

Qualitative Methods in Genders & Sexualities Research: Queering Gender and Sexualities Studies

International Journal of Qualitative Methods

Volume 25: 1–11

© The Author(s) 2026

DOI: 10.1177/16094069261487102

journals.sagepub.com/home/ijq



Abstract

In the last forty years, research, studies, and articles on gender and sexualities have flourished within and beyond the fields of sociology and social sciences. The scholars' efforts have pushed the boundaries of the discipline to unprecedented limits in terms of both the quality and the richness of their research. Despite these growing and fascinating numbers, it is possible to notice a gap: namely, methods. There are two main reasons for that. On the one hand, scholars had to fiercely fight to make space for their studies in gender and sexualities, as methodologies were left behind. On the other hand, the rigidity and rigorousness of "standard" methodologies were difficult to apply in these new and enhancing fields of study. Today, we know that academic production is not "neutral", and that it is "gendered".

Keywords

genders, intersectionality, LGBTQI+, queer methods, sexualities

In the last forty years, research, studies, and articles on gender and sexualities have flourished within and beyond the fields of sociology and social sciences. The scholars' efforts have pushed the boundaries of the discipline to unprecedented limits in terms of both the quality and the richness of their research. Despite these growing and fascinating numbers, it is possible to notice a gap: namely, methods. There are two main reasons for that. On the one hand, scholars had to fiercely fight to make space for their studies in gender and sexualities, as methodologies were left behind. On the other hand, the rigidity and rigorousness of "standard" methodologies were difficult to apply in these new and enhancing fields of study. Today, we know that academic production is not "neutral", and that it is "gendered".

Indeed, forms of knowledges are shaped by those who carry out and conduct the research process. Instead of being "objective" and looking for "facts" and "reality", we have learned to avoid the universalization of categories and the use of preconceived ideas, and to develop reflexive awareness of the power structures in which we (as researchers) find ourselves embroiled (Agustín, 2005). It is therefore necessary to consider one's own subjectivity in order to understand not just how we analyze data, but the way in which we position ourselves to observe it (Bacio & Rinaldi, 2019). What happens when a researcher with specific identity characteristics carries out qualitative research within sensitive fields (such as gender and sexualities)? Scholars who are "systematic" and "rigorous", who play the role of inexpressive and emotionless researchers, and look for the truth appear are working in outdated modes. Moving beyond these representations is not simply a matter of questioning an ideological representation which has become the standard (that of the rigorous, straight, white, male researcher), but also in understanding how distant and detached writing and questions of objectivity are found in the social structure of academic writing, research, and teaching (Bacio & Rinaldi, 2019). Critical approaches – especially postcolonial theory, feminist criticism, and queer theory – have generated hugely important critiques of the new role played by the portrayal of the self by those who carried out research in the social sciences. Is the author really a detached and invisible subject? Does the production of research imply power relations? Does the research succeed in supporting the "polyvocality of social life and the complexity of social forms, experiences and biographies?" (Coffey 2002, p. 322).

Corresponding author:

Cirus Rinaldi, University of Palermo, Palermo, Italy.

Email: cirus.rinaldi@unipa.it

Reflexive tension, through feminist, postcolonial, and queer theory, calls into question the assumption that the researcher, method, and data are separate, and suggests that these dimensions are interconnected and interdependent. In reflexive tension, no method or technique can be considered as a neutral and decontextualized procedure which can be applied to any case, and the researcher cannot be considered an invisible actor without evaluative judgments because they are carrying out the research as an “embodied” and situated subject, and it is through these characteristics (and various epistemological, ontological, and theoretical assumptions) that they conduct their methods (Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2000). When researchers use specific methods and techniques to construct theories they are carrying out a process of knowledge production; the reflexive researcher tries to be more aware of the ways in which knowledge is acquired, organized, and interpreted and how it can be made relevant (Altheide & Johnson 1994). Both are knowledge producers whose interactions (both in the field and in textual strategies) are filtered and constructed on the basis of gender, sexuality, nationality, race and ethnicity, social class, age, and physical ability. These complex, polyphonic, multilayered positions call into question and render problematic impartial observation (who is observing whom? Are they both observing, or is one observing the other?).

However, they also present opportunities – even in ethnic terms – because they mean the researcher can avoid the risk of objectifying their subjects (a “desired” risk in quantitative analysis), thereby deconstructing the researcher’s authority and balancing (as much as is possible) power differentials existing between researcher and participant. The ethical considerations a researcher must contend with when studying gender and sexualities open up interesting questions about his/her positioning that deserve to be deeply investigated and offer highly relevant examples of what it means to be a “queer researcher” (Bacio & Rinaldi, 2019) investigating gender and sexualities: what does it mean for a queer researcher to study gender and sexualities? How does the taboo around homosexuality threaten and question heteronormative social relations (Butler, 1990)?

Yet how could sexuality be studied as something which exists “objectively,” as “something,” a “fact” which is independent from personal experience? Sexuality is certainly an institution, and a pervasive one, and academia’s (heterosexual and sexist) demand based on “objectivity” coincides with their imposition that there is a single source of (heterosexual) legitimization which presents a certain kind of subject as the “only” subject who can legitimately produce knowledge. Because of this, it is likely non-normative sexualities within research agendas are considered “affected”: “a show” that uses niche subjects and is highly specialized, eccentric, subjective and, consequently, unscientific.

However, as Kenneth Plummer points out, sexuality is a subject that can be explored properly if self-awareness becomes a collective exploration rather than an individual and private undertaking (Plummer, 2001). One of the main risks in research, then, is to give these voices and bodies expression according to specific, acceptable, and standardized forms. This risks research losing its apprehension and destabilizing capacity to undo, oppressively, the identity of the “Other”, or to turn research into docile narratives with changed characteristics that risk codifying hegemonic and dominant codes within them (Plummer, 2001). It has already been shown frequently how difficult it is to question certain factors that are taken for granted (gender, sexual orientation, physical ability, race, and social class) and to examine and criticize them effectively. Resolving these issues is not simply a matter of questioning an ideological representation which has become the standard (that of the rigorous male researcher), but also of understanding how distant and detached writing and the question of objectivity are found in the criteria of the social structure of academic writing (Becker, 1986; DeVault, 1999).

Therefore, emotions can become an analytical tool in this struggle, capable not only of renewing research and its “standardized” ideas in epistemological terms, but also – when they are understood both as a social process and a social product – becoming crucial dimensions in understanding interactively how social factors are deployed in processual terms (Hochschild, 2003). These aspects are further highlighted by studies on sociology of the body and embodiment which have shown how emotional and mindful bodies are connected and inseparable: how emotions and the “flesh” are intertwined with cognitive and symbolic processes (Shilling, 1993; Shilling & Mellor, 1996). This process of embodied knowledge permits us to learn and discover also through our senses, our movements, and our bodies (Okely, 1992) and to move towards a “carnal sociology,” a sociology that considers the body not just as an object (“sociology of the body”) but rather one which considers the body as an instrument of inquiry and knowledge (Wacquant, 2004). Taking into account the gendered, sexualized, and erotic subjectivity of the researcher – making them explicit – challenges heterosexual male subjectivity and heteronormativity, including those found within critical inquiry (Bacio & Rinaldi, 2019). This special issue, titled “Qualitative Methods in Genders and Sexualities Research”, has the aim to enrich qualitative methodologies techniques under the influence of gender and sexualities in order to make the field of methodologies in sociology and social sciences more “queer”.

This Special Issue

This collection is formed of seven articles that cover, from a methodological, geographical, and theme perspectives, a wide range of topics within the spectrum of gender and sexualities studies. Hughes and Santinele Martino’s (2023) article explores the theme of disability and sexuality in relation to the LGBTQI+ population. It highlights the historical exclusion of people

with intellectual disabilities from research and proposes a CBPR (Community-Based Participatory Research) model to address gender, sexuality, and rights, with a deep reflection on informed consent and ethical gatekeeping.

[Bahner and Lindroth \(2023\)](#) address qualitative research with marginalized populations such as disability, trans identity, and incarcerated youth. The key contribution is the analysis of the ethical and methodological challenges that arise when participants seek a supportive or therapeutic role from the researcher (the so-called “added therapeutic value”) due to the denial of their sexual needs.

[Ndu's \(2022\)](#) contribution applies Bourdieu's sociological analysis to research on women's health in Nigeria. While not strictly focused on sexuality, it addresses themes of gender identity, limited rights, and cultural heritage as factors influencing health decisions (health-seeking behaviour), essential for a feminist and critical analysis in a highly patriarchal context.

[Closson et al.'s \(2023\)](#) article is an example of youth-led methodology that addresses power dynamics and gender equity in the relationships of young women and non-binary youth who identify as queer or trans. The methodology emphasizes intersectionality and Community-Based Research (CBR) to develop more inclusive measurement tools.

[Gaete et al.'s \(2023\)](#) article presents body mapping as an Art-Based Research (ABR) method combined with a phenomenological approach to explore the pre-reflective embodied experience and gender discordance in trans people. This directly addresses the call's need to examine emerging fields of study (like trans studies) through innovative qualitative methodologies.

[Betts and Herb's \(2023\)](#) contribution focused on designing focus groups that build “queer connections” and a sense of community among participants, especially youth. Their reflection centres on the ethical obligation to resist the “pedagogy of pathologization” in queer research, promoting safety and inclusion through empathetic listening.

Finally, [Mavhandu-Mudzusi's \(2023\)](#) article introduces Cyclical Longitudinal Ethnography as a design for studying sexuality education in challenging rural contexts such as South Africa. The approach allows for iterative intervention and evaluation over time, adapting to socio-cultural changes and overcoming the time constraints of academic researchers. It emphasizes the role of research as “engaged scholarship” to address social determinants of sexuality (e.g., poverty and cultural norms).

Gender and Sexualities Research in Context

Why have we produced a special collection focused on qualitative instead of quantitative methods? If we look the field of gender and sexualities from a historical perspective, it is impossible to forget the work made by Alfred C. Kinsey and colleagues as early as 1948. Indeed, both the “Sexual Behavior in the Human Male” ([Kinsey et al., 1948](#)) and the “Sexual Behavior in the Human Female” ([Kinsey et al., 1953](#)), better known as the “Kinsey Reports”, still represent one of the largest datasets on sexual behaviors ever made, with almost 10,000 participants. Despite the success of these studies, we also know that controversies followed. While quantitative research cannot be dismissed from the research process (as it is often a necessary starting point for population data, like in the two Kinsey Reports), we argue that it is generally insufficient, less appropriate, or even harmful when studying the complex, subjective, and marginalized experiences within gender and sexualities research. The seven articles in this collection brilliantly highlight this point.

Quantitative methods tend to impose rigid categories and miss critical nuances required for effective research with populations in the field. Quantitative measures often rely on predefined, standardized scales that are inherently heteronormative and cisnormative, failing to capture the fluidity, diversity, and uniqueness of queer and trans identities and relationships. They risk homogenizing diverse experiences. Furthermore, traditional methods often highlight negative outcomes, deficits, disparities, and struggle, contributing to the “pedagogy of pathologization” ([Betts & Herb, 2023](#)) or framing queer and marginalized lives purely through violence and trauma. Quantitative methods fail to access the implicit, embodied, and pre-reflective cues of lived experience—the “how” and “why” behind the numbers. They often silence participants' ability to speak for themselves or use their own terminology. Finally, quantitative designs can inadvertently reinforce ableist and institutional gatekeeping, such as through standardized consent forms or through a lack of accessible formats (like simple written surveys) that exclude populations like those with intellectual disabilities.

The seven articles in this special issue contribute, with innovative approaches, to qualitative methodologies. As a collection, they highlight three macro-themes: 1. Sexualities with disabilities and intersectional marginality; 2. Innovative methods for embodied and queer exploration; and, 3. Sexualities with education and long-term intervention.

Four articles exemplify sexualities with disabilities and intersectional marginality. [Hughes and Santinele Martino \(2023\)](#) focus on gender and sexuality experiences of LGBTQ+ people with intellectual/developmental disabilities, and highlight sexual self-determination of these people. They employ Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR) and especially discuss the ethical challenges (consent, gatekeeping) in making the research process more inclusive. [Bahner and Lindroth \(2023\)](#) focus on sexualities and sexual health in marginalized populations (people with disability/chronic illness, trans/non-binary people, incarcerated youth). Their work highlights ethical and methodological challenges in interviewing (e.g.,

researcher's therapeutic role, sensitive data). [Ndu \(2022\)](#) approaches health-seeking behavior of women in Nigeria (stressing that sexuality is implicit in maternal health and gender stereotypes). The article is an application of Bourdieu's Theory of Practice (Capital, Habitus, Field) in feminist qualitative research. [Closson et al. \(2023\)](#) article is a measurement of gender equity and power dynamics in relationships of gender-inclusive young women and non-binary youth (both queer and trans). It employs youth-Led Community-Based Research (CBR) together with cognitive interviewing and an intersectional analysis.

Two articles present the second theme, innovative methods for embodied and queer exploration. [Gaete et al. \(2023\)](#) present an exploration of the embodied experience of gender discordance and dysphoria in trans people. Their use of Art-Based Research (ABR) in body mapping with a phenomenological approach (pre-reflective, embodied cues, micro-phenomenology) adds a new perspective to research social process. [Betts and Herb's \(2023\)](#) article focuses on queer experiences and representation in literature (self-disclosure and sense of community). The methodology is a design of inclusive qualitative focus groups (stressing queer connections and empathetic listening) to resist the pedagogy of pathologization.

Finally, in the third area (sexualities with education and long-term intervention), [Mavhandu-Mudzusi's \(2023\)](#) work on sexuality education (including HIV prevention) in South African rural farm schools with a stress on socio-cultural factors (such as poverty and cultural norms) is especially relevant. It employs a cyclical longitudinal ethnography as an innovative design for extended studies and iterative interventions (engaged scholarship).

The seven articles brilliantly captured what intersectionality is about. Following [Crenshaw's \(1989\)](#) theorization of intersectionality, the authors in this collection have risen the voice from the Global South and rural communities to contrast Western and Global North hegemonic perspectives. They have engaged with populations who include those who identify as queer and trans to contrast cisnormativity. They also include in their sample people with disabilities to contrast ableism, and they employ different methods such as literature and art to contrast mainstream methods. Often authors use the word intersectionality without a real engagement of the term and its implications in the field. The authors in this special collection did not take intersectionality for granted. Rather they use the framework as a tool to deepen and enlarge our knowledge on the populations analysed.

If we look at the populations studied, we found three macro-categories: 1. Gender and sexual identities; 2. Structural and systemic vulnerabilities; 3. Both (identities and vulnerabilities). In the first area we found [Gaete et al. \(2023\)](#) who work with trans and gender non-conforming persons (with a focus on identity experiences). While [Closson et al. \(2023\)](#) worked on gender-inclusive young women and non-binary youth (with a focus on queer/trans identities and relationships). At the same time, even [Betts and Herb \(2023\)](#) worked with queer youth (with a focus on queer research methodology and community).

In the second area we found [Mavhandu-Mudzusi \(2023\)](#) who worked with rural school communities facing poverty, HIV, and cultural taboo (with a focus on contextual vulnerability). [Ndu \(2022\)](#) sample is made of women in a highly patriarchal context (with a focus on systemic gender vulnerability). [Bahner and Lindroth \(2023\)](#) worked with people with disability and chronic illness, and incarcerated youth (with a focus on disability and carceral vulnerability).

Finally, in the third area, [Hughes and Santinele Martino \(2023\)](#) worked with LGBTQ+ people with intellectual and/or developmental disabilities (IDD) (with a focus on both identity and structural vulnerability).

The richness of the populations studied here made this collection unique in its genres, because it embraces different situations and contexts, all with the aim of enriching qualitative methodologies in the study of gender and sexualities. From this point of view, close to the concept of intersectionality, it is possible to add the idea of decolonization and emergent voices from the Global South. Therefore, this special issue can also be helpful in centering marginalized voices through decolonization. An example, is the strengths-based focus of research such as that of [Hughes and Santinele Martino \(2023\)](#), focusing on the joy, pleasure, and resilience of disabled LGBTQ+ people, and directly challenging the historical focus on struggle. Similarly, [Closson et al. \(2023\)](#) stress community-led endeavours, including the development of quantitative tools (like measurement scales) so that they accurately and inclusively reflect the experiences of queer youth globally. Finally, articles such as that of [Ndu \(2023\)](#) highlight the use of indigenous and local frameworks in combination with critical social theory (Bourdieu, in this case) and feminist perspectives to fully dissect power structures specific to local cultural contexts (e.g., Nigerian patriarchy).

Therefore, the double perspectives of intersectionality and decolonization, both used together and not as an alternative, make this collection an invaluable resource in the study of gender and sexualities.

Qualitative Methods in Gender and Sexualities Research

As we saw from the previous paragraphs, the articles in this collection offer a wide range of qualitative methodologies. In this section, we want to highlight how they contribute to the field of gender and sexualities studies. It is possible to divide the seven articles into three categories: 1. Participatory and community-based designs; 2. Phenomenological and art-based approaches; 3. Methodological reflections and ethical practices.

In the first group, we found the articles of [Closson et al. \(2023\)](#) and [Hughes and Santinele Martino \(2023\)](#) both employ Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR), with the former focusing on youth and cognitive interviewing, and the latter focusing on inclusive research. The second group includes the articles of [Gaete et al. \(2023\)](#), who employ phenomenological exploration, Art-Based Research (ABR), and Body Mapping (BM), [Mavhandu-Mudzusi \(2023\)](#), who employs Cyclical Longitudinal Ethnography (CLE), and [Ndu \(2022\)](#), who applies Bourdieu's Theory of Practice (with a specific commentary on qualitative research). Finally, the third group includes [Bahner and Lindroth \(2023\)](#), who employ reflexive analysis of qualitative interviews, with a focus on ethics in sexuality research, and [Betts and Herb \(2023\)](#), who use a focus group design with a link to reflexive practices to foster inclusion in the digital spaces.

Within these groups, there are differences and similarities. In the participatory and community-based designs group, for example, [Closson et al. \(2023\)](#) emphasize a youth-led approach, specifically using cognitive interviewing to critique and improve existing survey measures related to gender equity, applying an intersectional framework. On the other hand, [Hughes and Santinele Martino \(2023\)](#) focus on inclusive research with LGBTQ+ people with intellectual and developmental disabilities. It details practical protocols for accessible consent and assent processes and navigating institutional review boards (IRBs). Both articles seek to disrupt traditional power imbalances by engaging the community as co-creators, emphasizing the need to study LGBTQ+ and marginalized youth and adults. Moreover, they both stress the importance of research leading to concrete action and knowledge products beneficial to the community (e.g., guidebooks and policy recommendations).

In the second group focused on phenomenological and art-based approaches, [Gaete et al. \(2023\)](#) use Body Mapping (BM) and Micro-Phenomenological Interviewing (MPI), a highly specialized approach to capture pre-reflective bodily experiences (non-verbal cues) of gender discordance, moving beyond narrative alone. [Mavhandu-Mudzusi \(2023\)](#) adapts ethnography into a cyclical longitudinal design. This is a field-based, iterative design focused on sustained engagement and intervention evaluation within a complex social context (like sexuality education in rural South Africa). [Ndu \(2022\)](#) advocates for the use of Bourdieu's theory of practice (habitus, capital, field). This is primarily a theoretical and epistemological tool for structuring analysis and situating women's health decisions within socio-cultural power structures (with a clear employment of feminist perspectives). All adapt methodologies to capture complex or hidden dimensions of experience that may be difficult to articulate verbally due to trauma, cultural taboo, or implicit nature. Mavhandu-Mudzusi's method is pragmatic and temporal, focusing on observation and program impact. Gaete et al.'s method is highly reflexive and focused on the immediate, internal bodily experience. Ndu's application of Bourdieu provides the macro-theoretical framework (post-disciplinary domain of inquiry) that underpins and gives weight to the micro-level methods of the other two articles in this group.

In the third group focused on methodological reflections and ethical practices, [Bahner and Lindroth \(2023\)](#) address the ethical dilemma of the researcher's role when participants in sexuality research (particularly those previously ignored) seek advice, information, or emotional support (the "added therapeutic value"). By contrast, [Betts and Herb \(2023\)](#) focus on focus group design and strategies for inclusion in online environments. Key concepts are "queer connections" and "empathetic listening" to resist the "pedagogy of pathologization". Both articles engage in critical reflexivity to acknowledge and mitigate researcher bias and power dynamics in sensitive research. At the same time, they both emphasize methods that ensure participant safety and well-being, moving beyond a deficit-focused research model when studying gender and sexualities.

The common thread across all seven articles is the commitment to critical qualitative inquiry that challenges traditional power dynamics, prioritizes the experiences of marginalized individuals, and ensures that the methodology itself is ethical, reflexive, and empowering.

When we "go" queer, one of the first elements to consider is the marginalized status of the people involved in our research. Therefore, it is interesting to look at the samples included in the articles of this collection. [Hughes and Santinele Martino \(2023\)](#) targeted LGBTQ+ people with intellectual and/or developmental disabilities (IDD) and their co-researchers/advisors, highlighting intersectional marginalities (such as sexual and gender minority with cognitive disability) that are often excluded from research. [Closson et al. \(2023\)](#) sample consists of 30 gender-inclusive young women and non-binary youth (aged 16-29) with diverse identities, currently or recently (within a 12-month period) in a non-heterosexual and/or non-monogamous relationship in British Columbia, Canada; the marginalized status includes sexual and gender minorities (such as queer, trans, and non-binary), youth in non-monogamous relationships, with a clear focus on intersectionality. [Bahner and Lindroth \(2023\)](#) employ three retrospective samples from 2011 to 2021: the first consists of 65 people with various disabilities and/or chronic illnesses (aged 22-67); the second consists of 20 trans and non-binary gendered persons (aged 18-74); and the last consists of 20 incarcerated young persons (aged 15-20) in secure state care. Across these three samples there are multiple marginalized groups in relation to sexual health (such as disability, chronic illness, trans identity, incarceration, and age/youth). [Betts and Herb \(2023\)](#) sample is made of young queer participants (students and young adults) involved in a focus group study about queer representation in young adult literature. The marginalized status is related to sexual and gender minorities (such as diverse identities including gay, lesbian, bisexual, pansexual, asexual, non-binary, trans, and questioning), with an intersection with age and youth. [Gaete et al.'s \(2023\)](#) research is a single-case pilot study focusing on a

female-to-male participant (18 years old) undergoing hormonal treatment. The full study targets trans and gender non-conforming (TGNC) persons. The marginalized status is therefore related to trans youth and individuals experiencing gender discordance or dysphoria. [Mavhandu-Mudzusi's \(2023\)](#) sample consists of educators teaching sexuality education, learners (students, including those as young as 11 who were pregnant), parents/guardians, and community members in South African rural farm schools. The marginalized status comes from the rural setting, and it is linked to severe poverty, high HIV prevalence, cultural taboos around sexuality education, and social and economic vulnerability. Finally, [Ndu's \(2022\)](#) article is a commentary and theoretical paper and does not study a specific empirical sample. It reviews and theorizes the research of women's health-seeking behavior in Nigeria, especially regarding maternal health. Its focus on the socio-cultural structures affecting women in Nigeria (such as patriarchy, low agency, gender stereotyping, and cultural norms).

Several studies of the collection specifically target individuals facing multiple layers of marginalization, such as LGBTQ+ people with disabilities or young people whose identities intersect with incarceration or chronic illness. Trans, non-binary, and queer youth and young adults are core to most studies, which aim to move beyond pathologizing narratives and capture lived experiences of identity, relationships, and dysphoria. The samples include groups historically excluded from sexual health discourses, such as people with intellectual disabilities who are often denied sexual self-determination, or individuals whose privacy and agency are compromised, like those under court-appointed guardianship or in secure state care. Finally, the article on sexuality education ([Mavhandu-Mudzusi, 2023](#)) highlights a sample (learners, parents, community) defined by severe rural poverty in South Africa, where social issues like teenage pregnancy and HIV infection are high and directly impact sexual behavior and research participation.

Reading the seven articles of this special issue, the authors' efforts to embrace different epistemological questions together with the use of innovative and creative methods are clear. Moreover, as we highlighted in the first section, the role of the researcher is not fixed and taken-for-granted, but reflexivity and positionality are core elements of the researchers' bodies, emotions, identities, and representations. Therefore, we have also reflected on the articles of this special collection using the above-mentioned parameters creating four groups that are complementary and do not exclude each other: 1. Knowability (epistemological questions about what can be known); 2. Creative methodologies (innovative and embodied methods); 3. Negotiating research contexts (global, cultural, and institutional challenges); 4. Researcher bodies, identities, experiences (reflexivity and positionality).

The first group, knowability, includes [Ndu's \(2022\)](#) article that offers a critique of reductionism and causal models. Specifically, it directly critiques the reductionist nature of models that focus solely on economic capital (often a simplified quantitative predictor) to explain complex health behaviors, echoing Edelman's critique of bio-medical focus. [Closson et al. \(2023\)](#) try to make sense of ambiguity and critique of quantification. It uses cognitive interviewing to critique and redefine how standardized survey items (quantitative data) are understood by queer and non-binary youth, acknowledging that rigid categories fail to capture the ambiguity and complexity of their lived experiences. Finally, [Gaete et al. \(2023\)](#) work on the insinuating body and its epistemological limits. It seeks to overcome the limits of verbal language by using body mapping to access the "unspeakable" and "non-teleological" emotional and physical experience of gender discordance.

In the second group, creative methodologies, we again include the article of [Gaete et al. \(2023\)](#) that focuses on body mapping, stories and sexual rights. More specifically, it practices direct alignment with the employment of body mapping and phenomenological interviews to capture the embodied, temporal, and affective dimensions of sexual experience and self-perception. Similarly, [Betts and Herb \(2023\)](#) use patchworking as a method for generating multi-dimensional accounts. Focus groups are designed to be explicitly creative spaces that facilitate "queer connections" and "empathetic listening" (a form of non-verbal data exchange) to capture the unspoken vulnerabilities of queer youth. Finally, [Mavhandu-Mudzusi \(2023\)](#) also use patchworking, but as a creative response to context. Ethnography is adapted into a cyclical longitudinal design to capture the deep, messy context (poverty, culture) influencing sexuality and education. The method itself is a creative adaptation to institutional and geographical challenges.

In the third group, negotiating research contexts, we find [Mavhandu-Mudzusi \(2023\)](#) who works on sexuality research "in translation." Researching sexuality education in South African rural schools necessitates understanding the local "cultural grammar" (taboos, poverty) and translating the research intent to diverse stakeholders (learners, adults) to ensure ethical engagement. At the same time, [Bahner and Lindroth's \(2023\)](#) research can also be labelled sexuality research "in translation". In this case, linguistic and ethical translation take center stage. It explores the dilemma of the researcher in cross-disciplinary work who is often asked to perform "emotion work" and provide support, acting as a translator between the participants' unmet needs and the constraints of academic ethics. Finally, [Hughes and Santinele Martino \(2023\)](#) context work can be called "hesitating at the door;" a youth-led research on realizing sexual rights. Specifically, youth-led CBPR and institutional negotiation, where the focus is on building a youth-centered research model to realize the sexual rights of LGBTQ+ people with IDD, requiring negotiation with institutional gatekeepers (IRBs, guardians) and designing accessible ethical protocols.

The fourth and last group, bodies, identities, and experiences, includes [Bahner and Lindroth \(2023\)](#) who employ diaries of a sex researcher to show vulnerability and imperfection. The two researchers use reflexivity to address the "imperfections and

messiness” of the research process, acknowledging their personal discomfort and feeling unqualified to handle the “added therapeutic value” sought by participants. [Hughes and Santinele Martino \(2023\)](#) also worked on researcher’s identities and experiences. The two researchers explicitly disclose their own LGBTQ+ and/or disability status to build trust with participants, showing how their “researcher identity” is leveraged as a “partial perspective” that enhances the research. [Betts and Herb \(2023\)](#) show the lusty, desiring researcher’s body, questioning self-consent. Here, researchers adopt the role of “in-betweeners” to navigate their own queer identity and expertise, practicing self-consent by ensuring the research space is supportive of their vulnerabilities while prioritizing the well-being of the participants. Finally, [Mavhandu-Mudzusi’s \(2023\)](#) alignment is on questioning sex and the anthropologist ethical restraints. Researcher’s account of sustained, long-term fieldwork addresses the difficulty of investigating sensitive subjects where the personal self must be managed to “resist or ignore” intrusive public/institutional pressures, aligning with the pressure for “professional restraint”. All these innovative and creative methods employed by the authors and, at the same time, their questioning of the adherence of their research processes to sociology and social sciences ethics value, show how this collection is deeply rooted in qualitative methods and, even more importantly, how all studies who employ qualitative methodologies should approach the fields of gender and sexualities.

A Critique to Quantitative Methods in Gender and Sexualities Research

If we go back to the critique of quantitative methodologies that we highlighted at the beginning of this editorial, all seven articles in this collection showed concerns about the use of quantitative methods in the field. For example, [Closson et al. \(2023\)](#) write about the imposition of norms and rigidity. They critique that commonly used quantitative measures of power dynamics (e.g., the sexual relationship power scale) focus exclusively on monogamous, cisgender, heterosexual women, thus limiting their applicability to queer, trans, and non-binary youth. Alternatively, they advocate for cognitive interviewing and CBR to check the construct validity and relevance of existing scales, ensuring they capture diverse identities and relationships. [Betts and Herb \(2023\)](#) write that quantitative methods often focus on deficit and pathologization. They warn against replicating a “pedagogy of pathologization” where research outcomes highlight only negative experiences of the queer community. They also note that standard interviews risk homogenizing diversity. As an alternative, they offer a reflexive focus group design using strategies like “queer connections” and “empathetic listening” to create safe, affirming spaces and gather nuanced, non-pathological data. [Hughes and Santinele Martino \(2023\)](#) critique is on both exclusion and lack of voice when using quantitative methods. Traditional approaches treat people living with disabilities as “subjects”, excluding their perspectives based on ableist notions (e.g., incapacity to consent), forcing others (family, caregivers) to speak for them. They offer a CBPR and the development of accessible, agency-honoring consent/assent protocols to center the voices of LGBTQ+ people with IDD. [Gaete et al.’s \(2023\)](#) critique is on the lack of depth and embodiment in quantitative and more traditional qualitative approaches. Verbal-narrative and quantitative approaches fail to access the implicit and pre-reflective embodied cues of experience, particularly the visceral, non-verbal experience of gender discordance. They offer, instead, Art-Based Research (ABR) and phenomenological methods (e.g., body mapping, micro-phenomenological interviewing) to give voice to the unspoken and explore experience from a first-person, embodied perspective. [Mavhandu-Mudzusi \(2023\)](#) stresses the superficiality and failure of context. Standard quantitative and cross-sectional methods (e.g., surveys) are insufficient because they miss the social, cultural, and environmental complexities (like poverty and cultural taboos) that influence sexuality and education in specific settings. The author offers cyclical longitudinal ethnography for prolonged engagement and iterative data collection/intervention that builds trust and captures deep context. [Ndu \(2022\)](#) stresses the theoretical superficiality and policy failure (at the macro-level). The critique is theoretical: quantitative approaches often reduce complex decision-making (e.g., health-seeking) to overly simplified models based primarily on economic capital, ignoring crucial socio-cultural factors (Bourdieu’s notion of habitus and field). Indeed, the use of Bourdieu’s relational theory is employed to provide a robust framework for explaining the influence of social structures on behavior in feminist research. Finally, [Bahner and Lindroth \(2023\)](#) stress the ethical insensitivity and the denial of needs. Quantitative methods risk overlooking the immediate, personal, and emotional needs that participants bring to the research setting, particularly when their sexual health needs have been systematically denied by society. Instead, they offer a reflexive analysis and an ethical practice prepared to provide advice and support during the interview, acknowledging the research’s “added therapeutic value” for marginalized participants.

Taking into account the seven articles in this collection, it is possible to highlight the following three areas of concern: 1. Epistemological and methodological rigidity; 2. Political and ontological harm; 3. Exclusion from research and practice.

If we look at the first group, quantitative research fails to grasp the complex, “messy”, and fluid reality of sexual experience. Fixed categories are insufficient because they rely on fixed sexual identity categories (e.g., heterosexual, gay/lesbian, bisexual) that are often culturally specific (Anglo-Western countries) and inadequate or not meaningful for racially diverse, working-class, or younger populations. This fails to represent the actual proliferation of labels used by young people

(e.g., queer, questioning, pansexual). It assumes a fixed sexual self: the discrete categories presume a stable, unitary sexual self, ignoring the fluidity, ambiguity, and uncertainty inherent in young people's sexual development, behavior, and identity. The lack of depth and nuance: quantitative methods cannot capture the subjective experience, non-verbal complexities, silences, or implicit, embodied cues necessary for a nuanced analysis.

The second group, political and ontological harm, highlights that quantitative research risks constructing a problematic and politically conservative version of reality. It contributes to homonormative governance: state-produced sexual identity statistics (a "homosexual demography") are viewed as state instruments for control by making populations "understandable and governable". This knowledge favors the white, middle-class, male, gay, adult at the center of "sexual citizenship", marginalizing those who are queerer, female, black, younger and poorer. It reinforces deficit models: applied sexual health research tends to focus on adverse outcomes (STIs, unplanned pregnancy) and "risk behaviors", reinforcing the narrative of marginalized sexualities solely through struggle and deficits. The reduction to individual cognition (ignoring structure). It commonly adopts constructs like "self-efficacy" and "risk perception" from health psychology, which places the responsibility for risk/health solely within the individual's cognition, neglecting the role of socio-demographic factors and structural issues. It treats socio-demographics descriptively. Quantitative models often treat crucial variables like class, ethnicity, and gender merely as descriptive (non-causal), failing to theorize them as key components of lived experience or structural predictors of health outcomes.

Finally, in the third group, exclusion from research and practice, it is possible to identify the following limits of quantitative methods, like the practical limitations that lead to the exclusion of important voices and experiences. Exclusion of vulnerable populations: it can exacerbate bias and lead to methodological "flaws" when attempting to achieve random sampling of disenfranchised populations (e.g., those with substance misuse problems). The inhibition of political insight: by focusing on behavioral concepts like "unplanned pregnancy" over "unintended pregnancy", quantitative research answers public health questions but obscures the political insight that an unintended pregnancy may be a valid choice, not simply a "neglect of one's sexual health" requiring correction. The lack of researcher reflexivity: the field of applied sexual health research often lacks a tradition of epistemological inquiry or reflexivity, leading to "depersonalized" researchers whose own experiences and feminist politics are neither acknowledged nor leveraged to critique methodologies. The focus is on the "easily counted": the development of national statistics risks only counting groups (like white, middle-class adults) who can be easily measured through fixed categories, leading to policy that marginalizes those who are not counted.

We do not want to participate in the "fight" between qualitative and quantitative methods, but it must be said that the fields of gender and sexualities are more like a kaleidoscopic of identities than a world of fixed and pre-established categories. Therefore, objectively, quantitative methods face problems in capturing these fluid and polyphonic identities that, on the other hand, are more easily available for qualitative methodologies. In the next section, we will discuss the theoretical foundations of gender and sexualities studies. Until now, the focus of this editorial has always been on methods. Therefore, before concluding our space available, and starting from the articles in the collection, we think it is appropriate to devote a section on theories.

Theoretical Foundations of Gender and Sexualities Studies

In the introduction, we mentioned the British sociologist Ken Plummer, one of the most prominent scholars in qualitative methods and sexualities studies. Plummer is one of the most consistently referenced figures, celebrated for founding the field's qualitative, humanist, and relational focus. He is the inspiration for researchers to be passionate, ethical, and focused on human rights. His concept of "telling sexual stories" is a key counter-approach to quantitative data. Another pivotal voice is that of Michel Foucault (1978), who is essential for the critical interjection. His work is the source of the critique that sexuality is a historical, discursive formation tied to power and knowledge. He is quoted for his insight that the production of knowledge on sexuality (like government statistics) is an instrument of state control and governance ("governmentality"). At the same time, Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari (1984) are the representatives of the new materialist critique, their concepts are used to radically shift the location of sexuality away from the individual body and towards the "affective flow within assemblages" of bodies, things, and ideas. Their work justifies using creative, non-traditional methods to capture these dynamic forces. More recently, Judith Butler became the voice to queer theory, her work is cited for undermining claims to gender/sexuality as "natural" and for theorizing it as performative. Her concepts are used to critique the way state statistics operate as power dissimulated as ontology or "truth".

Among these five prominent scholars, we want to focus attention on Plummer's contribution that can be read both at the micro and macro levels. The micro-experience looks at the individual's process of narrating their life and sexual identity. While the macro-stakes observe the collective demand for sexual and intimate rights that challenge social norms and oppression.

Three out of seven articles in this collection directly address Plummer's work. [Bahner and Lindroth \(2023\)](#) connect personal narratives to political action and rights to justify the research approach with marginalized communities, viewing interviews as a means for both personal and political possibility for sexual recognition and voice. Drawing on [Plummer's \(1994\)](#) "telling sexual stories" and the realization of sexual health and rights, they cite "telling sexual stories" to frame their interviews as not just personal data collection but a political act that enables sexual recognition and voice for the marginalized. [Hughes and Santinele Martino \(2023\)](#) define sexual and intimate citizenship. These concepts are then used to articulate the ultimate goal of inclusive research: ensuring marginalized people can claim their basic human rights related to their identity and body. Drawing on [Plummer's \(2003\)](#) "intimate citizenship", rights over one's body, feelings, identity, and relationships, they define the goal of their research as advocating for people with IDD to achieve their rights "to choose what we do with our bodies, our feelings, our identities, our relationships, our genders, our eroticisms". Finally, [Betts and Herb \(2023\)](#) challenge norms and advance rights. These are used in the introduction to frame the methodological discussion by noting the role of research in response to social reform that challenges the nature of sexual citizenship. Indeed, [Plummer's \(1994\)](#) sexual citizenship is cited in the introduction to contextualize the field and the increased interest in queer lives as a response to legal and social reform that challenges existing norms.

Therefore, we can observe the influence of Plummer's work (especially from "telling stories") since the majority of the articles ([Closson et al., 2023](#); [Gaete et al., 2023](#); [Hughes & Santinele Martino, 2023](#)) are fundamentally exercises in giving "voice" to people who have been historically silenced (trans individuals, disabled people, youth). This aligns directly with Plummer's call to recognize "telling sexual stories" as a form of empowerment and political action. At the same time, other important scholars' work contributed to the articles' success. For example, [Betts and Herb \(2023\)](#), [Closson et al. \(2023\)](#) and [Ndu \(2022\)](#) all expand on the early work of Celia [Kitzinger \(1987\)](#) which critiqued mainstream psychology for marginalizing lesbian experiences and imposing normative categories, through their strong emphasis on "resisting pathologization" and challenging heteronormative categories. Another example comes from Michel [Foucault \(1978\)](#) on power and governance: the critique of "homonormative sexual citizenship" and institutional control draws heavily on [Foucault's \(1991\)](#) analysis of power, knowledge, and "governmentality". Finally, all the articles (but especially [Hughes & Santinele Martino, 2023](#); [Mavhandu-Mudzusi, 2023](#); [Closson et al., 2023](#)) are designed to study people defined by multiple axes of difference (e.g., sexuality, class, age, disability, ethnicity), reflecting the explicit post-1990s commitment to intersectionality as both a theoretical perspective and a methodological necessity through the work of Kimberly [Crenshaw \(1989\)](#).

Conclusions. Queer Methods and Queer Researchers. How to Make Academia "More Queer"

The researchers' job on studying gender and sexualities is never over. The fluidity of our selves makes researchers effort to study gender and sexualities a priority within both sociology and social sciences. There are numerous suggestions for future research directions coming from the articles in this collection. [Bahner and Lindroth \(2023\)](#) highlight the ethical and methodological preparation and therapeutic role in research. They stress the need for structured training, peer support, and formal supervision (funding for counselling) for researchers engaging in emotionally demanding sexuality research, together with a more complex discussion of the ambivalent researcher role (academic vs. human service professional). [Hughes and Santinele Martino \(2023\)](#) stress the need to expand inclusive, CBPR, and strengths-based research. There is a need for more research reflecting the experiences of researchers with IDD themselves. The studies should focus on strengths, joy, pleasure, and fulfillment (not just deficits) in the sexual lives of people with IDD, together with a critical discussion of tokenism and appropriation in inclusive approaches. [Gaete et al. \(2023\)](#) focus on phenomenological embodied exploration and longitudinal art-based methods. Future research should use successive "snapshots" to follow the gender affirmation process and account for changes in the bodily experience over time, explore the use of this protocol with other tools to unfold embodied experience. [Betts and Herb's \(2023\)](#) primary pathway is the use of inclusive queer methodologies and digital contingency planning. They suggest adopting the strategies (queer connections, empathetic listening) as a contingency plan for rapid, unexpected transitions to online research protocols. They continue to promote research that resists the pedagogy of pathologization by focusing on nuance, celebration, and joy. [Closson et al. \(2023\)](#) suggest improving measurement and global inclusivity of gender equity, developing new measures of relationship and gender equity informed by the lived realities of queer and trans youth, expanding and adapting the youth-led qualitative approach to other global settings and populations. [Mavhandu-Mudzusi \(2023\)](#) stresses the methodological sustainability and team structure in CLE to curb attrition, target educators living in the study area and include learners from several classes. They further suggest including multiple researchers (established and emerging) on the research team to ensure sustainability and skills transfer. Finally, [Ndu \(2022\)](#) highlights feminist theory application and policy relevance. The author combines Bourdieu's theory with feminist research to reconstruct norms and social belief systems and acknowledge women as experts. Additionally, future research should look at the intersubjective experiences of women who perpetuate masculine ideologies.

The political debate, especially within conservative parties and public figures, has provoked changes in society as a whole related to all aspects of non-normative sexualities. But “what is research?” Is it a comfortable zone where society can find protection, or is it a place where research can play a provocative part in advancing social dialogues within their work? Thanks to postcolonial studies, feminist criticism, and queer theory, all contributors to this collection have been successful in promoting a qualitative research model that employs visibility of the subject of the research, emotions, and reflexivity to create a specific genre not only in qualitative research, but also in the methodology of social science. Even if the ethical aspects of the research process can be sometimes problematic and may face issues of validity inside academia, the common values shared between the researcher and the subjects of their studies can lead to different and, as discussed in this special collection, better research outcomes. Indeed, making explicit the emotional connections between the researcher and the subject of the research, in other words “coming out,” can lead to positive and unexpected research outcomes because objectivity takes many different forms, not only the one that is expected. We showed that emotions can become an analytic tool used to explain the social process of research and become a social product in and of themselves. Can the use of emotions survive criticisms of validity within sociology and social science? We promote the concept of a “carnal sociology”, a sociology not just of the body, but one where the body is used as an instrument of inquiry and knowledge (Bacio & Rinaldi, 2019). Therefore, to have an academia that is “more queer” many steps need to be considered, both at the theory and methods levels. In this editorial, we engaged with the latter, and we showed how queer methods and queer researchers are important steps to make academia first and society later more open, free, and queer. Indeed, to make both academia and society a more inclusive place for all, we need to start with the employment of methods that are not rigid, validated, and standard, but methods that are flexible, open, and fluid, that are led by emotions and feelings, care and love for the research subject. We hope that with this special collection we contribute to make, if not academia, at least qualitative methods more queer.

Cirus Rinaldi¹ , Marco Bacio¹  and Riccardo Caldarera¹
¹University of Palermo, Palermo, Italy

ORCID iDs

Cirus Rinaldi  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4047-9234>

Marco Bacio  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9485-540X>

References

- Agustín, L. M. (2005). New Research Directions: The Cultural Study of Commercial Sex. *Sexualities*, 8(5), 618–631. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1363460705058400>
- Altheide, D. L., & Johnson, J. M. (1994). Criteria for assessing interpretive validity in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 485–499). Sage.
- Alvesson, M., & Skoldberg, K. (2000). *Reflexive Methodology: New Vistas for Qualitative Research*. Sage.
- Bacio, M., & Rinaldi, C. (2019). The queer researcher: Challenging homonormativity in research and educational settings. In S. Magaraggia, G. Mauerer, & M. Schmidbaur (Eds.), *Feminist Perspectives on Teaching Masculinities. Learning Beyond Stereotypes* (pp. 29–42). Routledge.
- Bahner, J., & Lindroth, M. (2023). Researchers With Benefits? Methodological and Ethical Challenges and Possibilities in Sexuality Research Within Marginalised Populations. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 22(■■■■), Article 16094069231171095. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069231171095>
- Becker, H. S. (1986). *Writing for Social Scientists*. Chicago University Press.
- Betts, D., & Herb, A. (2023). Queer Connections and Fostering Inclusion: Reflections on Qualitative Focus Group Design. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 22(■■■■), Article 16094069231205180. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069231205180>
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender Trouble. Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. Routledge.
- Closson, K., Nemutambwe, T., Osborne, Z., Lee, G. Y., Hangle, C., Stephenson, S., Magagula, P., Leonce, I., Raj, A., Nicholson, V., & Kaida, A. (2023). Relationship and Gender Equity Measurement Among Gender-Inclusive Young Women and Non-Binary Youth in British Columbia (RE-IMAGYN BC): Planning a Youth-Led, Community-Based, Qualitative Research Study. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 22(■■■■), Article 16094069221148415. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069221148415>
- Coffey, A. (2002). Ethnography and self: reflections and representations. In T. May (Ed.), *Qualitative Research in Action* (pp. 313–331). Sage.
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 1(8), 139–187.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1984). *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Athlone.
- DeVault, M. (1999). *Liberating Method: Feminism and Social Research*. Temple University Press.

- Foucault, M. (1978). *The History of Sexuality. Volume 1: An Introduction*. Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1991). Governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* (pp. 87–104). University of Chicago Press.
- Gaete, M. I., Castillo-Hermosilla, M., Martínez, C., Concha, F., Paiva-Mack, I., & Tomicic, A. (2023). Protocol of Application and Phenomenological Exploration of Body Mapping in Transgender Population: An Art-Based Research Method. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 22(■■■■), Article 16094069221150108. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069221150108>
- Hochschild, A. R. (2003). *The Managed Heart. Commercialization of Human Feeling*. University of California Press.
- Hughes, O. E., & Santinele Martino, A. (2023). Community-Based Participatory Gender and Sexualities Research With LGBTQ+ People With Intellectual and/or Developmental Disabilities. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 22(■■■■), Article 16094069231173779. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069231173779>
- Kinsey, A., Pomeroy, W., & Martin, C. (1948). *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*. Saunders.
- Kinsey, A., Pomeroy, W., Martin, C., & Gebhard, P. (1953). *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female*. Saunders.
- Kitzinger, C. (1987). *The social construction of lesbianism*. Sage.
- Mavhandu-Mudzusi, A. H. (2023). Cyclical Longitudinal Ethnography as an Innovative Design for Addressing Sexuality Education in South African Rural Farm Schools. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 22(■■■■), Article 16094069231207576. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069231207576>
- Ndu, M. (2022). Examining Bourdieu's Concepts of Capital, Habitus, and Field in Women's Health Research in Nigeria: A Feminist Perspective. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 21(■■■■), Article 16094069221136765. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069221136765>
- Okely, J. (1992). Anthropology and autobiography. Participatory experience and embodied knowledge. In J. Okely & H. Callaway (Eds.), *Anthropology and Autobiography* (pp. 1–27). Routledge.
- Plummer, K. (1994). *Telling Sexual Stories: Power, Change and Social Worlds*. Routledge.
- Plummer, K. (2001). *Document of Life 2. An Invitation to a Critical Humanism*. Sage.
- Plummer, K. (2003). *Intimate Citizenship: Private Decisions and Public Dialogues*. McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Shilling, C. (1993). *The Body and Social Theory*. Sage.
- Shilling, C., & Mellor, P. A. (1996). Embodiment, Structuration Theory and Modernity: Mind/Body Dualism and Repression of Sensuality. *Body & Society*, 2(4), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1357034X96002004001>
- Wacquant, L. (2004). *Body and Soul: Notebooks of an Apprentice Boxer*. Oxford University Press.