

# Collecting and Storing Data

Antonio Duran, Eliza Gallagher, Ryan Miller  
March 17, 2023





# Thank You to the PRISMATIC leadership team!

Mike Bergland-Riese, University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Tricia Clayton, Wake Forest University

Antonio Duran, Arizona State University

Eliza Gallagher, Clemson University

Savannah Garmon, Osaka Prefecture University

Jay Garvey, University of Vermont

Madison Fitzgerald-Russell, Texas State University

Bryce Hughes, Montana State University

Jodi Linley, University of Iowa

Ryan Miller, University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Wendy Smith, University of Nebraska-Lincoln

John Sutton, ResultED

Matt Voigt, Clemson University



# Purpose of PRISMATIC

*The Propagating Research Ethics around Sexual Marginalization and Transgender Issues Conference* aims to provide guidance for conducting ethical and responsible research with LGBTQIA+ individuals in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) fields in higher education.

*The goals of PRISMATIC are to identify best practices and considerations for conceptualizing, designing, conducting, and disseminating higher education research involving LGBTQIA+ participants, and then create and share a prioritized research agenda related to the major ethical issues.*



# A few definitions

- Gender identity: one's internal sense of self; can be the same or different from sex assigned at birth
- Sexual Orientation: romantic attraction to other people
- LGBTQIA+: an acronym for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, intersex, asexual, and non-binary, with a "+" sign to recognize the limitless sexual orientations and gender identities people have
- BIPOC: Black, Indigenous, or People of Color

Resources for more definitions:

- [Glossary of Terms - Human Rights Campaign](#)
- [LGBTQ Terms and Definitions](#)
- [GLAAD Media Reference Guide - LGBTQ Terms](#)
- [Defining LGBTQIA+](#)



# Baseline Facts

- All research that involves human participants necessarily includes people with minoritized identities of gender and/or sexuality (including but not limited to lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, intersex, asexual, and nonbinary [LGBTQIA+])
- LGBTQIA+ individuals spend time & energy assessing their personal safety and potential consequences from disclosing their identities in every situation
- There are real implications for potential harm and danger from breaches in research confidentiality, particularly for LGBTQIA+ individuals
- Responsible conduct of research with LGBTQIA+ participants needs to span the entire research process: design & planning, participant recruitment, instrumentation, data collection, data analysis, propagation of findings, confidentiality
- All researchers are responsible for ethical practices





# Schedule for Today [eastern time]

- 2:00 Welcome and norms refresher
- 2:10 Introductions
- 2:20 Considerations for data collection and storage
- 2:30 Scenario discussion round 1
- 2:50 Sharing out round 1
- 3:05 Scenario discussion 2
- 3:25 Sharing out round 2
- 3:45 Wrapping up
- 3:50 Evaluation survey



# Workshop Norms

- We are here to learn from each other through discussions about ethical research considerations involving LGBTQIA+ communities
- We are not here to debate the legitimacy of LGBTQIA+ individuals and their identities, nor the need for vigilance and intentionality for the ethical inclusion of LGBTQIA+ individuals in STEM education research
- Verbal or written harassment or aggressions will lead to individuals being removed from this Zoom workshop
- [Code of Conduct](#)



# Engagement & Participation

- Encourage others to participate, asking if others want to comment or add on your contributions (out loud or in the chat), and invite people in who have been quiet
- Recognizing the value of having, understanding, and using shared terms
- Engage (in whichever way you can); be an engaged listener
- Support an encouraging vibe and tone
- Have conversations based on understanding and not debate, listen to understand (to hear, as opposed to thinking about the response)
- Engage with (and agree or disagree with) ideas, not individual people





# Vulnerability, Bravery, & Secure Spaces

- Taking risks, recognizing complex contexts, being willing to contribute even when we're unsure
- Everyone is coming in with good intentions but it is also okay to point out when there is an "ouch" moment
- If you disagree, accept such disagreements and pause to respond passionately
  - Disagree with the idea and not the person
- Personal stories stay -- lessons learned go with us. (e.g., don't retell stories from those that are shared in this space)
- Use I statements and relate to our own stories and perspectives, not sharing others



# Introductions

In small groups, we invite you to introduce yourselves to briefly share as much of the following as you are comfortable sharing:

- Name
- Pronouns
- Institution
- What are you thinking about after last week's session? and/or What are you hoping to gain from this session?





# Data Collection & Storage in Research with LGBTQIA+ Communities in STEM

## **Gender and sexuality as distinct but often interconnected aspects of identity within research**

- Gender and sex conflation in language - e.g. “male/female” referring to sex, not gender (see ASHE report on trans lives)
- Flattening distinct experiences of gender (trans\*, non-binary) and sexuality (LGB)
- Gender and sexuality across identities and communities
  - Terminology and assumptions used in surveys or qualitative interviews
  - Assuming that LGBTQ+ identities are highly salient and others are not; prioritizing disclosure or outness



# Data Collection & Storage in Research with LGBTQIA+ Communities in STEM

- **Intersectionality and multiple identities**
  - Figuring out how to solicit and account for various identities—and getting at issues of power
  - Collecting data with LGBTQ+ people as an umbrella group vs. focusing on subpopulations
- **Longitudinal data collection considerations** (e.g, changing identities, terminology, pronouns)
- **Safety and privacy/confidentiality considerations for data collection and storage**, especially given current political and social climate



# Scenario Discussion Round 1



# Scenario 1

A doctoral candidate, Taylor, is conducting a survey on the experiences of pre-medical students from their first to second year transition. In looking at the data after collecting two waves of data, they realize that a few responses on identity categories (gender and sexuality) changed from particular cases from one year to the next. In talking to their advisor who does not do queer and trans research, the advisor states that this may mean the data are not reliable and suggests simply focusing on one year's experiences.



## Scenario 2

Shih-Wei is conducting a longitudinal study on queer and trans STEM students of color during their college years at a particular institution. They are conducting qualitative interviews with each participant during each semester. One participant who identifies as a non-binary trans man who is also mixed race reviews the transcripts from their first year interviews. They share during their first semester, second year interview that they do not feel comfortable with the ways that they were describing their gender identity in the first year as they have been exploring more of themselves during college. They ask Shih-Wei not to include any of the data that Shih-Wei collected in the first year, because they are worried about how they will be perceived by others who read their narrative. They also worry that they will be too identifiable because of the people who know them within the engineering department.



# Scenario 3

Anyes has been conducting a study on the experiences of LGBTQIA+ students at public colleges and universities in their state. Their institution has a formal policy that all data collected or stored using university resources belongs to the university, although researchers have perpetual irrevocable license to publish from the data and use it for noncommercial purposes. A state senator has asked the university to turn over all data pertaining to LGBTQIA+ initiatives and a university administrator has notified Anyes that their data is included in the request and will be turned over to the state. Although the data has been stripped of direct identifiers, Anyes is concerned about potential re-identification of participants.





# Scenario Discussion Questions

- What are the ethical issues at play?
- What are the potential consequences (for researchers, research participants, etc)? Who is harmed and who stands to benefit?
- What are some possible actions, solutions, or responses?
- In what ways does context influence the scenario/solution(s) and how would a different context matter? (e.g. field/discipline, institution/institutional type, geographic/local context)
- What are implications for LGBTQIA+ people with multiple and intersecting social identities? (e.g., race, class, dis/ability, religion)
- Are there existing resources, networks, or groups that may have specific expertise to share in this area?





# Scenario Discussions

- Start with the scenario selected
- 1 volunteer (or more) to take notes
- 1 volunteer to share out
- Consider the discussion questions
- You may also share similar scenarios you have encountered and how you responded

We will have two rounds of discussions; for round 2 you can select a different scenario (and group)



# Group Sharing Out

Each group summarize  
major points of discussion in  
2-3 minutes

After round 1, we have two  
new scenarios for round 2



# Scenario Discussion Round 2



# Scenario 4

Alex is a doctoral student whose advisor has a large grant using multiple research methods to investigate inclusive undergraduate teaching in STEM classrooms focusing primarily on gender and race/ethnicity. As part of their graduate assistantship, Alex has been asked to observe selected undergraduate courses throughout the semester. Within a computer science course that Alex is observing, the instructor explained that students would be paired by gender to complete coding exercises and assignments—a practice aimed at reducing sexism and empowering women to be leaders in the class. The instructor paired students using the class roster generated by the university that includes names and headshots. Alex's observation protocol calls for recording details related to student interactions and the ways gender and race, in particular, may play a role in these interactions. As the semester kicks off, Alex is wondering about the ethical and practical implications of the observations and how the data collected from the observations might be used.



## Scenario 5

Anita is conducting qualitative interviews with queer and trans individuals. In an interview, a participant flat-out refuses to answer a question because they receive the question as an intrusion into their past trauma for the gaze of other researchers, rather than an authentic representation of their experiences.

What should Anita do? Does this need to be reported to the IRB?



# Scenario Discussion Questions

- What are the ethical issues at play?
- What are the potential consequences (for researchers, research participants, etc)? Who is harmed and who stands to benefit?
- What are some possible actions, solutions, or responses?
- In what ways does context influence the scenario/solution(s) and how would a different context matter? (e.g. field/discipline, institution/institutional type, geographic/local context)
- What are implications for LGBTQIA+ people with multiple and intersecting social identities? (e.g., race, class, dis/ability, religion)
- Are there existing resources, networks, or groups that may have specific expertise to share in this area?





# Scenario Discussions

- Start with the scenario selected
- 1 volunteer (or more) to take notes
- 1 volunteer to share out
- Consider the discussion questions
- You may also share similar scenarios you have encountered and how you responded

We will have two rounds of discussions; for round 2 you can select a different scenario (and group) or continue discussing the scenario you chose in round 1





# Group Sharing Out

Each group summarize  
major points of discussion in  
2-3 minutes





# Coming Next

- March 24, 2-4pm ET, Analyzing Data
- March 31, 2-4pm ET, Disseminating Data
- May 31-June 2 hybrid workshop



# Workshop Evaluation

<https://forms.gle/ywkQ7woJGX4phqxo8>

Because these workshops are funded by NSF, we need to be able to report back to NSF on how they went, via an anonymous evaluation survey.

We value your feedback and will use it to inform our future efforts in the short & long term





PRISMATIC is supported in part by a grant from the National Science Foundation (DUE-2220269). All PRISMATIC activities and findings are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the funding agency.

