A Letter from the President and SQIP Conference Report
Suzanne Kirschner, Ed.D, College of the Holy Cross

Dear Members of the SQIP Community,

It gives me great pleasure to share with you some highlights of SQIP’s Sixth Annual Conference, which took place on June 9th-11th at Simmons University in Boston. The vitality and creativity of qualitative inquiry, and the engagement and congeniality of our membership, were very evident during those two and a half days. Over 160 people attended and took part in more than 30 symposia, paper sessions and conversation hours, as well as an excellent group of poster presentations. The conference provided many opportunities, both formal and informal, for everyone to share their work and connect with colleagues. A wide range of methodologies was represented – from phenomenology to discourse analysis, narrative to participatory action research, ethnography to cases studies. The presenters dealt with many kinds of methodological, ethical and epistemological questions. As in previous years, many of the projects displayed a strong focus on giving voice to marginalized or disempowered groups, as well as on the development of innovative theoretical positions and expanded methodological applications. Also prominent at this conference were a number of presentations that explored issues related to teaching and learning about qualitative methodologies.

It was especially important to me that this gathering be not only intellectually stimulating, but also welcoming and supportive, and I’m happy to report that many people have told me that this was indeed their experience.
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By: David Tomaselli, Psy.D. student, Point Park University
Special Thanks to Interviewee Logan Barsigian, Ph.D. student, University of California, Santa Cruz

A cache of 191 interviews from the Generations study—the first long-term, five-year study to examine health and well-being across three generations of lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals—has proven an invaluable resource for Logan Barsigian, a Ph.D. student at the University of California, Santa Cruz, as the basis of their study exploring non-binary gender identity, The Meaning of Genderqueer: Narratives of Three Generations of Genderqueer Sexual Minorities.

Like the larger Generations study, Barsigian’s study focuses on identity and development across the life course and explores the role of cultural context. Barsigian explained that data from Generations, with cohorts culled from three different age groups (ages 18-25, 34-41, and 52-59), also served as an ideal platform for engaging similarities—and differences—in experience between generations of genderqueer people with respect to: how someone understands non-binary gender experience; how someone narrates the intersections of gender, sexuality, and other identities when faced with overly reductive societal identifiers; and how someone finds community in terms of supportive fellowship and what that fellowship feels like. These points of interest lie at the heart of Barsigian’s study.

It was Barsigian’s faculty advisor and mentor at the University of California, Santa Cruz, Phil Hammack, professor of psychology and director of the Sexual and Gender Diversity Laboratory, who introduced them to Generations. Barsigian, who identifies as genderqueer and uses the pronouns “they/them/their,” was drawn to the University of California, Santa Cruz for an opportunity to work in a psychology department operating within a “sound social justice framework.” More specifically, Hammack’s work in the area of sexual and gender identities studied through the lens of narrative psychology proved of particular interest to Barsigian. And Hammack, a co-investigator on Generations, helped to guide Barsigian’s building of a codebook and their drawing out of recurring themes from Generations interviews for their study.

In addition to Hammack’s guidance, the efforts of another Generations team member, Quin Morrow, a PhD student in family science at the University of Minnesota, were instrumental in laying the groundwork for Barsigian’s study. Morrow examined data for greater insight into genderqueer experience; this provided a readymade cohort of 30 respondents who had identified as genderqueer in Generations screeners and interviews.

With a genderqueer cohort identified, Barsigian worked within the age-based categorizations established in Generations—ages 18-25, 34-41, and 52-59—a progression well-suited to exploring identity across life course. Barsigian explained that these age groups were originally selected by Generations researchers because of their proximity to culturally significant events that would almost certainly play a role in shaping the identity of any lesbian, gay, or bisexual person coming of age relative to them. “There are three unique cultural events that would prove massive for identity formation,” said Barsigian. “Events like the Stonewall riots in June 1969 and the rise of gay pride around that time...the AIDS crisis in the 1980s, and folks coming of age in the era of marriage equality with the Supreme Court decision rendered at this time...and being privy to that conversation along the lines of the progress narrative happening now.” These events were equally significant in identity formation for the Generations genderqueer cohort, who also identified as gay, lesbian, or bisexual. Barsigian, however, was careful to note that one’s being genderqueer in addition to being gay, lesbian, or bisexual can present additional—or qualitatively different—dimensions to one’s experience of identity formation relative to such formative events.
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The conference brought together researchers at all stages of their careers—from students, to early career academics and practitioners, to prominent and influential senior scholars. It drew people from many different parts of the world. Quite a few attendees came from universities, hospitals and community organizations in the Boston area, as well as from many other parts of North America. It was especially thrilling to welcome so many international scholars. Our presenters included researchers from Brazil, England, Hong Kong, Hungary, India, Israel, Japan, the Netherlands, Republic of Ireland, Scotland, South Africa, Switzerland and Turkey. These scholars shared their work at many different sessions, as well as in a special symposium (organized by Zsuzsa Kaló and Maria del Río Carrál) in which they discussed the situations and challenges faced by qualitative researchers working in European and Latin American countries. This panel was followed by a conversation hour focused on similar advances and challenges in the United Kingdom, presented by Chris McVittie and Simon Goodman.

We were indeed fortunate that Dr. Joseph P. Gone (Professor of Global Health and Social Medicine at Harvard Medical School and Professor of Anthropology at Harvard University) delivered the keynote address. Prof. Gone is an internationally recognized expert on the psychology and mental health of American Indians and other Indigenous peoples. He gave a dynamic and thought-provoking talk, which was titled “Proof of Power: Navigating Culture and Coloniality in Pursuit of Healing for American Indian Communities.” He highlighted the important role qualitative inquiry has played in his own development as a researcher, particularly in his efforts to study and appraise the use of conventional mental health services in American Indian communities and to promote alternative approaches to understanding and healing.

Barsigian understood that inherently social features of their research—specifically, questions addressing genderqueer identity formation relative to the challenges of navigating cultural space and building community—demanded theoretical underpinnings that equipped them to draw out the full range and complexity of meanings within these experiences. As such, Barsigian found Intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1991; Moradi & Grzanka, 2017), Life-Course Theory (Elder, 1998), and Narrative Theory (Hammack & Cohler, 2009) particularly incisive in terms of acknowledging power structures and how they locate the marginalized, how socio-historical context shapes one’s choices and life events, and how a person weaves the story of their life to make sense of who they are, respectively.

What ultimately emerged from Barsigian’s inductive thematic analysis were themes of unintelligibility (the experience of not being understood or validated within larger culture), the necessity of navigating stigma and challenging oppression, and the need to seek and create community.

Also among Barsigian’s findings, most prevalent within the two older cohorts, was the experience of an expanding cultural vocabulary giving voice to feelings for which there had previously been no expression—creating self-understanding later in life. “In terms of what gender feels like for non-binary people, there was not a whole lot of difference across generations. What was different [between age groups] were the ages at which one’s genderqueer identity emerged,” said Barsigian. “In some cases, there were people identifying as a woman or man for the first 30 or 40 years of their lives who had no other options until the cultural discourse began to change.”
Among the many wonderful symposia, panels and conversation hours were two plenary sessions, both of which dealt with foundational methodological issues. “Questioning Qualitative Methods,” which featured presentations by prominent researchers and methodologists (Rivka Tuval-Mashiach, Heidi Levitt with Zenobia Morrill and Bediha Ipekci, Sue Motulsy, and Ruthellen Josselson), explored the tension between recent efforts to systematize and validate qualitative methods, on the one hand, and the importance of preserving some of qualitative inquiry’s core strengths, on the other. The latter include creativity, methodological experimentation, and attunement to epistemic privilege.

A second plenary, “Teaching and Learning through Doing Qualitative Methods,” featured presentations by four poised and engaging young researchers (Juliann Nicholson, Cristina Brinkerhoff, Rachel John and Kendall Johnson), who spoke of experiences and lessons learned during a yearlong, mandatory sequence in qualitative methods taught by Prof. Renée Spencer, Associate Dean for Research at Boston University’s School of Social Work. Prof. Spencer chaired the session, introducing it by sharing her curricular and pedagogical goals. Several other symposia and panels also focused on teaching and learning, including “Critical Invocations in Qualitative Inquiry: Methods and Lives at the Intersection of History, Social Movements, Race and Imagination.” This symposium was organized by Prof. Michelle Fine. It featured innovative theoretical and methodological ideas from her students in CUNY’s Department of Critical Social/Personality Psychology (Arita Balaram, Donald Brown, Loren Cahill, Richard Clark and Sonia Sánchez).

Over the course of the conference, there were multiple opportunities to connect with colleagues, share ideas, and explore ways to contribute to various SQIP initiatives. On Tuesday, during the lunch period, we held meetings of several SQIP Task Forces. These included the Task forces on Publications, Curriculum, Ethics, Graduate Students, International Connections and Website/Communications. It was wonderful to see that there is so much interest in contributing to these important projects. We welcome your involvement!

I hope those of you who attended have been able to carry some of the warmth and excitement with you, and that even more of you will be able to join us at next year’s conference. Stay tuned for details! Many people contributed to this conference’s success. Gary Senecal, Program Co-Chair, helped with multiple tasks over the course of the past year. It was Gary who first connected us with Simmons, which proved to be a wonderful venue for this conference. Special thanks to SQIP’s Past President, Heidi Levitt, whose marvelous pre-conference workshop on “Methodological Integrity in Qualitative Research: Strengthening the Design of your Study and your Communication with Reviewers,” filled quickly and was very well received. Our President-elect, Jeanne Marecek, initiated and planned the In Memoriam table that was on display for attendees to remember and learn about several distinguished researchers, recently deceased, whose work advanced and supported qualitative inquiry in psychology. Abundant thanks go to Peiwei Li, our registration coordinator, and to a wonderful team of conference volunteers without whom things could not have gone so smoothly. This group was coordinated by Zenobia Morrill and included Justin Karter, Aaron Daniels, Bediha Ipekci, and Chris Page, among others. I am extremely grateful to President Katrina Rogers of Fielding Graduate University (https://www.fielding.edu/) for her generous support of this conference, this year as in previous years.

The success of this year’s SQIP conference is just one sign that our organization is thriving, and that qualitative inquiry continues to develop and to expand its influence in psychology. Other indices include the flourishing of our APA journal, Qualitative Inquiry, under the editorship of Ruthellen Josselson, and the fact that an American Psychologist article providing guidelines for reporting on qualitative research in psychology was the most downloaded APA journal article of 2018.1 Of course, much remains to be done.
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I’m especially excited about current work of the Task force on Curriculum, spearheaded by Linda McMullen, Chris Head and Ruthellen Josselson (all members of the SQIP Executive Committee), which is focused on the development and dissemination of curricula and pedagogies for teaching qualitative inquiry, along with efforts to support their routine inclusion within psychological research methods courses.

It has been an honor and a joy to serve as President this year and to work for a cause that we all support so strongly. I am delighted that our incoming President is Jeanne Marecek, a distinguished qualitative researcher. As I transition to the role of Past President, I thank all the members of the Executive Committee for their support, good will, great ideas and hard work, and I look forward to continuing to work on behalf of this wonderful community.

Best wishes,
Suzanne R. Kirschner


```
“IT HAS BEEN AN HONOR AND A JOY TO SERVE AS PRESIDENT THIS YEAR AND TO WORK FOR A CAUSE THAT WE ALL SUPPORT SO STRONGLY. I AM DELIGHTED THAT OUR INCOMING PRESIDENT IS JEANNE MARECEK, A DISTINGUISHED QUALITATIVE RESEARCHER. AS I TRANSITION TO THE ROLE OF PAST PRESIDENT, I THANK ALL THE MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR THEIR SUPPORT, GOOD WILL, GREAT IDEAS AND HARD WORK, AND I LOOK FORWARD TO CONTINUING TO WORK ON BEHALF OF THIS WONDERFUL COMMUNITY.”
```
Ethical and Political Dimensions of Research Methodologies (1086)
Thursday August 8th, 9 – 10:50

Giorgi's Reflections on Certain Qualitative and Phenomenological Research Methods:
Panel Discussion (1218)
Thursday August 8th, 12 – 1:50

Qualitative Methods (4051)
Sunday, August 11th, 9 – 9:50

Social Justice and Methodology (3083 II)
Saturday, August 10th, 9 – 9:50

On the Shoulders of Activist Scholars: Building Healthy Environments for Immigrants and Refugees (2034)
Friday August 9th, 8 – 9:50

Women in Psychology (2299)
Friday August 9th, 4 – 4:50
McCormick Place/W186b Level 1 West Building

SQIP BUSINESS/MEMBERSHIP MEETING
Thursday, August 8th 4 – 4:50pm
Marriott Marquis Philosophy Room (changed from APA program)
Find out what’s happening with SQIP and how you can get involved.

DIVISION 5 BUSINESS MEETING
Friday, August 9th 5 – 5:50pm
McCormick Place W182 Level 1 West Building

We strongly encourage our members to attend. Important Division-wide discussions and decisions happen at these meetings, and SQIP members should be present, included and represented in these decisions!

Division 5 Award Ceremony
Saturday August 10th 4 – 5:50pm
McCormick Place W186a Level 1 West Building

Come celebrate our Division 5 Award Winners, featuring a brief presentation by Fred Wertz.

SQIP on Social Media:
https://www.facebook.com/groups/QualPsy
Twitter @qualpsy
See/hear something interesting about qualitative research? Tweet it @qualpsy!