COLLABORATIVE OF GENDER & SEXUAL HEALTH EQUITY
RESEARCH EDUCATION RESOURCES

Gender & Sex in Methods & Measurement

Research Equity Toolkit

Tool #9: Qualitative Considerations

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Introduction

There is guidance throughout each of the tools in the Gender & Sex in Methods and Measurement Research Equity Toolkit that is applicable to qualitative research - from **determining study eligibility**, to **effective recruitment strategies** to **navigating peer-review**, **ethics and funding landscapes**. However, there are also additional unique considerations that need to be made with regards to sex and gender when undertaking qualitative research projects. Here, we turn our attention to those unique considerations. In this tool, you will find discussions of pseudonym selection, as well as other ways that participants in qualitative research outputs may be represented and/or anonymized. We also offer guidance for researchers using open-ended interview questions to collect participant's gender identities, modalities and expressions, including when those questions are misunderstood or received defensively. Finally, we explore researcher positionality. This includes the risk of reproducing bias in studies involving sex and gender as concepts which include participants who are marginalized based on their genders and/or sexes. We also provide guidance on how to navigate complex insider relationships, where researchers may have pre-existing relationships with their participants or may establish relationships with research study participants after a study has completed.

Qualitative Considerations

On Naming Participants

In qualitative research outputs, rather than using depersonalized identifiers like randomly generated or codified numbers and letters, we often call each participant by a unique name, albeit a name that is not their own - a pseudonym. This is often done to protect participants' identities and maintain confidentiality, while at the same time emphasizing that study participants are individuals, with unique voices and experiences, with whom readers can connect on a personal level. In contrast, alphanumeric codes can render participants more abstract and dehumanized which is often not in keeping with qualitative approaches.

In 2024, Wang et al. reviewed 181 journal articles that used qualitative methods in the study of language learner identity development in the context of higher education. They identified nine distinct practices employed by researchers in the naming of participants; however, they note that only 7 of the 181 articles provided a rationale for their naming practices, and that only 5 indicated that pseudonym selection was done collaboratively or at the direction of the participants themselves. Heaton (2021) argues that while it is usually researchers who assign pseudonyms, the process by which this occurs is rarely described and instead relegated to a brief footnote or simple statement of "pseudonyms are used throughout." Like these authors, we contend that whereas pseudonym selection might seem a relatively innocuous and benign part of the research process, the process of naming is both deeply personal and political.

When Participants Select the Pseudonyms

When participants are given an opportunity to select their own pseudonyms, we might be concerned that they will treat the exercise with a degree of frivolity (e.g., the authors of this toolkit have had a significant number of youth participants ask to be called "Voldemort") or that they will select pseudonyms that will identify them.

Scenario

Vee is conducting a qualitative project with undergraduate students from across Canada, all of whom are training to be high school teachers. Using focus groups and one-on-one follow-up semi-structured interviews, Vee is hoping to assess the sexual health knowledge of these future educators, and their preparedness to offer inclusive, comprehensive sex education. As part of study enrolment, Vee asks each participant to self-select a pseudonym. Some select fictional character names, others select more recognizable first names, and still others select nonsensical creations. Vee notes that some of the participant-selected pseudonyms are conventionally gendered – in some instances, where the selected pseudonym seems to correspond with the participant's reported gender identity, and in some instances, where the selected pseudonym seems contrary to the participant's gender identity. Vee also notes that some of the pseudonyms are like the person's legal name, or that upon selection, the participant disclosed that their selected pseudonym was an existing stage name, pen name or online moniker.

Vee has concerns about the gendered dynamics of the participants self-selected pseudonyms, about the potential identifiability of participants based on their selection, and on the ways that research outputs will be received by readers when a more recognizable first name (e.g., Jared) is listed alongside a more fantastical name (e.g. Miss Princess of Banana Land).

Consider

It may not always be clear to participants how their self-selected pseudonym will be used; for example, they may not be fully aware that it will appear in published papers and other reports as a form of attribution, alongside quotes extracted from their interview and focus group transcripts. It may be helpful to provide participants with a description of pseudonym use, so that they can take this information into account when formulating a pseudonym. While a researcher might be concerned about having participants named in inconsistent ways, providing a set of naming-related guidelines may be disruptive to the process of building rapport, and may suggest to participants that there are only certain researcher-determined 'acceptable' naming conventions to which they must adhere as a condition of participation in the project.

When participants select names that may render them identifiable, researchers have an ethical responsibility to ensure that participants are informed about the potential ramifications of their choice. This may involve an informal conversation with the participant, wherein the participant is offered the opportunity to slightly alter their selection, or where the researcher can seek assurances that the participant understands the likelihood of their being identified if the selected pseudonym is retained. This may additionally or alternatively involve more formal documentation, such as the use of a waiver of anonymity, wherein the participant consents to being named in a identifiable way. The Tri-Council Policy Statement 2 allows participants to waive their anonymity, so long as their welfare and the welfare of other participants is not compromised. A waiver of anonymity might also be used in arts-based research, where a participant elects to have the artistic creations that they submit for inclusion into a research study attributed to them by name (Spray et al., 2022).

As discussed in **Tool 3 on Sampling Plans and Data Analyses** while there may be many undue, negative consequences of being identifiable as a participant in research, there are also many reasons why participants may ultimately prefer to be identifiable – where 'anonymity by default' may be disempowering and paternalist, and where the potential harm that may result from a lack of anonymity is exaggerated (Saunders et al., 2015).

Remember

Participants who are given the opportunity to select their own pseudonym are not merely undertaking a technical task of obscuring their identities; instead, renaming has psychological meaning for participants, who may take great care in selecting a pseudonym, including with regards to its gender specificity, as well as other salient aspects of self-identity (Allen & Wiles, 2016; Itzik & Walsh, 2023).

Spotlight

In Lowik et al. (2023), 152 trans youth participated in online focus group discussions regarding their sexual and reproductive health, to develop a text message-based pregnancy prevention and sexual health program tailored to their needs. During data collection, participants were encouraged to select their own screen name. An initial draft of the resulting manuscript included those screen names verbatim. However, during the peer review process, a reviewer raised a concern that the participants may have elected to use their existing screen names for the focus groups (i.e., names that they were already using online, including as social media monikers, the publication of which would render them identifiable). As such, the authors were encouraged to further anonymize the participants. They created new, unique pseudonyms for each participant, while retaining key features and characteristics of the names that the youth themselves had chosen. References to gender, for example, were retained in spirit but altered in specificity. As a fictionalized example, if a participant's chosen screen name was "ThoughtfulBoy101," they became "SensitiveLad202."

When Researchers Select the Pseudonyms

When pseudonyms are selected by researchers (rather than randomly generated), we might intentionally select a name for a participant that reflects or conceals one or more aspects of their identity. For example, a participant named Barbara might receive the pseudonym of Nancy – another distinctly woman's name, which also hints at the participant's age and perhaps also her ethnicity. Recognizing that there are young and racialized women named Nancy, when included alongside the participant's age (e.g., 72) and ethnicity (e.g., white), as well as other pertinent sociodemographic details, the name Nancy reflects who Barbara is, even while her given name is withheld.

When providing Amirah with a pseudonym – where Amirah is a distinctly Muslim woman's name - we might elect to choose one that reflects Amirah's gender and religion in a presumably obvious way. However, we might be concerned that Amirah will be identifiable by way of our pseudonym selection, if we select another Muslim name in place of Amirah – for example, where our sample is comprised of only employees of a given organization, and where there are few Muslim women who work there. Here, we might ask for Amirah's input – where names are deeply important to many people, being called by a pseudonym that is stripped of the entanglement between gender and religion might not feel good to her. Provided Amirah understands the risks associated with being identifiable, ought she be able to opt into a pseudonym that reflects the aspects of her identity that she feels are most salient? Or Amirah might find it reasonable and not unwelcome to be identified by a pseudonym that reflects her gender but not necessarily her religion, especially if she feels that her religious identity is not centrally pertinent to the research or if she has concerns about being identifiable given the nature of the research and considering her relative identifiability within the sample.

Scenario

Dr. Osworth is conducting research with nonbinary adults, to better understand their experiences accessing care at fertility clinics. As each participant is recruited to the project, Dr. Osworth makes note of their name in a confidential and encrypted 'Participant Details' list, and then selects a pseudonym for each. In this way, they can save all participant data under their pseudonym, and if needed, easily remove data from the dataset should a participant elect to discontinue and withdraw from the project. Among the 15 nonbinary participants they recruit, they note that 6 have names that they themselves understand as conventionally women's names (Emma, Roberta, Sophie, etc.), and the remaining 9 have names that they read as more androgynous or neutral.

Consider

Dr. Osworth is having to grapple with what it means to reflect or conceal aspects of gender that are thought to be embedded in names, by way of their pseudonym selection. They are considering whether to replace any conventionally gendered name with more neutral ones since the participants are all nonbinary – at least, neutral according to their own internal sense of gendered naming – or, whether they should retain and reflect the purportedly gendered connotations of the participants' self-selected names. They ultimately decide to generate a gendered or neutral name for each participant, accordingly, and then to share their selection with the participants, making amendments as needed based on their feedback.

Remember

Selecting pseudonyms for participants is never a neutral exercise, due to the significance of names for individuals and the various layers of social meaning that any singular – even fictitious - name can convey (Lahman et al., 2022). It is important to consider the gendered dynamics of naming practices, including how names are 'doing' words which are the core of (re)producing gender identities, differences, and inequities (Pilcher, 2017; Seguin et al., 2021). Balance is required between researchers' ethical obligations to confidentiality and anonymity, participants' own perspectives on the value of confidentiality and anonymity, and the potential of selecting pseudonyms which obscure or reflect important aspects of participants' identities, including gender (Allen & Wiles, 2016). Pseudonym selection, even when done on behalf of participants, may be more ethically and respectfully done, in consultation with those same participants.

On Gender, Attribution and Deidentification Practices

When might we deem it appropriate to alter the genders of participants in qualitative research outputs? If we are concerned that the combination of identifiers (gender identity including gendered name, alongside location, sexuality, age, etc.) would ostensibly identify the participant, is gender identity one of the things we can alter in pursuit of participant anonymity? What are the ethical responsibilities and limits associated with this practice?

Scenario

PhD Candidate Faith Condit conducted a small interview and arts-based research project with 30 people living with human papillomavirus from across the UK. She is considering the level of detail she should include alongside the interview excerpts and participant-produced photographs. She is worried that a combination of identifiers, placed alongside narrative descriptions of any participant's unique experience of living with HPV, will be sufficient to render them identifiable. Where blurring and redaction techniques can be used as tools for deidentification (Campbell et al., 2023), Faith is grappling with the limits of these techniques, especially as they apply to the genders of her participants.

For instance, while there are likely multiple 34-year-old cisgender men in Bristol who have HPV, does adding that "John" is disabled render him too identifiable? Faith finds that disability is ultimately relevant to his experience of HPV care and thus not something that can be obscured in the reporting. As such, she wonders whether his gender identity can be altered – whether "John" could be identified instead as "Alexandra," a 34-year-old cisgender woman?

Faith is similarly concerned about how to sufficiently anonymize the three trans participants from within her small sample, and wonders about rendering them cisgender for the purposes of anonymity, or about more subtly altering the specifics of their trans identity (e.g., where a genderqueer person, becomes agender) – and yet, each made reference to their genders within the interviews and photographs themselves.

Consider

Faith decides that in this qualitative study, gender is highly releveant to her anaylsis and to the participants' stories, and so altering it has the potential of impacting how the participants are read, and how her analyzes are interpreted. She is also concerned about the thics of codifying someone as a different gender - of particular concern is when somone with a marginalized gender identity or modality has that stripped from them for the purposes of safeguarding confidentiality. Thus, she decides that there are other approaches to deidentification that she can undertake – altering ages, locations, and blurring other details as needed. She also elects to show her results to the participants prior to publication, so that they can assess for themselves both the alterations she made and whether they feel sufficiently anonymized as a result.

Remember

With increased calls to share data, including qualitative data, researchers will need to carefully balance the need to de-identify those data for the purposes of participant anonymity, with the ways in which de-identification can strip participants and thus data derived from their stories of important contextual detail. How will those conducting secondary analysis with de-identified qualitative data meaningfully interpret the stories shared, if factors like gender identity have been omitted or altered? (Friedrich et al., 2023).

On Open-Ended Interview Questions about Gender

During qualitative interviews, researchers often begin by collecting sociodemographic details which are later used to describe participants generally as part of a sample, and which can be presented alongside interview excertps as a form of quote attribution. It is generally considered better to ask participants for these details outright, rather than assuming aspects of their identities and experiences based on physical appearance, tone of voice, or other markers. See **Tool 4** for a more fulsome discusson of how to ask about and measure participant's genders and sexes, inclusind a discussion of Two-Spirit as a protected term that only applies to Indigenous participants - where researchers need to be aware of how to navigate non-Indigenous participants self-describing as Two-Spirit.

When The Question is Misunderstood

Scenario

Researchers at the University of Big Thinkers conducted semi-structured interviews with older adults who had moved into retirement homes in Canada within the last year, to better understand whether and how their sexual lives changed alonside their residence status. Having conducted 10 interviews so far, during wich they asked each participant "What is your gender?" half of the participants either state that they did not understand the question or offered some detail about their sexuality instead. The researchers were concerned that by reporting participants' gender as "straight" for example, without qualification, explanation or disclaimer, that they would only further muddy the conceptual waters. As such, they decide to add an example or two to their question going forward, to help clarify what they are after to future participants (e.g., "What is your gender - thie means whether you're a woman, man, nonbinary, for example"). They also decide to report on the unintended responses with transparency and care in all outputs - where participants no taking the questino as intended, is ultimately data that they can analyze, alongside the narratives of sexual life that compromise the more substantive content of the interviews. They also elect to put a footnote next to their participant details table, to draw attention to the fact that some participants disclosed their sexualitites, rather than their genders, in response to the question.

Consider

Ascertaining participants' genders in qualitative research settings is sometimes done by way of an open-ended question – what gender do you identify with, or what is your gender? Even if researchers have a sense of what they are hoping this question will achieve (i.e., a declarative statement about each participant's current personal gender identity), this is not always the outcome. Participants may misunderstand the question, and they may describe facets of their sex, gender expression and/or sexuality instead (Lindqvist et al., 2021; Pryzgoda & Chrisler, 2000). When these conflations and confusions have occurred, how can we attend to them in our analyses? In the moment, we might be able to clarify our intentions and attend to misunderstandings, if appropriate – however, sometimes conceptual misunderstandings are what we are endeavoring to explore, where clarifying what we think a question means would not be in keeping.

Remember

When participants are themselves confused about how to answer specific questions, we must decide whether, when and how to attend to their confusion – by clarifying our question in the moment, by updating our interview guides for all additional participants, and/or by carefully attending to how we describe participants' identities for the purposes of analysis and in our writing, if they were asked about one thing and yet shared another.

When the Question is Received Defensively

Scenario

As part of his master's degree, CJ is conducted a small qualitative research project with disabled adults who accessed a community-based health clinic, to better understand their perinatal care needs. CJ initially asked participants for their genders but received a few defensive and dismissive responses during the first couple of interviews, including two participants who seemed offended by the question – one transgender woman who indicated that the question implied that she wasn't being perceived as a woman, and one older cisgender man who indicated that the question was offensive to him, as a 'real man.' Following the advice of his supervisor, he decided to omit gender identity from the interview guide, and instead used the participants' legal sex as recorded in their medical chart.

Consider

It is entirely possible that asking participants about their gender identities will prompt a variety of responses – from gratitude, to confusion, to anger (e.g., the authors of this toolkit have received all manner of defensive – and sometimes vitriolic and transphobic – responses to gender identity questions in interviews and written into open-ended gender questions on surveys). If the question is deemed important enough to ask (which questions about gender often are), it is recommended that researchers anticipate and plan for a variety of participant responses. For instance, rather than reverting to legal sex and omitting gender identity from their project, CJ might have been supported by his supervisor with a script, detailing how to reply when participants are offended, upset or angry. For instance, a simple, "Oh, this is a question that I'm asking everyone; I'd hate to assume and get it wrong," might be sufficient to reassure a participant that the question is being asked of everyone, to ensure that everyone's gender is accurately recorded.

Remember

It is reasonable to worry about offending participants when asking questions about a variety of personal and sensitive topics – gender, sexuality, disability, substance use, etc. However, the fear of offending needs to be balanced against the impacts of not asking in the first place, where these aspects of a person's identity or experience may be significant for understanding and contextualizing the stories they subsequently share during an interview or other form of data collection. When a study participant's response to any question shifts from being upset or offended, to behaving aggressively or unapologetically espousing prejudice in ways that are not pertinent to the study aims and goals, researchers should be empowered to discontinue an interaction for their own safety and wellbeing.

On Positionality

In qualitative research, we often engage with participants live and in person (or virtually, increasingly) – to conduct an interview, facilitate a focus group, work together on an artistic activity, or for another purpose. Then, in qualitative research as with quantitative research alike, someone analyzes the resulting data. Much has been written, therefore, about the ways in which the identity of the researcher matters, especially whether the researcher shares characteristics with the participant(s) – whether the researcher is an insider, an outsider, or an inbetweener, including with specific attention being paid to shared

or divergent experiences of gender and sexuality (Doyle et al., 2022; Rosenberg & Tilley, 2020).

On Reproducing Bias During Interview

Reflexivity is a practice whereby researchers examine and make explicit power relations and imbalances as they exist during research processes, including during data collection and analysis. Even the most thoughtful researcher has the potential of inadvertently reproducing and perpetuating dominant norms, biased and discriminatory perspectives, regardless of their knowledge, expertise and lived experience in any given area. This potential is often framed as especially pronounced when a researcher is an outsider to the community or population that they are studying.

Knott-Fayle et al. (2022) conducted a feminist reflexive analysis, by reexamining interview transcripts from a project focused on manifestations of cisgenderism in media representations of trans and intersex athletes. The interviews were conducted by the lead author on the published article cited above, cisgender researcher Knott-Fayle, who reflects on her own collusion in perpetuating cisgenderism during data collection. Knott-Fayle had participants challenge her on: the selection of certain media materials as discussion prompts, how she framed oppositional views to trans inclusion in sports as a matter of 'a balanced debate,' about how trans women were positioned as the referent of that debate, and about how she made assumptions about trans people and their participation in sports. The authors reflect on how the onus for addressing the discursive reproduction of dominant norms falls squarely on the shoulders of researchers, who hold positions of power – especially those who "engage with topics that fall outside of [their] own identity categories," where reflexivity is "vital in challenging prejudicial ideas and producing effective research in allyship (Knott-Fayle et al., 2022, 194)."

On Navigating Insider Relationships

Being an insider to a given community is framed as valuable in so far as it may facilitate the rapid establishment of trust and rapport between researchers and participants. However, the insularity and size of some marginalized and minoritized communities means that researchers who share identities with their participants may need to navigate both existing, as well as potential future, acquaintance, professional, platonic, romantic and/or sexual relationships with participants. While it may at first blush appear always, necessarily and unequivocally unethical to have established relationships with prospective participants, or to establish any type of relationship with someone with whom you were introduced by way of their participation in a research study (Bryant, 1999; Irwin, 2006), this is not always as straight forward in practice. Indeed, many have written about how they successfully managed to navigate these insider relationships (Cuomo & Massaro, 2016; Goode, 1999; Roiha & Iikkanen, 2022; Taylor, 2011; Wekker, 2006). This navigation often includes:

- Reflexive practice focused on understanding, examining and working to mediate power imbalances – including in ways that attend to the agency and autonomy of adult research study participants.
- Having frank discussions about boundaries and expectations. Just as in therapeutic dual relationships, one example might be having the participant guide any public disclosures about existing relationships and/or participation in the project. When a friendship is established following a research relationship, the participant alone can be empowered to decide if, when and with whom they disclose that they were a participant in the research project. The researcher's commitment is to their confidentiality, but where the participant/friend can exercise their autonomy on when that confidentiality can be relinquished. When a researcher interviews a work colleague as part of their study, the researcher can inform the participant that they will never bring up anything disclosed during the interview, at work – whether they are alone or in the company of other colleagues. However, the work colleague can be empowered to decide for themselves if, when and with whom to discuss the interview and anything that was disclosed therein.
- Attending to the ways that established relationships impact the data, its collection and its analysis, including by exposing those impacts in field notes, reflexive memos, and research outputs. This may also include making decisions about who conducts a given interview. For instance, where a participant is in an intimate relationship with a researcher such that the interview is likely to explore details about that intimate relationship, it may be prudent for another member of the research team to conduct that interview. This works to ensure that the participant can speak more freely and without taking narrative shortcuts as they might when speaking to their romantic partner who is already familiar with the story being told. It also works to ensure that the researcher is not having to juggle their competing roles as interviewer and as partner.

Additional reading

This list includes both additional recommended readings and items that were cited in this tool.

Abrams, J., Tabaac, A., Jung, S., & Else-Quest, N. M. (2020). Considerations for employing intersectionality in qualitative health research. *Social Science & Medicine 258*, 113138.

Allen, R. E. S., & Wiles, J. L. (2016). A rose by any other name: Participants choosing research pseudonyms. *Qualitative Research in Psychology 13(2)*, 149-165.

Bryant, C. D. (1999). Gratuitous sex in field research: "Carnal lagniappe" or "inappropriate behavior." *Deviant Behavior 20(4)*, 325-329.

Campbell, R., Javorka, M., Engleton, J., Fishwick, K., Gregory, K., & Goodman-Williams, R. (2023). Open-science guidance for qualitative research: An empirically validated approach for de-identifying sensitive narrative data. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science 6(4)*.

Cuomo, D., & Massaro, V. A. (2016). Boundary-making in feminist research: New methodologies for 'intimate insiders.' *Gender, Place & Culture 23(1)*, 94-106.

Doyle, C., Blanckensee, S., Nestor, N., & Buggy, C. J. (2022). The inbetweeners: Queer and allied insider/outsider experiences and perspectives from higher education in an evolving Ireland. In A. Duran, R. A. Miller, T. Jourian, & J. Cisneros (Eds.) *Queerness as Being in Higher Education: Narrating the Insider/Outsider Paradox as LGBTQ+ Scholars and Practitioners* (pp. 157-172). Routledge.

Friedrich, A. B., Mozersky, J., & DuBois, J. M. (2023). Potentially identifying variables reported in 100 qualitative health research articles: Implications for data sharing and secondary analysis. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research 24(2)*, 1-22.

Goode, E. (1999). Sex with informants as deviant behavior: An account and commentary. *Deviant Behavior 20(4)*, 301-324.

Heaton, J. (2021). "*Pseudonyms are used throughout": A footnote, unpacked. *Qualitative Inquiry 28(1)*, 123-132.

Irwin, K. (2006). Into the dark heart of ethnography: The lived ethics and inequality of intimate field relationships. *Qualitative Sociology 29*, 155-175.

Itzik, L. & Walsh, S. D. (2023). Giving them a choice: Qualitative research participants chosen pseudonyms as a reflection of self-identity. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 54(6-7)*, 705-721.

Knott-Fayle, G., Peel, E., & Witcomb, G. L. (2022). Prejudice in 'inclusive' spaces: Cisgenderist collusion in the interview context. *Feminism & Psychology 32(2)*, 178-198.

Lahman, M. K. E., Thomas, R., & Teman, E. D. (2022). A good name: Pseudonyms in research. *Qualitative Inquiry 29(6)*, 678-685.

Lindqvist, A., Gustafsson Sendén, M. & Renström, E. A. (2021). What is gender, anyway? A review of options for operationalizing gender. *Psychology & Sexuality 12(4)*, 332-344.

Lowik, A., Al-anzi, S. M. F., Amarasekera, A., Chan, A., Rana, M., Salter, A., Nath, R., Ybarra, M., & Saewyc, E. (2023). Transgender youth's perspectives on factors influencing intended and unintended pregnancies. *Women's Reproductive Health 10(4)*, 572-590.

Pilcher, J. (2017). Names and 'doing gender:' How forenames and surnames contribute to gender identities, difference, and inequalities. *Sex Roles 77*, 812-822.

Pryzgoda, J., & Chrisler, J. C. (2000). Definition of gender and sex: The subtleties of meaning. *Sex Roles 43*, 553-569.

Roiha, A., & Iikkanen, P. (2022). The salience of a prior relationship between researcher and participants: Reflecting on acquaintance interviews. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics 1(1)*, 1000003.

Rosenberg, S., & Tilley, P. J. M. (2021). 'A point of reference': The insider/outsider research staircase and transgender people's experiences of participating in trans-led research. *Qualitative Research 21(6)*, 923-938.

Saunders, B., Kitzinger, J., & Kitzinger, C. (2015). Anonymising interview data: Challenges and compromise in practice. *Qualitative Research 15(5)*, 616-632.

Seguin, C., Julien, C., & Zhang, Y. (2021). The stability of androgynous names: Dynamics of gendered naming practices in the United States 1880-2016. *Poetics, 85*(101501).

Spray, J., Hunleth, J., & Fechtel, H. (2022). What do arts-based methods do? A story of (what is) art and online research with children during a pandemic. *Sociological Research Online 27(3)*, 574-586.

Taylor, J. (2011). The intimate insider: Negotiating the ethics of friendship when doing insider research. *Qualitative Research 11(1)*, 3-22.

Wang, S., Muhamad Ramdani, J., Sun, S., Bose, P., & Gao, X. (2024). Naming research participants in qualitative language learning research: Numbers, pseudonyms, or real names? *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, online ahead of print.

Wekker, G. (2006). *The Politics of Passion: Women's Sexual Culture in the Afro-Surinamese Diaspora*. Columbia University Press.

Co-Authors/Advisory Team

Dr. A.J. Lowik is the lead author. Co-authors include Dr. Jessica Cameron, Jessy Dame, Dr. Jae Ford, Dr. Lex Pulice-Farrow, Dr. Travis Salway, Dr. Sari van Anders.

Funding

The Project Lead is Dr. A.J. Lowik, CGSHE Postdoctoral Fellow.

This work is funded by a CIHR Sex and Gender Science Chair in Gender-Transformative Sexual Health (PI: Dr. Kate Shannon).

Design & Development

Layout & design by Shivangi Sikri, Altaira Northe, CGSHE-UBC Comms Team & Carlie McPhee.

Advisory & resource support by Esther Ibu, CGSHE Research Coordinator for Sexual Health.

Suggested Citation (APA)

Lowik, A., Cameron, J. J., Dame, J., Ford, J., Pulice-Farrow, L., Salway, T., van Anders, S., & Shannon, K. (2024). Gender and Sex in Methods & Measurement - Research Equity Toolkit. “Tool #9: Qualitative Considerations” Collaborative of Gender and Sexual Health Equity, University of British Columbia.

Note: The advisory authors are listed alphabetically, each having contributed equally to this collaborative project; the exceptions to the alphabetical ordering are the first author (who is the project lead and primary author) and the last author (who is the senior author/PI and CIHR Chair that funded this project).

COLLABORATIVE OF GENDER & SEXUAL HEALTH EQUITY RESEARCH EDUCATION RESOURCES

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

CIHR IRSC