and intersectional realities" (Tiessen 2023, 4). Germany's implementation of improved language and commitment to a stronger conceptualization of equality and human rights showcase an improvement and a will to move in the right direction while laying the foundation for better practice within policy-making. This research paper acknowledges and recognizes Germany's apparent response to some of the common critiques that plague the FIAP, among other FFPs. Acknowledging the plurality of feminism and its closer ties to a transformative approach while recognizing the centrality of intersectionality within feminist movements demonstrates a willingness to get the vocabulary and the concepts right. The German government also avoids essentializing women as a monolithic category of individuals and conflating gender equality with women's empowerment.

However, considerable challenges remain that require further attention. While Germany might be closer to getting the language right, many rhetorical statements appear to be ongoing challenges to implementing a comprehensive, transformative approach to feminism. The combination of critical discourse analysis and qualitative content analysis of Germany's FDP highlighted current missed opportunities, as noted by scholars who have critically examined earlier FFPs. Germany's FDP, in practice, partly conflicts with the ideologies and concepts put forward by its absence of real mention of colonial history, patriarchal structures, and capitalist implications. The BMZ adopts a vague and minimal approach to colonialism and imperialism, specifically German colonization. The lack of acknowledgment and understanding of the unpaid care work sector, in addition to the burden of the mental load and the failure to engage men and boys, point to several missed opportunities of the German government to address

fundamental issues originating from global systems which feed and maintain gender inequality in all spheres of society. These exclusions directly impact the possibility of women and girls in all their diversity to acquire equal access to rights, resources, and representation. They also question the authenticity and integrity of a transformative approach to feminism by the BMZ.

Exploring the Boundaries: Limitations and Implications

This paper sought to analyze if and how critiques drawn from FFPs in general, and the FIAP in particular, have been integrated into the policy-making of Germany's FDP. The combination of qualitative discourse analysis and empirical study of the policy narrative offers complementary insights into Germany's understanding of feminism and gender equality. However, some limitations arise from the research.

A drawback of the policy analysis is the restricted capacity to showcase a comprehensive understanding of the diverse activities involved in policy implementation. While policy analysis is an intriguing endeavour, it often needs to provide insights into the practical aspects of policy implementation. Policy examination employing "discourse analysis does not provide definite answers" nor definite solutions (Mogashoa 2014, 112). It can also be challenging to understand the practical implications of policy narratives that shape policy implementation in unpredictable and uncertain ways as it depends on the dynamic and complex interplay of discursive and non-discursive elements in the policy process.

This research outcome also remains limited by the critical discourse analysis favouring certain parts of the policy while leaving others out. Some problematic perspectives of gender equality and instrumentalization of women are observed within the first pages of the policy document but are not unveiled with the same intensity in the following sections. Underlining these sections can emphasize these perspectives, which might not represent Germany's global approach to development aid.

Despite these limitations, it is crucial to acknowledge that language plays a pivotal role in guiding actual practice and adopting the right discursive approach is most important. Poorly

defined terms or theories or mistaken associations of concepts at the theoretical level directly impact the practical level and policy implementation. Concepts such as gender equality or feminism end up being “emptied” and utilized in development without using power or procedures or addressing the root causes of the problem the policy aims to tackle (Cadesky 2020, 303). Therefore, while policy analysis may have limitations, the careful consideration of language can significantly influence and shape the successful implementation of policies, watering down powerful concepts (Cadesky 2020, 303-304). As policy discourses, narratives, and vocabularies reflect the values, interests, and power dynamics of policy-making actors and stakeholders, policies hold the capacity to influence public perceptions and acceptance of policy issues and their conceptualized relations, which impacts the implementation of policies by shaping how people understand and expect situations (Ciccia et Lombardo 2019).

Potential future research to investigate the impact of inclusive decision-making processes on implementing feminist development policies would be highly relevant to understanding the role of gender and intersectionality in feminist policy-making and implementation processes. Exploring how actively involving diverse decision-makers, including women and men in all their diversity, as well as local actors, can contribute to addressing gender inequalities more effectively. Additionally, analyzing how changes in language and concepts over time provide insights into new understandings and acknowledgements that take us a step closer to more effective feminist policies. More work is still needed to get the language right in feminist foreign policies. Critical feminist scholars have offered valuable insights into what additional considerations and approaches are needed, as this paper summarizes. Greater attention to the possibilities for a transformative feminist approach is therefore crucial for improving the policies that guide practice and ensuring that the principles of feminism are fully articulated in these so-called feminist foreign policies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Achilleos-Sarll, Columba, Jennifer Thomson, Toni Haastrup, Karoline Färber, Carol Cohn, et Paul Kirby. 2023. « The Past, Present, and Future (s) of Feminist Foreign Policy ». *International Studies Review* 25 (1): viac068.
- Aggestam, Karin, et Jacqui True. 2020. « Gendering Foreign Policy: A Comparative Framework for Analysis ». *Foreign policy analysis* 16 (2): 143-62. <https://doi.org/10.1093/fpa/orz026>.
- Al-Ali, Nadje. 2020. « Covid-19 and Feminism in the Global South: Challenges, Initiatives and Dilemmas ». *European Journal of Women's Studies* 27 (4): 333-47. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350506820943617>.
- Alqunayir, Asma, et M. Ali. 2019. « 'Transediting' Saudi Arabia by the BBC: A Corpus-Driven Critical Discourse Analysis Study of Representations and Power Negotiation, 2013–2015 ». Durham University. <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/13369>.
- Amoussou, Franck, et Ayodele A. Allagbe. 2018. « Principles, Theories and Approaches to Critical Discourse Analysis ». *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature* 6 (1). <https://doi.org/10.20431/2347-3134.0601002>.
- Amt, Auswärtiges. s. d. « Guidelines for Feminist Foreign Policy: A Foreign Policy for All ». German Federal Foreign Office. Consulté le 6 septembre 2023. <https://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/en/aussenpolitik/themen/ffp-guidelines/2585074>.
- Aylward, Erin, et Stephen Brown. 2020. « Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity in Canada's "Feminist" International Assistance ». *International Journal: Canada's Journal of Global Policy Analysis* 75 (3): 313.
- Bahna, Miloslav, et Martina Sekulová. 2019. « Crossborder care ». *Lessons from Central Europe*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bammeke, Funmi O. 2011. « Learning Gender Inequality: The Place of Culture and Socialization ». SSRN Scholarly Paper. Rochester, NY. <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=1968946>.
- Bardach, Eugene, et Eric M. Patashnik. 2020. *A practical guide for policy analysis: the eightfold path to more effective problem solving*. Sixth edition. Thousand Oaks, California: CQ Press.
- Bennett, Andrew. 2015. « Found in Translation: Combining Discourse Analysis with Computer Assisted Content Analysis ». *Millennium* 43 (3): 984-97. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0305829815581535>.
- Blair, Erik. 2015. « A reflexive exploration of two qualitative data coding techniques ». *Journal of Methods and Measurement in the Social Sciences* 6 (1): 14-29.
- Bloor, Meriel, and Thomas Bloor. *The Practice of Critical Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*. Routledge, 2013.
- Brechenmacher, Saskia. s. d. « Germany Has a New Feminist Foreign Policy. What Does It Mean in Practice? » Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Consulté le 25 octobre 2023. <https://carnegieendowment.org/2023/03/08/germany-has-new-feminist-foreign-policy.-what-does-it-mean-in-practice-pub-89224>.
- Brown, Stephen, et Liam Swiss. 2017. « Canada's Feminist International Assistance Policy: Bold Statement or Feminist Fig Leaf? » Dans , 117-31.

- Browne, Colette V., Jeanette C. Takamura, et Jin Young Seo. 2022. « Global Gender Inequality, Older Women, and the Call for Change in the United States ». *Journal of Cross-Cultural Gerontology* 37 (3): 339-53. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10823-022-09462-2>.
- Burris, Jessica Margaret. 2012. « Finding Feminism in American Political Discourse: A Discourse Analysis of Post-Feminist Language », avril. <https://digitalcommons-unf-edu.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1464&context=etd>.
- Cadesky, Jessica. 2020. « Built on Shaky Ground: Reflections on Canada's Feminist International Assistance Policy ». *International Journal* 75 (3): 298-312. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020702020953424>.
- Callamard, Agnès. 2002. « Refugee women: A gendered and political analysis of the refugee experience ». Dans *Global changes in asylum regimes*, 137-53. Springer.
- Canada, Global Affairs. 2017. « Canada's Feminist International Assistance Policy ». GAC. 21 février 2017. https://www.international.gc.ca/world-monde/issues_developpement-enjeux_developpement/priorities-priorites/policy-politique.aspx?lang=eng.
- Catalano, Theresa, et Linda R. Waugh. 2020. « The Main Approaches to CDA/CDS ». Dans *Critical Discourse Analysis, Critical Discourse Studies and Beyond*, édité par Theresa Catalano et Linda R. Waugh, 155-217. Perspectives in Pragmatics, Philosophy & Psychology. Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-49379-0_4.
- Cezilly Fernandez De Liger, Virginia. 2023. « Feminism(s) and Feminist Foreign Policy(Ies) : The Cases of France, Spain and Germany ». <https://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:umu:diva-211119>.
- Chant, Sylvia, et Carolyn Pedwell. 2008. « Women, gender and the informal economy: An assessment of ILO research and suggested ways forward ».
- Chapnick, Adam. 2019. « The Origins of Canada's Feminist Foreign Policy ». *International Journal* 74 (2): 191-205. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020702019850827>.
- Chen, Martha Alter. 2001. « Women in the Informal Sector: A Global Picture, the Global Movement Whither Formality: Informal Economy/U.S. Africa Policy ». *SAIS Review of International Affairs* 21 (1): 71-82.
- Cheung, Jessica, Dilek Gürsel, Marie Jelenka Kirchner, et Victoria Scheyer. 2021. « Practicing Feminist Foreign Policy in the Everyday: A Toolkit ». Berlin: Internationale Frauenliga für Frieden und Freiheit Deutschland. https://eu.boell.org/sites/default/files/2021-11/211112_WILPF_FFP_Toolkit.pdf.
- Ciccina, Rossella, et Emanuela Lombardo. 2019. « Care policies in practice: how discourse matters for policy implementation ». *Policy and Society* 38 (4): 537-53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14494035.2019.1702278>.
- Cobb, Shelley. 2015. « Is this what a feminist looks like? Male celebrity feminists and the postfeminist politics of 'equality' ». *Celebrity Studies* 6 (1): 136-39. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19392397.2015.1005405>.
- Cummings, Sarah, Leah De Haan, et Anastasia-Alithia Seferiadis. 2020. « How to Use Critical Discourse Analysis for Policy Analysis: A Guideline for Policymakers and Other Professionals ». *Knowledge Management for Development Journal* 15 (1): 99-108.
- Daminger, Allison. 2019. « The Cognitive Dimension of Household Labor ». *American Sociological Review* 84 (4): 609-33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122419859007>.

- Dangoisse, Pascale, et Gabriela Perdomo. 2021. « Gender Equality through a Neoliberal Lens: A Discourse Analysis of Justin Trudeau's Official Speeches ». *Women's Studies in Communication* 44 (3): 419-47. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07491409.2020.1781315>.
- Delgado, Martha. 2020. « Mexico's feminist foreign policy ». *TPQ* 19 (1): 35-39.
- Doucet, Andrea, et Natasha S. Mauthner. 2006. « Feminist methodologies and epistemology ». *Handbook of 21st century sociology* 2: 36-43.
- Downe-Wamboldt, Barbara. 1992. « Content analysis: method, applications, and issues ». *Health care for women international* 13 (3): 313-21.
- Drisko, James W., et Tina Maschi. 2015. « Basic Content Analysis ». Dans *Content Analysis*, édité par James Drisko et Tina Maschi, 0. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190215491.003.0002>.
- Eaton, Brianna L. 2019. « Pregnancy discrimination: Pregnant women need more protection in the workplace ». *SDL Rev.* 64: 244.
- Elo, Satu, Maria Kääriäinen, Outi Kanste, Tarja Pölkki, Kati Utriainen, et Helvi Kyngäs. 2014. « Qualitative Content Analysis: A Focus on Trustworthiness ». *SAGE Open* 4 (1): 215824401452263. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244014522633>.
- Elo, Satu, et Helvi Kyngäs. 2008. « The Qualitative Content Analysis Process ». *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 62 (1): 107-15. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04569.x>.
- Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. 2023. « Feminist Development Policy ». The Federal Government of Germany. <https://www.bmz.de/en/issues/feminist-development-policy>.
- Ferrant, Gaëlle, Luca Maria Pesando, et Keiko Nowacka. 2014. « Unpaid Care Work: The Missing Link in the Analysis of Gender Gaps in Labour Outcomes ». https://www-oecd-org.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/dev/development-gender/Unpaid_care_work.pdf.
- Fischer, Frank. 2003a. « Public Policy and Discourse Analysis ». Dans *Reframing Public Policy: Discursive Politics and Deliberative Practices*, édité par Frank Fischer, 0. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/019924264X.003.0004>.
- . 2003b. « Public Policy as Narrative: Stories, Frames, and Metanarratives ». Dans *Reframing Public Policy: Discursive Politics and Deliberative Practices*, édité par Frank Fischer, 0. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/019924264X.003.0008>.
- Forman, Jane, et Laura Damschroder. 2007. « Qualitative Content Analysis ». Dans *Advances in Bioethics*, 11:39-62. Elsevier. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1479-3709\(07\)11003-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1479-3709(07)11003-7).
- Frantz, Roger S. 2003. « In defense of critical discourse analysis ». *Studies in Applied Linguistics and TESOL* 3 (2).
- Fraser, Nancy. 1994. « After The Family Wage: Gender Equity and the Welfare State ». *Political Theory* 22 (4): 591-618. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0090591794022004003>.
- Fraser, Nancy, et Linda Nicholson. 1989. « Social Criticism without Philosophy: An Encounter between Feminism and Postmodernism ». *Social Text*, n° 21: 83-104. <https://doi.org/10.2307/827810>.
- Friesen, Ina, et Alma Wisskirchen. 2022. « Ten Recommendations for Germany's Feminist Development Policy ». Working Paper 17/2022. IDOS Discussion Paper. <https://doi.org/10.23661/idp17.2022>.

- German Federal Foreign Office. 2023. « Shaping Feminist Foreign Policy - Federal Foreign Office Guidelines ». German government. <https://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/blob/2585076/4d2d295dad8fb1c41c6271d2c1a41d75/ffp-leitlinien-data.pdf>.
- Glapka, Ewa. 2018. « 'If you look at me like at a piece of meat, then that's a problem' – women in the center of the male gaze. Feminist Poststructuralist Discourse Analysis as a tool of critique ». *Critical Discourse Studies* 15 (1): 87-103. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2017.1390480>.
- Government of Canada, Statistics Canada. 2022. « Chapter 6: Political Participation, Civic Engagement and Caregiving among Youth in Canada ». 19 juillet 2022. <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/42-28-0001/2021001/article/00006-eng.htm>.
- Graneheim, Ulla H., Britt-Marie Lindgren, et Berit Lundman. 2017. « Methodological challenges in qualitative content analysis: A discussion paper ». *Nurse Education Today* 56 (septembre): 29-34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2017.06.002>.
- Guerrina, Roberta, Toni Hastrup, et Katharine A.M Wright. 2023. « Contesting feminist power Europe: is Feminist Foreign Policy possible for the EU? » *European Security* 32 (3): 485-507. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09662839.2023.2233080>.
- Haider, Syed. 2016. « The Shooting in Orlando, Terrorism or Toxic Masculinity (or Both?) ». *Men and Masculinities* 19 (5): 555-65. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X16664952>.
- Harrington, Carol. 2021. « What Is "Toxic Masculinity" and Why Does It Matter? » *Men and Masculinities* 24 (2): 345-52. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X20943254>.
- Hecker, Susanne, Nina Wicke, Muki Haklay, et Aletta Bonn. 2019. « How Does Policy Conceptualise Citizen Science? A Qualitative Content Analysis of International Policy Documents ». *Citizen Science: Theory and Practice* 4 (1): 32. <https://doi.org/10.5334/cstp.230>.
- Hennebry, Jenna L., et Allison J. Petrozziello. 2019. « Closing the Gap? Gender and the Global Compacts for Migration and Refugees ». *International Migration* 57 (6): 115-38. <https://doi.org/10.1111/imig.12640>.
- Herrera, Yoshiko Margaret, et Bear F. Braumoeller. 2004. « Symposium: Discourse and Content Analysis ». https://wcfia.harvard.edu/files/wcfia/files/870_symposium.pdf.
- Hewitt, Sally. 2009. « Discourse analysis and public policy research ». *Centre for rural economy discussion paper series* 24: 1-16.
- Hodges, Brian David, Ayelet Kuper, et Scott Reeves. 2008. « Qualitative Research: Discourse Analysis ». *BMJ: British Medical Journal* 337 (7669): 570-72.
- Husband-Ceperkovic, Taryn, et Rebecca Tiessen. 2020. « Beyond the Binary: Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity in Canadian Foreign Policy ». Dans *The Palgrave Handbook of Gender, Sexuality, and Canadian Politics*, édité par Manon Tremblay et Joanna Everitt, 401-19. Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-49240-3_20.
- International Women's Day. s. d. « Double Standards for Women Exist, but Female Empowerment Shines Through ». International Women's Day. Consulté le 2 octobre 2023. <https://www.internationalwomensday.com/Missions/18438/Double-standards-for-women-exist-but-female-empowerment-shines-through>.
- Jacoby, Liva, Laura A. Siminoff, et Liva H. Jacoby, éd. 2008. *Empirical Methods for Bioethics: A Primer*. 1. ed. Advances in Bioethics 11. Amsterdam Heidelberg: Elsevier JAI.
- Janzen, Bonnie, et Laurie-Ann Hellsten. 2021. « Household Income and Psychological Distress: Exploring Women's Paid and Unpaid Work as Mediators ». *International*

- Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 18 (12): 6402. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18126402>.
- Johnson, Melissa N. P., et Ethan McLean. 2020. « Discourse Analysis ». Dans *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography (Second Edition)*, édité par Audrey Kobayashi, 377-83. Oxford: Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-102295-5.10814-5>.
- Kabeer, Naila. 2005. « Gender equality and women's empowerment: A critical analysis of the third millennium development goal 1 ». *Gender & Development* 13 (1): 13-24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13552070512331332273>.
- Khoury, Nabil el. 2022. « Le Liban, terre d'affrontement entre l'Arabie Saoudite et l'Iran ». *Politique étrangère* Automne (3): 177-87. <https://doi.org/10.3917/pe.223.0177>.
- Kim, Eunkyung. 2007. « Chapter 7. The Hidden Population ». *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment* 14 (1-2): 139-58. https://doi.org/10.1300/J137v14n01_07.
- Kusakabe, Kyoko. 2005. « Gender Mainstreaming in Government Offices in Thailand, Cambodia, and Laos: Perspectives from Below ». *Gender & Development* 13 (2): 46-56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13552070512331332286>.
- Lazar, Michelle M. 2007. « Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis: Articulating a Feminist Discourse Praxis ». *Critical Discourse Studies* 4 (2): 141-64. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405900701464816>.
- Leeuwen, T. van. 2006. « Critical Discourse Analysis ». Dans *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics (Second Edition)*, édité par Keith Brown, 290-94. Oxford: Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-08-044854-2/00501-0>.
- Lombardi, Lia. 2017. « Violence Against Refugee and Migrant Women. The Reproduction of Gender Discrimination and Inequality ». *Fondazione ISMU*.
- MacArthur, Jess, Naomi Carrard, Federico Davila, Melita Grant, Tamara Megaw, Juliet Willetts, et Keren Winterford. 2022. « Gender-transformative approaches in international development: A brief history and five unifying principles ». *Women's Studies International Forum* 95 (novembre): 102635. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2022.102635>.
- Mason, Corinne L. 2019. « Buzzwords and fuzzwords: flattening intersectionality in Canadian aid ». *Canadian foreign policy journal* 25 (2): 203-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/11926422.2019.1592002>.
- Mason, Ian. 2014. « Discourse and Translation — A Social Perspective ». Dans *Translation: A Multidisciplinary Approach*, édité par Juliane House, 36-55. Palgrave Advances in Language and Linguistics. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137025487_3.
- Mayring, Philipp. 2004. « Qualitative content analysis ». *A companion to qualitative research* 1 (2): 159-76.
- . 2015. « Qualitative content analysis: Theoretical background and procedures ». *Approaches to qualitative research in mathematics education: Examples of methodology and methods*, 365-80.
- Mogashoa, Tebogo. 2014. « Understanding critical discourse analysis in qualitative research ». *International Journal of Humanities Social Sciences and Education* 1 (7): 104-13.
- Mortari, Luigina. 2015. « Reflectivity in Research Practice: An Overview of Different Perspectives ». *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 14 (5): 1609406915618045. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406915618045>.

- Morton, Sam E. 2022. « Development workers and gender work in Lao PDR ». Memorial University of Newfoundland. <https://research.library.mun.ca/15560/>.
- Morton, Sam E., Judyannet Muchiri, et Liam Swiss. 2020. « Which Feminism(s)? For Whom? Intersectionality in Canada's Feminist International Assistance Policy ». *International Journal* 75 (3): 329-48. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020702020953420>.
- Nylund, Mia-Lie, Sandra Håkansson, et Elin Bjarnegård. 2023. « The Transformative Potential of Feminist Foreign Policy: The Case of Sweden ». *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy* 44 (3): 257-73. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1554477X.2022.2113662>.
- Oas, Rebecca. 2020. « What is feminist foreign policy ». *Center for Family & Human Rights. Obtenido de*. <https://c-fam.org/wp-content/uploads/What-is-feminist-foreign-policy-.pdf>.
- Offen, Karen. 1988. « Defining Feminism: A Comparative Historical Approach ». *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 14 (1): 119-57. <https://doi.org/10.1086/494494>.
- Parisi, Laura. 2020. « Canada's New Feminist International Assistance Policy: Business as Usual? ». *Foreign Policy Analysis* 16 (2): 163-80. <https://doi.org/10.1093/fpa/orz027>.
- Paul, Katharina T. 2009. « Discourse analysis: an exploration of methodological issues and a call for methodological courage in the field of policy analysis ». *Critical Policy Studies* 3 (2): 240-53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19460170903385692>.
- Peterson, Helen, et Birgitta Jordansson. 2022. « Gender mainstreaming in Swedish academia: translating policy into practice ». *Journal of Gender Studies* 31 (1): 87-100. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2021.2004539>.
- Rao, Sheila, et Rebecca Tiessen. 2020. « Whose Feminism(s)? Overseas Partner Organizations' Perceptions of Canada's Feminist International Assistance Policy ». *International Journal* 75 (3): 349-66. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020702020960120>.
- Reich-Stiebert, Natalia, Laura Froehlich, et Jan-Bennet Voltmer. 2023. « Gendered Mental Labor: A Systematic Literature Review on the Cognitive Dimension of Unpaid Work Within the Household and Childcare ». *Sex Roles* 88 (11-12): 475-94. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-023-01362-0>.
- Roberts, Celia, et Julia V. Bailey. 2023. « What Counts as Discourse Analysis and What Use Is It? », novembre. <https://www.bmj.com/rapid-response/2011/11/02/what-counts-discourse-analysis-and-what-use-it>.
- Rottenberg, Catherine. 2014. « The Rise of Neoliberal Feminism ». *Cultural Studies* 28 (3): 418-37. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09502386.2013.857361>.
- . 2018. « The Neoliberal Feminist ». Dans *The Rise of Neoliberal Feminism*, édité par Catherine A. Rottenberg, 0. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190901226.003.0003>.
- Ruppert, Uta, Tanja Scheiterbauer, et Helma Lutz. 2020. « Feminisms of the Global South: Critical thinking and collective struggles: An introduction ». *European Journal of Women's Studies* 27 (4): 329-32. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350506820951938>.
- Scheyer, Victoria, et Marina Kumskova. 2019. « Feminist Foreign Policy: A Fine Line Between "Adding Women" and Pursuing a Feminist Agenda ». *Journal of International Affairs* 72 (2): 57-76.
- Schneider, Sebastian H., Alexandra Gödderz, Helge Zille, et Nora Sassenhagen. 2023. « Who Supports Feminist Development Policy? Evidence from Germany ». *European Journal*

- Schrøder, K.C. 2006. « Media: Pragmatics ». Dans *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics (Second Edition)*, édité par Keith Brown, 623-31. Oxford: Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-08-044854-2/00354-0>.
- Schuster, Julia. 2022. « Neoliberalism and Its Relationships with Feminism, Intersectionality and Postcolonialism ». Dans *Neoliberalism and Its Impact on the Women's Movement in Aotearoa/New Zealand: Where Have All the Feminists Gone?*, édité par Julia Schuster, 29-57. Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-95523-6_2.
- Slack, Tim, et Leif Jensen. 2008. « Employment Hardship Among Older Workers: Does Residential and Gender Inequality Extend Into Older Age? » *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B* 63 (1): S15-24. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/63.1.S15>.
- Sowa, Theo. 2023. « In My View: Are Feminist Foreign Policies Translating to Real Action? », février. <https://doi.org/10.1787/337d6469-en>.
- Stemler, Steve. 2000. « An overview of content analysis ». *Practical assessment, research, and evaluation* 7 (1): 17. <https://doi.org/10.7275/Z6FM-2E34>.
- Sue, Derald Wing. 2010. *Microaggressions in Everyday Life: Race, Gender, and Sexual Orientation*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Swan, Emma. 2021. « “The personal is political!”: exploring the limits of Canada’s feminist international assistance policy under occupation and blockade ». *Canadian Foreign Policy Journal* 27 (1): 117-35. <https://doi.org/10.1080/11926422.2020.1805340>.
- Thomas, Keith. 1959. « The Double Standard ». *Journal of the History of Ideas* 20 (2): 195-216. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2707819>.
- Thompson, Demise. 1994. « Defining Feminism ». *Australian Feminist Studies* 9 (20): 171-92. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08164649.1994.9994750>.
- Thompson, Lyric, Spogmay Ahmed, et Tanya Khokhar. 2021. « Defining Feminist Foreign Policy: A 2021 Update ». International center for research on women. <https://www.icrw.org/publications/defining-feminist-foreign-policy/>.
- Thompson, Lyric, et Rachel Clement. 2019. « Defining feminist foreign policy ». *International Center for Research on Women* 2.
- Thomson, Jennifer. 2020a. « The Growth of Feminist (?) Foreign Policy ». *E-International Relations* (blog). 10 février 2020. <https://www.e-ir.info/2020/02/10/the-growth-of-feminist-foreign-policy/>.
- . 2020b. « What’s Feminist about Feminist Foreign Policy? Sweden’s and Canada’s Foreign Policy Agendas ». *International Studies Perspectives* 21 (4): 424-37. <https://doi.org/10.1093/isp/ekz032>.
- Tiessen, Rebecca. s. d. « What’s New about Canada’s Feminist International Assistance Policy: The Problem and Possibilities of ‘More of the Same’† ». Canadian Global Affairs Institute. Consulté le 12 septembre 2023. https://www.cgai.ca/whats_new_about_canadas_feminist_international_assistance_policy_the_problem_and_possibilities_of_more_of_the_same.
- Tiessen, Rebecca, et Nnenna Okoli. 2022. « Towards a Transformative Vision for Gender and Canadian International Policy: The Role and Impact of ‘Feminist inside Activists’ ». *International Journal: Canada’s Journal of Global Policy Analysis* 77 (4): 615-37. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00207020231163490>.

- Tiessen, Rebecca, et Emma Swan. 2018. « Canada's feminist foreign policy promises: an ambitious agenda for gender equality, human rights, peace, and security ». *Justin Trudeau and Canadian foreign policy*, 187-205.
- Tosun, Jale, Maria Tullia Galanti, et Michael Howlett. 2022. « The Significance of Leadership in the Evolution of Policy Styles: Reconciling Policy-Making in the Short and Long Term ». *Politische Vierteljahresschrift* 63 (2): 337-58. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11615-022-00395-6>.
- UN Women. 2022. « FEMINIST FOREIGN POLICIES: AN INTRODUCTION ». UN Women. https://www.unwomen.org/sites/default/files/2022-09/Brief-Feminist-foreign-policies-en_0.pdf.
- Walfridsson, Hanna. 2023. « The Rise and Fall of the First Feminist Foreign Policy ». Master's thesis, Malmö University. <https://mau.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1764670/FULLTEXT01.pdf>.
- Warburton, Trevor. 2016. « Turning the Lens: Reflexivity in Research & Teaching with Critical Discourse Analysis. » *Critical Questions in Education* 7 (3): 249-67.
- Williamson, Kirsty, Lisa M. Given, et Paul Scifleet. 2018. « Chapter 19 - Qualitative data analysis ». Dans *Research Methods (Second Edition)*, édité par Kirsty Williamson et Graeme Johanson, 453-76. Chandos Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-102220-7.00019-4>.
- Wilson, Kalpana. 2015. « Towards a Radical Re-Appropriation: Gender, Development and Neoliberal Feminism ». *Development and Change* 46 (4): 803-32. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dech.12176>.
- Zhan, Heying Jenny. 2005. « Aging, Health Care, and Elder Care: Perpetuation of Gender Inequalities in China ». *Health Care for Women International* 26 (8): 693-712. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07399330500177196>.
- Zhukova, Ekatherina. 2023. « A Struggle for Hegemonic Feminisation in Six Feminist Foreign Policies Or, How Social Hierarchies Work in World Politics ». *Millennium*, juillet, 03058298231182186. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03058298231182186>.
- Zilla, Claudia. 2022. « Feminist Foreign Policy: Concepts, Core Components and Controversies ». Research Report 48/2022. SWP Comment. <https://doi.org/10.18449/2022C48>.
- . 2023. « Foreign policy reorientation: Feminist foreign and development policy in ministerial documents and debates ». SWP Comment. <https://www.econstor.eu/handle/10419/271555>.

APPENDIX

TABLE 1: Themes Used for Analysing Germany's FDP

THEMES				
Colonialism/ Patriarchy/Capitalism	Economic instrumentalization	Essentialization of women	Lack of intersectional approach	Paternalization of women
Discrimination	Economic development/ Economic/Economy	Women and girls	Disabilities/Disabled	Protection
Global South	Potential	Role	LGBTQI+	Guidance
Colonialism/Colonial/Post- colonial	Sustainable development	Women and children juxtaposed	Sexuality/Sexual orientation	Educating
Patriarchal system/Patriarchy	Poverty reduction	Vulnerable	Gender identity	Risk
Anti-racist	Women empowerment/ Empower	Mothers	Youth/Young	Defend/Defense
Gender role	Skills	Caregivers	Ethnicity/Ethnic	Helpful/Help
Stereotype	Hunger reduction	Civilians	Women and girls in all their diversity	Helping
Oppression	Productivity	Victim	Religious	Save/Saving
Exploitation	Agricultural		Age	
Exclusion	Manage/Managing		Classism	
Privilege	Capacity		Anti-gender	
European colonization	Control		Socioeconomic status	
German colonization	Work/Workforce		Indigenous	
Anti-discrimination			Social class/Class	
Capitalism/Capitalist			Children	
Imperialism			Inclusivity/Inclusion	
Empire			Transgender	
Decolonization			Intersex	
			Non-binary	
			Migrant/ Migration	
			Rural/Remote/ Urban	
			Nationality/National origins	
			Elders	
			Informal worker sectors	
			Bisexual	

			Gay	
			Lesbian	
			Queer	
			Asexual	
			Pansexual	
			Homosexual	
			Heterosexual	
			Diversity	
			Accessibility/ Accessible	
			Race	
			Refugee	
			Heteronormativity	
			Two-spirit	
			Pregnant/Pregnancy	

TABLE 2: Frequency of Key Term References in Germany's FDP

THEMES														
Colonialism/Patriarchy/ Capitalism			Economic instrumentalization			Essentialization of women			Lack of intersectional approach			Paternalization of women		
Terms	Total	Systemic	Terms	Total	Instrumentalizing	Terms	Total	Essentializing	Terms	Total	Intersectionality	Terms	Total	Paternalizing
Global South	26	26	Potential	11	4	Role	28	4	LGBTQI+	14	14	Guidance	2	1
Colonialism/Colonial/Post-colonial	15	15	Sustainable development	4	4	Women and children juxtaposed	3	3	Sexuality/Sexual orientation	11	11	Educating	12	0
Patriarchal system/Patriarchy	11	11	Poverty reduction	8	3	Vulnerable	1	0	Gender identity	10	10	Risk	5	0
Anti-racist	10	10	Women empowerment/ Empower	9	2	Mothers	1	0	Youth/Young	7	7	Defend/Defense	4	0
Gender role	9	9	Skills	8	2	Caregivers	15	0	Ethnicity/Ethnic	7	7	Helpful/Help	3	0
Stereotype	8	8	Hunger reduction	2	1	Civilians	0	0	Women and girls in all their diversity	7	7	Helping	0	0
Oppression	7	7	Productivity	1	1	Victim	0	0	Religious	9	6	Save/Saving	0	0
Exploitation	6	6	Agricultural	2	1				Age	6	6			
Exclusion	4	4	Manage/Managing	3	1				Classism	5	5			
Privilege	4	4	Capacity	1	0				Anti-gender	5	5			
European colonization	2	2	Control	2	0				Socioeconomic status	4	4			
German colonization	2	2	Work/Workforce	48	0				Indigenous	13	4			
Anti-discrimination	1	1							Social class/Class	3	3			
Capitalism/Capitalist	0	0							Children	5	3			
Imperialism	0	0							Inclusivity/Inclusion	8	2			
Empire	0	0							Transgender	2	2			
Decolonization	0	0							Intersex	2	2			

									Non-binary	2	2			
									Migrant/ Migration	4	1			
									Rural/Remote/ Urban	2	1			
									Nationality/National origins	1	1			
									Elders	1	1			
									Informal worker sectors	2	1			
									Bisexual	1	1			
									Gay	1	1			
									Lesbian	1	1			
									Queer	1	1			
									Asexual	1	1			
									Pansexual	1	1			
									Homosexual	1	1			
									Heterosexual	1	1			
									Diversity	3	0			
									Accessibility/ Accessible	3	0			
									Race	2	0			
									Refugee	0	0			
									Heteronormativity	0	0			
									Two-spirit	0	0			
									Pregnant/Pregnancy	0	0			