Sage Reference

The SAGE Handbook of Social Research Methods

Author: Andrea Doucet, Natasha Mauthner

Pub. Date: 2014

Product: Sage Reference

DOI: https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446212165

Keywords: feminist research, interviews, feminism, qualitative interview, knowledge, identity, research methods, social change, rapport, critique

Disciplines: Social Research Methods, Research Methods for the Social Sciences, Research Methods for Health & Social Care, Research Methods for Health & Social Care, Research Methods for Sociology, Social Research, Sociology

Access Date: June 3, 2023

Publishing Company: SAGE Publications Ltd

City: London

Online ISBN: 9781848608429

Qualitative Interviewing and Feminist Research

AndreaDoucet
NatashaMauthner

Introduction

Over the past three decades, there have been multiple intersections between feminism and the fields of methodology and epistemology. While feminist scholars initially claimed the distinctiveness of 'feminist methods,' 'feminist methodologies,' and 'feminist epistemologies,' since the 1990s they have begun to map out significant feminist contributions to these domains rather than separate fields of study *per se* (see Doucet and Mauthner 2006). Nevertheless, feminist researchers have embraced particular characteristics in their work. First, they have long advocated that feminist research should be not just *on* women, but *for* women (DeVault 1990, 1996; Edwards 1990; Fonow and Cook 1991, 2005; Ramazanoglu and Holland 2002; Reinharz 1992; Smith 1987, 1989, 1999; Stanley and Wise 1983, 1993). Second, they have advocated that feminist research should be concerned with issues of broader social change and social justice (Fonow and Cook 1991, 2005). For example, Beverly Skeggs argues that feminist research is distinct because it 'begins from the premise that the nature of reality in western society is unequal and hierarchical' (Skeggs 1997, 77) while Ramazanoglu and Holland (2002, 2–3) note that such research 'is imbued with particular theoretical, political, and ethical concerns that make these varied approaches to social research distinctive.' Third, feminist researchers have actively engaged with methodological innovation through challenging conventional or mainstream ways of collecting, analyzing, and presenting data (Code 1995; Gelsthorpe 1990; Lather 2001; Lather and Smithies 1997; Mol 2002; Naples 2003; Richardson 1988, 1997).

In the 1970s and 1980s, many feminists questioned whether positivist frameworks and quantitative methods could adequately capture women's experiences and everyday lives (Graham 1983; Oakley 1974; Reinharz 1979; Stanley and Wise 1990). Early feminist debates tended to draw a marked distinction between qualitative and quantitative approaches with the implication that qualitative methods were quintessentially feminist (Maynard and Purvis 1994). In particular, the in-depth face-to-face interview came to be seen as 'the paradigmatic "feminist method"' (Kelly et al. 1994, 34). The equation of feminist research with qualitative methods was criticized by a number of feminists early on (e.g. Jayaratne 1983). Since then, feminists have increasingly

moved away from privileging particular methodological approaches and methods. There has been recognition that research methodologies and methods should reflect the specific research questions under investigation, and that key feminist concerns can usefully be addressed by adopting a range of different approaches and methods (Brannen 1992; Chafetz 2004a, 2004b; Kelly et al. 1994; Maynard 1994; McCall 2005; Oakley 1998; Westmarland 2001).

Whilst recognizing that current feminist research is characterized by the use of multiple and mixed methods and approaches, the focus of this chapter is specifically on the ways in which feminist scholars have sought to transform the classic social science interview in line with feminist aims. Just as feminist thinking around issues of method, methodology, and epistemology have had a profound effect on research practices and theories more generally, contributions that feminist scholars have brought to the *interview* as a site for knowing from and about women's lives have been influential in reshaping the practice and theory of qualitative interviewing more broadly.

The aim of this chapter is therefore to examine feminist debates concerning the interview as a particular method of data collection. We begin by sketching out what we regard as some key historical trends in feminist approaches to interviewing, with a particular discussion of Ann Oakley's (1981) now classic piece on the importance of non-hierarchical interviewing practices. While Oakley's contribution initially stimulated discussions around the possibilities and limitations of creating rapport and friendliness within interviews, more recent challenges from black feminism, cultural studies, post-structural and postcolonial writing have questioned the extent to which ‘others’ can be known at all through interviews or, indeed, through any other method (Wilkinson and Kitzinger 1996). Our chapter also addresses the increasingly topical and critical question of how one can come to know others who are different from ourselves (such as in cross-cultural interviewing and women interviewing men) and highlights the most recent contributions of feminist scholarship to contemporary understandings of the research interview.

Feminist Contributions to the Interview: 1970s and 1980s

In the 1970s, feminist researchers began to engage with the intersections between feminist theory and methodologies, and turned their attention to the ways in which the methods available for studying and understanding women's lives were flawed. As Dorothy Smith (1974, 2) noted, there was within sociology ‘a disjunction between how women find and experience the world beginning (though not necessarily ending up) from

their place and the concepts and theoretical schemes available to think about it in.' Early feminist sociological theory thus pointed to how women's exclusion mattered both theoretically and methodologically. Turning their gaze to dominant methods used to generate theory, many feminist scholars expressed unease about quantitative data collection methods across the social and natural sciences and, more specifically, gender bias in the collection and interpretation of data on sex differences in behavioral, biological, and bio-behavioral scientific research. Feminist scientists documented, in particular, the exclusive use of male subjects in both experimental and clinical biomedical research, the selection of male activity and concomitant male-dominant animal populations for study, and the blatant invisibility of females in research protocols (Haraway 1988, 1991; Keller 1983, 1985; Keller and Longino 1998; Longino and Doell 1983; Rose 1994).

Whilst feminist scientists made such observations on the basis of experiments conducted on rats and baboons, similar concerns were made across the social sciences and humanities on research processes and protocols with human beings. Feminist social scientists noted how masculine bias permeated research, as perhaps best revealed in the valuing and incorporation of traditional masculine characteristics of reason, rationality, autonomy, and disconnection (see Code 1981; Gilligan 1977, 1982; Keller 1985; Lloyd 1983; Miller 1976; Smith 1974). Also within the social sciences and humanities, feminists waged a long and wide epistemological critique of positivism as a philosophical framework and its detached and 'objective' scientific approach that objectified research subjects.

Feminist scholars raised three particular concerns within this epistemological critique. First, women's lives and female-dominated domains were largely absent in much social science research. Thus when Dorothy Smith argued that 'sociology … has been based on and built up within the male social universe' (Smith 1974, 7), this was a 'social universe' that left unstudied and invisible the female-dominated social sites of domestic work and the care of children, the ill and the elderly (see also Finch and Groves 1983; Graham 1983, 1991). Second, these sentiments were even more profoundly felt by particular groups of women, especially by women of color who watched as feminist movements and feminism within the academy unfolded in ways that did not speak to them or about them. In the United States, this sense was aptly described as one of 'feelings of craziness' by the infamous Combahee River Collective's manifesto entitled: 'A Black Feminist Statement' (Combahee River Collective 1977/1986; see also Collins 1990; Hooks 1989, 1990; Lorde 1984). In Britain, women of African and Asian descent spoke to the invisibility of their experiences in public, political, and academic portrayals of women's lives (see Bryan et al. 1985; Mirza 1998; Wilkinson and Kitzinger 1996). A third concern was over the preferred tool for research within positivist frameworks, namely, the quantitative survey, and the extent to which it could adequately capture the complexity of women's lives. As Hilary Graham

lamented, women's experiences were being measured within surveys designed on the basis of men's lives; her provocative question, posed at the beginning of the 1980s, summed up the growing dissatisfaction with surveys for understanding women's experiences: '*Do her answers fit his questions?*' (Graham 1983).

It was against this backdrop that feminist social scientists turned their attention to the possibilities and practices of interviewing. During the 1980s feminist researchers, especially those working within sociology, began to engage with the issue of how to interview in ways that would adhere to widely recognized feminist goals of conducting non-hierarchical and egalitarian research. This critique began early in the decade with Ann Oakley's now highly cited article on 'non-hierarchical' relationships between female interviewers and interviewees (Oakley 1981). Her discussion sought to provide an alternative to what were presented as 'proper interviews' in sociological textbooks. More broadly, Oakley challenged positivist research methods that emphasized 'objectivity,' distance, and 'hygienic' research uncontaminated by the researcher's values or biases. In contrast to an objective, standardized and detached approach to interviewing, Oakley argued that 'the goal of finding out about people through interviewing was best achieved when the relationship of interviewer and interviewee is non-hierarchical and when the interviewer is prepared to invest his or her own personal identity in the relationship' (1981, 41). Janet Finch (1984), writing a few years later, echoed Oakley's concerns in emphasizing the rapport that could easily be struck between two women in an interview situation while others followed suit and argued for the importance of developing mutually reciprocal relationships during the interviewing stage (Mies 1983; Rheinharz 1992; Stanley and Wise 1983, 1993).

A central preoccupation for feminist researchers writing in the 1980s was an acute sensitivity to the relations between researcher and researched, and power relations more widely (see Maynard and Purvis 1994; Ramazanoglu and Holland 2002). In the 1990s, however, feminist social scientists began to challenge the notion of non-hierarchical interviews, the idea that power differentials could be equalized between women, as well as the assumption that reciprocity and mutuality between women necessarily leads to 'better' knowing. Indeed, feminists began to display a growing appreciation of the 'dilemmas' and tensions involved in coming to know and represent the narratives, experiences, or lives of their interview subjects (e.g. Ribbens and Edwards 1998; Willkinson and Kitzinger 1996; Wolf 1992).

Western-based social scientists have exhibited profound 'worry' over resolving these tensions (Fine and Wiess 1996, 251; see also DeVault 1999). However, the ethical dilemmas around coming to know 'others' have been particularly clearly articulated by Black feminist scholars (Lewis 2000; Mama 1995; Reynolds 2002a) and by feminists working in contexts where inequalities are especially acute, such as in low-income

communities and in Third World countries (Patai 1991; Wolf 1992). One of the most vocal scholars on this issue has been Daphne Patai who has insisted that, due to socio-economic and global inequalities, research relations between First World women interviewing Third World women are not only intrinsically hierarchical, but can be unethical (Patai 1991). Questions of who produces knowledge, with what politics, and from which locations (Mohanty 1988, 1991) have, furthermore, become increasingly critical and urgent in feminist, post-modern, and post-colonial research. Throughout the 1990s, women of color working within western contexts and feminists working in Third World settings have highlighted systemic processes of exclusion, racism, and ethnocentrism in research. Key and much-debated issues have included: intersections of global capitalism and feminist transnational identities (Ferguson 2004; Schutte 1993, 1998, 2000; Shohat 2001); the extent to which feminists in dominant cultures can ever *know* subaltern cultures (Alexander and Mohanty 1997; Ladson-Billings 2000; Mohanty et al. 1991; Oyewumi 2000; Spivak 1993); the challenges of knowing transnational lesbian and gay identities (Bunch 1987; Stone 1991); and the role and representation of subordinate 'others' in the production of knowledge (Bernal 2002; Christian 1996).

A decade after Ann Oakley's celebration of non-hierarchical woman-to-woman interviewing, and its ability to yield greater insight into knowledge of women's lives, feminist work took a 360-degree turn and began to highlight the potential dangers associated with trying to pretend that interviews could be friendly or mutually beneficial for both researchers and interviewees. Judith Stacey (1991: 114) argued that the 'ethnographic method exposes subjects to far greater danger and exploitation than do more positivist, abstract, and "masculinist" research methods. And the greater the intimacy – the greater the apparent mutuality of the researcher/researched relationship – the greater is the danger.' Pamela Cotterill (1992: 597) similarly drew attention to the 'potentially damaging effects of a research technique which encourages friendship in order to focus on very private and personal aspects of people's lives.' These criticisms have continued into the new millennium, with feminists commenting on the irony that feminist researchers may be reproducing the very practices they have been seeking to challenge:

> It is perhaps ironic, then, that scholars are discovering that methodological changes intended to achieve feminist ends—increased collaboration, greater interaction, and more open communication with research participants—may have inadvertently reintroduced some of the ethical dilemmas feminist researchers had hoped to eliminate: participants' sense of disappointment, alienation, and potential exploitation. (Kirsch 2005, 2163)

Three decades of ardent reflection on the usefulness of interviews as the most appropriate, or even the best,

way of gathering knowledge from and for women have paved the way for broader theoretical and epistemological debates about 'knowing' others. Beginning in the 1990s, feminists have turned their attention to the difficulties and challenges involved in creating knowledge from interview accounts.

Feminist Contributions to the Interview: Recent Issues and Concerns (1990s–2000s)

While the issues raised by Oakley have been critiqued and displaced with other key concerns, it remains the case that her reflections on what was important to feminist interviewing still resonate as highly relevant in the new millennium. That is, issues of non-hierarchical relations, power, rapport, and empathy, and the investment of one's identity in the interview process continue to dominate discussions of feminist research practices. However, these discussions have grown more complex and nuanced, and have incorporated a number of other concerns including: interviews as sites for collaborative meaning-making (the 'how' of interviews); the interrogation of 'what' constitutes data; and the theoretical assumptions and underpinnings of interviews, and research methods more generally.

Non-Hierarchical Relations in Interviewing

Underlying early discussions of non-hierarchical interviewing was the assumption that differences between women could be muted or eliminated altogether. Decades of scholarship on differences between women, postmodern and post-structural critiques of the stability of a concept and identity such as 'woman,' and black feminist contributions to this debate have revealed the naivety and essentialism inherent within this position. Many feminist researchers have shown that structural characteristics other than gender, such as differences in class, ethnicity, age, sexuality, and global location can matter and that the ways in which power imbalances play out in the interview process are not straightforward. Tang, for example, in her interviews with peers – academic mothers in both China and the UK – argues that both the interviewer's and interviewee's *perceptions* of social, cultural, and personal differences have an impact on the power relationship in the interview and that the relational dynamics between the interview pair can matter in what kind of information is divulged (Tang 2002; see also Garg 2004). Others have focused on how other aspects of the research relationship can influence the content and conduct of interview, including: shared proficiency by both interviewer and intervie-

wee in the language of the interview (Garg 2004; Temple and Edwards 2002); generational differences between interviewers and interviewees (Casey 2003); shared racial position (such as Black women researchers conducting interviews with Black women on topics that are highly sensitive) (Few et al. 2003); and how class relations may influence the 'telling' of lesbian stories in research interviews (McDermott 2004).

Power relations in research have been discussed with an overwhelming focus on how interviews affect the researched. Recently, however, feminists have highlighted the ways in which research respondents can exercise power, creating a two-way flow of power relations between the researcher and the researched. Informed by Foucauldian understandings of power, Thapar-Bjorkert and Henry (2004) view power hierarchies in research as 'shifting, multiple, and intersecting' (Thapar-Bjorkert and Henry 2004, 364). Drawing on the multiple locations within which both researchers and research participants are located, they argue that their combined locations as 'non-white/non-western and non-white/western researchers in a non-western setting' enabled them to 'closely examine the operation of power as it flows and ebbs in the context of a multiplicity of potential identities of researchers and research participants' (2004, 363). They note, in particular, how age, generation, national location, and reciprocity during and after the interviews influence how these power relations play out. Similarly, drawing on her research with Black mothers, Reynolds (2002b) questions the notion of the 'powerful researcher.' She notes that 'the power relations between the mothers and myself, as researcher, involved a dynamic, fluid and two-way interactive process' (2002b, 303). She found that power relations within her interviews shifted according to structural differences in race, class, age, and gender between researcher and researched. She writes:

> 'Where the researcher and research participant share the same racial and gender position, such as Black female researcher interviewing Black women, power between the two groups is primarily negotiated through other facts such as social class and age difference. This interaction between race, class and gender suggests that power in social research is not a fixed and unitary construct, exercised by the researcher over the research participant. Instead … power is multifaceted, relational and interactional and is constantly shifting and renegotiating itself between the researcher and the research participant according to differing contexts and their differing structural locations.' (2002b, 307–8)

Feminist reflections on the inevitability of hierarchy and power differences in interview settings and relationships do not suggest or imply abandonment of this method but rather invite researchers to be reflexive about

their research practices by recognizing, debating, and working with these power differentials.

Empathy, Rapport, and Reciprocity

Feminists have deepened their reflections on issues of empathy, rapport, and reciprocity in interview situations, with a recent focus on how to navigate differences of social positioning. Questions about how much researchers should reveal about themselves, their situations and their views during interviews have continued to be asked (see Edwards 1993), particularly in cases of research on overtly political issues where researcher and researched may hold divergent perspectives. For example, in her research in the British Serbian community on Serbian liability for atrocities, Pryke (2004) challenges the methodological convention that the interviewer must never disagree with a respondent in qualitative research.

Issues of rapport and empathy in interviewing have tended to be discussed and conceptualized in relation to woman-to-woman interviewing. However, since the 1990s, feminists have increasingly been investigating the lives of men, thus raising questions around creating empathy and rapport with male research subjects. These challenges have emerged from the work of feminist researchers who, for example, have interviewed powerful, authoritative, and uniformed men (e.g. senior police officers) or violent male offenders (Campbell 2003; Presser 2004, 2005; Taylor and Rupp 2005). Researchers of fatherhood have further explored how feminist research relationships can be fostered with men. In recent research on divorced fathers, for example, Canadian feminists have reflected on the tensions in interviewing fathers in political climates where fathers' rights groups have been gaining momentum. They highlight how fathers' narratives can be heard as potentially damaging to women's traditional caregiving interests (see Doucet 2004, 2006; Mandell 2002). Feminist research on men's experiences demonstrates how the establishment of trustworthy relations in the interviewing setting can nevertheless exist within relations of considerable power inequities and conflict that can ultimately undermine larger feminist research objectives.

Investing One's Identity in the Research Relationship

In the early work of Ann Oakley (1981), the idea of investing one's identity in the research relationship was marked by a tendency to frame a binary opposition between the researcher as an 'insider' or an 'outsider' to the research and to one's research subjects. Oakley, and many other feminist researchers who followed her,

illustrated this tendency in the argument that where the researcher has an area of shared identity with her research subjects, there was a reduced likelihood of unequal, exploitative, or unethical research. In the case of Oakley, shared motherhood was the entry point for the researcher to have 'insider' status in the research. Other feminists were quick to contest this notion by underlining how differing, as well as shared, structural characteristics could impede mutuality and reciprocity (Coterill 1992; Edwards 1990, 1993; Glucksmann 1994; Ramazanoglu 1989; Reynolds 2002b; Ribbens 1989; Song and Parker 1995). Feminist scholars also noted that even where researchers and respondents shared structural and cultural similarities of gender, ethnicity, class, and age, this did not guarantee mutual understanding or 'better' knowing. As Catherine Riessman pointed out, 'gender and personal involvement may not be enough for full "knowing"' (Riessman 1987, 189; see also Ribbens 1998). Since the early 1990s, feminist discussions of identity investment in interviews have, thus, debunked the view that any commonality in one's social positionality, structural location, and biographical experience can guarantee that these axes of shared identification will establish an open or 'better' research exchange (see Dyck 1997).

At the same time, feminists began to recognize that the identity of being an 'insider' was riddled with contradictions and that there were varied degrees of being *both* an insider and an outsider in the research relationship (e.g. Narayan 1993; Olesen 1998; Stanley 1994; Zavella 1993). In this vein, Patricia Hill Collins has referred to herself as the 'outsider within' (Hill Collins 1990, 1998) as a way of describing 'being on the edge' of 'intersecting power relations of race, gender and social class' (Hill Collins 1999, 85; see also Anzaldua 1987; Braidotti 1994). Furthermore, post-structuralist discussions of the complexity of the theoretical concepts and empirical constructs of subjectivity and identity have further strengthened the problematization of what it means to be an insider or an outsider, both theoretically and methodologically.

Two key issues have come to the fore in these debates. First, there is now fairly widespread consensus among feminists that '"outsiderness" and "insiderness" are not fixed or static positions; rather they are ever-shifting and permeable social locations that are differentially experienced or expressed by community members' (Naples 2003, 373; see also Naples 1996). Ongoing reflections on the complexities of 'otherness' have highlighted the increasing set of challenges that face researchers as they attempt to know others who are different from themselves across multiples axes of identities and experiences (see Fawcett and Hearn 2004).

Second, the question of *who we are*, while engaged concretely in the practice of research interviews, is also viewed as neither unitary nor static. Shlulamit Reinharz, for example, in a book chapter entitled 'Who Am I,'

reflects upon how she has ‘approximately 20 different selves’ (Reinharz 1997, 5) during her interviews and fieldwork. Recent feminist contributions to this debate have highlighted how the interview topics as well as the relational dynamics occurring in the research encounter influence *how* we present ourselves and *which parts of our identity we choose to emphasize*. Some researchers may adopt ‘in-between positions’ as they straddle different identities (Ghorashi 2005) while others have stressed the ‘border-making process that occurs during the social constructionist interview’ wherein ‘various pre-assumed roles are created by researchers and by their respondents’ (Gubrium and Koro-Ljungberg 2005, 690).

Interviews and an Interrogation of ‘What’ Constitutes Data

Feminist researchers have also interrogated just ‘what’ emerges out of interview data. In the 1970s and 1980s, there was a tendency for feminist researchers, particularly those influenced by feminist standpoint theory (Harding 1987; Hartsock 1983, 1985; Smith 1987), to talk and write about seemingly coherent and transparent subjects whose experiences, voices, or subjectivities could be captured by well-formulated research questions. Going back to Hilary Graham's point about ‘her answers’ not fitting ‘his questions,’ there was an implicit assumption that if the questions could just be reformulated *better*, then ‘her answers’ would indeed provide pathways into understanding women's experiences. In ensuing years, however, the influence of postmodern and post-structural critiques has meant that feminists have begun to strongly challenge this view. Researchers have named this as the recurring ‘transparent self problem’ and the ‘transparent account problem’ (Hollway and Jefferson 2000, 3; see also Frith and Kitzinger 1998, 304–307) within interviews and their analysis.

An extensive scholarship on post-structuralist conceptualizations of subjects is now well incorporated into feminist research and feminist approaches to the interview. Most notable has been post-structural theorizing about a non-unitary, constantly changing subject where there is no ‘core self’ (e.g. Weedon 1987). Even feminist scholars who have been critical of post-structuralist approaches have been influenced by such critiques. Sandra Harding, for example, has moved beyond her originally narrow conception of a feminist standpoint to argue that ‘the subjects of knowledge are … multiple, heterogeneous and contradictory or incoherent’ (Harding 1993, 65). Other scholars have remained unconvinced by the linguistic turn and have continued to hold onto some notion of coherent subjectivities, or to ‘knowing subjects’ in their interviewing, as well as knowledge-construction practices (see Code 1993; Smith 1999; Stanley 1994). Dorothy Smith, for example, has

argued persuasively that post-structuralism 'has rejected the unitary subject of modernity only to multiply it as subjects constituted in multiple and fragmented discourses' (Smith 1999, 108) while Linda Alcoff has maintained: 'Poststructuralist critiques pertain to the construction of *all* subjects or they pertain to none' (Alcoff 1988, 409). These debates on 'who' or 'what' is being accessed within interviews have continued in discussion of feminist research into the new millennium against a backdrop of larger theoretical work on post-structuralist and materialist/interpretivist conceptions of the subject (see Benhabib 1995; Butler 1995; Fraser and Nicholson 1988; Weeks 1998), debates on theorizing the concept of 'experience' (Holt 1994; Scott 1992, 1994) as well as feminist critiques of Foucault's varied conceptions of the subject (Deveaux 1994; McNay 1993; Sawicki 1991).

Interviews as Collaborative Meaning-Making: The 'How' of Interviews

Feminists, particularly those influenced by ethnomethodology, have highlighted the importance of the interview not only as a place to collect data, but also a site where data is co-constructed, where identities are forged through the telling of stories, and where meaning-making begins. Researchers have focused on how the research interview has particularly strong meanings for the research participant (Hiller and DiLuzio 2004; see also Brannen 1988). The research interview can be a site for the construction of one's 'moral' identity (Presser 2004) as well as a potential avenue for resistance and healing when topics are of a sensitive nature (Taylor 2002). In Presser's qualitative work with men who had committed 'serious violent crimes, including crimes again women – rape of girls and women and assault and murder of female partners' (2005, 2067), she examines how the interview itself acted as a context for the creation of men's narratives and their identities. Reflecting on her role as a researcher in these settings, she highlights how the men she interviewed presented themselves as 'good and manly' and 'decent' while simultaneously constructing her, the researcher, both as somebody 'needing strength and guidance concerning relations with men' as well as 'an object of fantasies of domination' (2005, 2086). Presser, thus, argues that feminist researchers need to pay closer attention to how power relations within the interview setting can become part of one's data and she calls for a 'close and deep (multilevel) examination of the "how" of talk and not just the "what"' (2005, 2087).

These issues have also received considerable attention in the expanding literature on focus groups. Focus group, or groups interviews, have come to be viewed as important ways of breaking down hierarchies between the interviewer and the interviewees, of providing insights into group-based discussion, and for allow-

ing an interactive forum for negotiation around concepts and issues (see Doucet 2006; Frith and Kitzinger 1998; Kitzinger 1994; Munday 2006; Warr 2005; Wilkinson 1999). Kitzinger (1994, 119), for example, maintains that the interactive nature of group interviews 'enables the researcher to … explore how accounts are constructed, expressed, censured, opposed and changed though social interaction.' Hyams (2004), who utilized a 'feminist group discussion method' in her research on adolescent Latina gender identities noted that '(g)roup discussions are seen as potentially empowering in exploring and enabling group members' social agency and knowledge production while at the same time diminishing the unequal power relations between the researched and researcher.' A further example of the links between feminist research ideals and group interviews is in Pini's work (2002) on the Australian sugar industry where she argues that the effectiveness of focus groups for reaching feminist research goals can be demonstrated in at least four ways. These include: making visible to women that which was previously invisible; enabling connections between individual and collective experiences; challenging dominant beliefs; and allowing a space for ample discussion about gender issues (see also Wahab 2003). Others have argued for the complementarities of individual and group-based interviews (Pollack 2003; Wahab 2003). Given that a fundamental aim of feminist research has always been that of social change for women, focus groups have served the function of eliciting a rich dataset which can simultaneously complement individual interviews while also potentially facilitating 'consciousness raising' (see Wilkinson 1999).

Research Methods as Theoretical Issues

While early feminist discussions of issues of identity, reciprocity, and power focused on the initial research stages, more recent feminist discussions have highlighted how these issues pervade the entire research endeavor, and particularly the post-interview processes of data analysis, writing up and dissemination. As Harrison writes: 'Every stage of the research process relies on our negotiating complex social situations' (Harrison et al. 2001, 323). For example, feminists have drawn attention to the ways in which race, class, and gender intersect during data analysis (Archer 2002); the influence of biographical and theoretical issues on the analysis and interpretation of interview transcripts (Mauthner and Doucet 1998, 2003); and the diverse ways in which interview stories can be presented and re-told (McCormack 2004; M. Wolf 1992).

These reflections serve to underline the ways in which power relations continue to shape the research process long after interviews have been completed. Feminists have noted that researchers and respondents

have a 'different and unequal relation to knowledge' (Glucksmann 1994, 150) and that within most research projects, 'the final shift of power between the researcher and the respondent is balanced in favor of the researcher, for it is she who eventually walks away' (Cotterill 1992, 604; see also Reinharz 1992; Stacey 1991; Wolf 1992). We have argued that when interview accounts or narratives become 'transformed' into theory, the later stages of analysis, interpretation, and writing up are critical to feminist concerns with power, exploitation, knowing and representation (Doucet and Mauthner 2002; Mauthner and Doucet 1998, 2003; see also Glucksmann 1994). Researchers have also reflected on the dilemmas and power issues involved when contradictions arise between interviewer interpretations and interviewee understandings of their own stories (see Andrews 2002; Borland 1991; Ribbens 1994).

The move away from an overwhelming focus on the interview setting, to what happens after the interview is completed, transcribed, analyzed, and written up has meant that the issue of power in interviewing has shifted from the question of *whether* there are power inequalities between researchers and respondents, to consider *how*, *when, and where* power influences knowledge production and construction processes. These reflections on negotiating research relationships in the post-interview phase of research are part of a larger set of methodological and epistemological conversations on the intricate connections between 'doing and knowing' (Lather 2001; Letherby 2003, 2004) and on the critical ways in which methods, methodologies, and epistemologies are linked through all stages of the research process (e.g. Code 1995; Holland and Ramazanoglu 1994; Maynard 1994; Naples 2003; Ramazanoglu and Holland 2002). These feminist debates have highlighted how research methods are imbued with methodological, epistemological, and ontological assumptions that impact on the later interpretive stages of the research in terms of how and what knowledge gets constructed from them. As Jennifer Mason (2002, 225) writes, 'Asking, listening and interpretation are *theoretical projects* in the sense that how we ask questions, what we assume is possible from asking questions and from listening to answers, and what kind of knowledge we hear answers to be, are all ways in which we express, pursue and satisfy our theoretical orientations in our research.'

Conclusions

In 1990, feminist theorists and researchers Liz Stanley and Sue Wise (1990, 37) noted that 'feminist theorists have moved away from the "reactive" stance of the feminist critiques of social science and into the realms

of exploring what "feminist knowledge" could look like.' Part of this task of generating feminist knowledge, and social science knowledge more generally, relates to the widely acknowledged contributions that feminist researchers have made to the theory and practice of qualitative research (see, for example, DeVault 1999; Hesse-Biber and Yaiser 2004; Olesen 1998, 2005; Stanley and Wise 1983, 1990, 1993). The issue of interviewing as a way of coming to know others and to construct knowledge about them has been a recurrent theme of debate for all qualitative researchers. As discussed in this chapter, it has also been a subject that has had particular salience for feminist scholars. Beginning with Ann Oakley's classic piece over two decades ago which argued that 'the goal of finding out about people through interviewing is best achieved when the relationship of interviewer and interviewee is non-hierarchical' (1981, 41), this chapter has traced some of the key feminist contributions to the theory and practice of interviewing over the past quarter century. While discussion initially focused on the potential and pitfalls of attempting to create rapport and friendliness within interviews, more recent challenges from cultural studies, post-structural sensibilities, and postcolonial writing have unsettled the idea that 'others' can be known through interviews or indeed through any method.

This chapter has also highlighted the most recent contributions of feminist scholarship to contemporary understandings of the research interview. These contributions include: attempts to render more complex earlier debates on non-hierarchical interviewing; empathy, rapport, reciprocity, and the investing of one's identity in the research relationship; interviews as sites for collaborative meaning-making (the 'how' of interviews); the interrogation of 'what' constitutes data; and the theoretical assumptions and underpinnings of interviews, and research methods more generally. Feminist scholars, due to their overarching focus on issues of power and a quest to dismantle systemic inequalities within social relationships more widely, have made – and will continue to make – important and rich contributions to the practice of interviewing as well as to the field of qualitative methods and methodologies more generally.

References

Alcoff, Linda Martin. 1988. 'Cultural Feminism Versus Post-Structuralism: The Identity Crisis in Feminist Theory.'*Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*13: 405–436.

Alexander, Jackie and Chandra TalpedeMohanty. 1997. *Feminist Genealogies, Colonial Legacies, Democratic Futures*. New York: Routledge.

Andrews, Molly. 2002. ‘Feminist Research with Non-Feminist and Anti-Feminist Women: Meeting the Challenge.’*Feminism and Psychology*12: 55–77.

Anzaldua, Gloria. 1987. *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. San Francisco: Spinsters/Aunt Lute.

Archer, Louise. 2002. ‘“It's Easier That You're a Girl and That You're Asian”: Interactions of “ Race” and Gender Between Researchers and Participants.’*Feminist Review*72: 108–132.

Benhabib, Seyla. 1995. ‘Feminism and Postmodernism.’ In *Feminist Contentions: A Philosophical Exchange*, edited by S.Benhabib, J.Butler, D.Cornell, and N.Fraser. New York and London: Routledge.

Bernal, Dolores Delgado. 2002. ‘Critical Race Theory, Latino Critical Theory, and Critical Raced-Gendered Epistemologies: Recognizing Students of Color as Holders and Creators of Knowledge.’*Qualitative Inquiry*8: 105–126.

Borland, Katherine. 1991. ‘“That's Not What I Said”: Interpretive Conflict in Oral Narrative Research.’ pp. 63–75 in *Women's Words: The Feminist Practice of Oral History*, edited by S. B.Gluck and D.Patai. New York: Routledge.

Braidotti, Rosi. 1994. *Nomadic Subjects: Embodiment and Sexual Difference in Contemporary Feminist Theory*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Brannen, Julia. 1988. ‘Research Note: The Study of Sensitive Subjects.’*The Sociological Review*36: 552–563.

Brannen, Julia. 1992. ‘Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches: An Overview.’ pp. 3–37 in *Mixing Methods: Qualitative and Quantitate Approaches*, edited by J.Brannen. Avebury: Aldershot.

Bryan, Beverly, StellaDadzie, and SuzanneScafe. 1985. *The Heart of the Race: Black Women's Lives in Britain*. London: Virago.

Bunch, Charlotte. 1987. *Passionate Politics: Feminist Theory in Action*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Butler, Judith. 1995. ‘Contingent Foundations.’ In *Feminist Contentions: A Philosophical Exchange*, edited by S.Benhabib, J.Butler, D.Cornell, and N.Fraser. New York and London: Routledge.

Campbell, Elaine. 2003. ‘Interviewing Men in Uniform: a Feminist Approach?’*International Journal of Social Research Methodology*6: 285–305.

Casey, Emma. 2003. ‘“How do You Get a Ph.D. in That?” Using Feminist Epistemologies to Research the

Lives of Working Class Women.'*International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*23: 107–123.

Chafetz, Janet Saltzman. 2004a. 'Bridging Feminist Theory and Research Methodology.'*Journal of Family Issues*25: 963–977.

Chafetz, Janet Saltzman. 2004b. 'Reply to Comments by Walker, Baber, and Allen.'*Journal of Family Issues*25: 995–997.

Christian, Barbara. 1996. 'The Race for Theory.' In *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory: a Reader*, edited by M.Padmini. New York: Arnold.

Code, Lorraine. 1981. 'Is the Sex of the Knower Epistemologically Significant?'*Metaphilosophy*12: 267–276.

Code, Lorraine. 1993. 'Taking Subjectivity into Account.' In *Feminist Epistemologies*, edited by L.Alcoff and E.Potter. New York and London: Routledge.

Code, Lorraine. 1995. 'How Do We Know? Questions of Method in Feminist Practice.' In *Changing Methods: Feminists Transforming Practice*, edited by S. D.Burt and L.Code. Peterborough: Broadview.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 1990. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. London and New York: Routledge.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 1998. *Fighting Words: Black Women and the Search for Justice*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 1999. 'Reflections on the Outsider Within.'*Journal of Career Development*26: 85–88.

Combahee River Collective. 1977. 'A Black Feminist Statement.' In *Capitalist Patriarchy and the Case for Social Feminism*, edited by Z.Eisenstein.

Cotterill, Pamela. 1992. 'Interviewing Women: Issues of Friendship, Vulnerability, and Power.'*Women's Studies International Forum*15: 593–606.

DeVault, Marjorie L.1990. 'Talking and Listening from Women's Standpoint: Feminist Strategies for Interviewing and Analysis.'*Social Problems*37: 96–116.

DeVault, Marjorie L.1996. 'Talking Back to Sociology: Distinctive Contributions of Feminist Methodology.'*Annual Review of Sociology*22: 29–50.

DeVault, Marjorie. 1999. *Liberating Method: Feminism and Social Research*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple Uni-

versity Press.

Deveaux, Monique. 1994. ‘Feminism and Empowerment: A Critical Reading of Foucault.’*Feminist Studies*20: 223–247.

Doucet, Andrea. 2004. ‘Fathers and the Responsibility for Children: A Puzzle and a Tension.’*Atlantis: A Women's Studies Journal*28: 103–114.

Doucet, Andrea. 2006. *Do Men Mother? Fathering, Care and Domestic Responsibility*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Doucet, Andrea and Natasha S.Mauthner. 2002. ‘Knowing Responsibly: Linking Ethics, Research Practice and Epistemology.’ In *Ethics in Qualitative Research*, edited by M.Mauthner, M.Birch, J.Jessop, and T.Miller. London: Sage.

Doucet, Andrea and Natasha S.Mauthner. 2006. ‘Feminist Methodologies and Epistemologies.’ In *Handbook of 21st Century Sociology*, edited by Clifton D.Bryant and Dennis L.Peck. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dyck, Isabel. 1997. ‘Dialogue with Difference: A Tale of Two Studies.’ pp. 183–202 in *Thresholds in Feminist Geography: Difference, Methodology, Representation*, edited by J. P. I.Jones, H.Nast, and S. M.Roberts. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Edwards, Rosalind. 1990. ‘Connecting Method and Epistemology: A White Woman Interviewing Black Women.’*Women's Studies International Forum*13: 477–490.

Edwards, Rosalind. 1993. ‘An Education in Interviewing: Placing the Researcher and the Researched.’ In *Researching Sensitive Topics*, vol. 181-196, edited by C. M.Renzetti and R. M.Lee. Newbury Park: Sage.

Fawcett, Barbara and JeddHearn. 2004. ‘Researching Others: Epistemology, Experience, Standpoints and Participation.’*International Journal of Social Research Methodology*7: 201–218.

Ferguson, Ann. 2004. ‘Symposium: Comments on Ofelia Schutte's Work on Feminist Philosophy.’*Hypatia*19: 169–181.

Few, April L., Dionne P.Stephens, and MarloRouse-Arnett. 2003. ‘Sister-to-Sister Talk: Transcending Boundaries and Challenges in Qualitative Research with Black Women.’*Family Relations*52: 205–215.

Finch, Janet. 1984. ‘“It's Great to Have Someone to Talk to”: The Ethics and Politics of Interviewing Women.’ In *Social Researching: Politics, Problems, Practice*, edited by C.Bell and H.Roberts. London: Routledge and

Kegan Paul.

Finch, Janet and DulcieGroves. 1983. *A Labour of Love: Women, Work and Caring*. London: Routledge.

Fine, Michelle and LoisWiess. 1996. '"Writing the Wrongs' of Fieldwork: Confronting our Own Research/Writing Dilemmas."*Qualitative Inquiry*2: 251–274.

Fonow, Mary M. and Judith A.Cook. 1991. *Beyond Methodology: Feminist Scholarship as Lived Research*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Fonow, Mary M. and Judith A.Cook. 2005. 'Feminist Methodology: New Applications in the Academy and Public Policy.'*Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*30: 2211–2236.

Fraser, Nancy and LindaNicholson. 1988. 'Social Criticism without Philosophy: An Encounter between Feminism and Postmodernism.'*Theory, Culture and Society*5: 373–394.

Frith, Hannah and CeliaKitzinger. 1998. '"Emotion Work" as a Participant Resource: A Feminist Analysis of Young Women's Talk-in-interaction.'*Sociology*32: 299–320.

Garg, Anupama. 2004. 'Interview Reflections: A First Generation Migrant Indian Woman Researcher Interviewing a First Generation Migrant Indian Man.'*Journal of Gender Studies*14: 147–152.

Gelsthorpe, Lorraine. 1990. 'Feminist Methodology in Criminology: A New Approach or Old Wine in New Bottles.' In *Feminist Perspectives in Criminology*, edited by L.Gelsthorpe and A.Morris. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Ghorashi, Halleh. 2005. 'When the Boundaries are Blurred: The Significance of Feminist Methods in Research.'*European Journal of Women's Studies*12: 363–375.

Gilligan, Carol. 1977. 'In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development.'*Harvard Educational Review*47: 481–517.

Gilligan, Carol. 1982. *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Glucksmann, Miriam. 1994. 'The Work of Knowledge and the Knowledge of Women's Work.' In *Researching Women's Lives from a Feminist Perspective*, edited by M.Maynard and J.Purvis. London: Taylor and Francis.

Graham, Hilary. 1983. 'Do Her Answers Fit His Questions? Women and the Survey Method.' In *The Public*

and the Private, edited by E.Gamarnikow. London: Tavistock.

Graham, Hilary. 1991. 'The Concept of Caring in Feminist Research: The Case of Domestic Service.'*Sociology*25: 61–78.

Gubrium, Erika and MirkaKoro-Ljungberg. 2005. 'Contending with Border Making in the Social Constructionist Interview.'*Qualitative Inquiry*11: 689–715.

Haraway, Donna. 1988. 'Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective.'*Feminist Studies*14: 575–599.

Haraway, Donna. 1991. *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. New York: Routledge.

Harding, Sandra. 1987. 'Conclusion: Epistemological Questions.' pp. 181–190 in *Feminsm and Methodology*, edited by S.Harding. Bloomington, Indiana and Milton Keynes, UK: Indiana University Press and Open University Press.

Harding, Sandra. 1993. 'Rethinking Standpoint Epistemologies: What is Strong Objectivity.' In *Feminist Epistemologies*, edited by L.Alcoff and E.Potter. London: Routledge.

Harrison, Jane, LesleyMacGibbon, and MissyMorton. 2001. 'Regimes of Trustworthiness in Qualitative Research: The Rigors of Reciprocity.'*Qualitative Inquiry*7: 323–345.

Hartsock, Nancy. 1983. 'The Feminist Standpoint: Developing the Ground for a Specifically Feminist Historical Materialism.' In *Discovering Reality: Feminist Perspectives on Epistemology, Metaphysics, Methodology and Philosophy of Science*, edited by S.Harding and M.Hintakka. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing.

Hartsock, Nancy. 1985. *Money, Sex and Power: Toward a Feminist Historical Materialism*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Hesse-Biber, Sharlene Nagy, and Michelle L.Yaiser. 2004. *Feminist Perspectives on Social Research*. New York and London: Oxford University Press.

Hiller, Harry H. and LindaDiLuzio. 2004. 'The Interviewee and the Research Interview: Analysing a Neglected Dimension in Research.'*The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*41: 1–26.

HollandJanet and CarolineRamazanoglu. 1994. 'Coming to Conclusions: Power and Interpretation in Researching Young Women's Sexuality.' pp. 125–148 in *Researching Women's Lives from a Feminist Perspective*, edited by M.Maynard and J.Purvis. London: Taylor and Francis.

HollwayWendy and ToniJefferson. 2000. *Doing Qualitative Research Differently: Free Association, Narrative and the Interview Method*. London: Sage.

Holt, Thomas A.1994. ‘Experience and the Politics of Intellectual Inquiry.’ In *Questions of Evidence: Proof, Practice and Persuasion across the Disciplines*, edited by J.Chandler, A. I.Davidson, and H.Harootunian. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hooks, Bell. 1989. *Talking Back: Thinking Feminist, Thinking Black*. Boston: South End Press.

Hooks, Bell. 1990. *Yearning: Race, Gender and Cultural Politics*. Boston: South End Press.

Hyams, Melissa. 2004. ‘Hearing Girls' Silences: Thoughts on the Politics and Practices of a Feminist Method of Group Discussion.’*Gender, Place and Culture*11: 105–119.

Jayaratne, T. E.1983. ‘The Value of Quantitative Methodology for Feminist Research.’ In *Theories of Women's Studies*, edited by G.Bowles and R.Duelli-Klein. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Keller, Evelyn Fox. 1983. *A Feeling for the Organism: The Life and Work of Barbara McClintock*. New York: W.H. Freeman.

Keller, Evelyn Fox. 1985. *Reflections of Gender and Science*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Keller, Evelyn Fox and Helen E.Longino. 1998. *‘Feminism and Science.’*Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Kelly, Liz, SheilaBurton, and LindaRegan. 1994. ‘Researching Women's Lives or Studying Women's Oppression? Reflections on what Constitutes Feminist Research.’ pp. 27–48 in *Researching Women's Lives from a Feminist Perspective*, edited by M.Maynard and J.Purvis. London: Taylor and Francis.

Kirsch, Gesa E.2005. ‘Friendship, Friendliness, and Feminist Fieldwork.’*Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*30: 2163–2172.

Kitzinger, Jenny. 1994. 'The Methodology of Focus Groups: The Importance of Interaction between Research Participants. *Sociology of Health & Illness*16(1): 103–121.

Ladson-Billings, G.2000. ‘Racialized Discourses and Ethnic Epistemologies.’ pp. 257–277 in *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 2nd edition, edited by N. K.Denzin and Y. S.Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lather, Patti. 2001. ‘Postbook: Working the Ruins of Feminist Ethnography.’*Signs*27: 199–227.

Lather, Patti and ChrisSmithies. 1997. *Troubling the Angels: Women Living with HIV/AIDS*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Letherby, Gayle. 2003. *Feminist Research in Theory and Practice*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Letherby, Gayle. 2004. 'Quoting and Counting: An Autobiographical Response to Oakley.'*Sociology*38: 157–189.

Lewis, Gail. 2000. *'Race,' Gender and Social Welfare*. London: Polity Press.

Lloyd, Genevieve. 1983. *Man of Reason*. London: Routledge.

Longino, Helen E. and RuthDoell. 1983. 'Body, Bias, and Behaviour: A Comparative Analysis of Reasoning in Two Areas of Biological Science.'*Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*9: 206–227.

Lorde, Audre. 1984. *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*. Berkeley, California: The Crossing Press.

Mama, Amina. 1995. *Beyond the Mask: Race, Gender and Subjectivity*. London: Routledge.

Mandell, Deena. 2002. *Deadbeat Dads: Subjectivity and Social Construction*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Mason, Jennifer. 2002. 'Qualitative Interviewing: Asking, Listening and Interpreting.' pp. 225–241 in *Qualitative Research in Action*, edited by T.May. London: Sage Publications.

Mauthner, Natasha S. and AndreaDoucet. 1998. 'Reflections on a Voice Centred Relational Method of Data Analysis: Analysing Maternal and Domestic Voices.' In *Feminist Dilemmas in Qualitative Research: Private Lives and Public Texts*, edited by J.Ribbens and R.Edwards. London: Sage Publications.

Mauthner, Natasha S. and AndreaDoucet. 2003. 'Reflexive Accounts and Accounts of Reflexivity in Qualitative Data Analysis.'*Sociology*37: 413–431.

Maynard, Mary. 1994. 'Methods, Practice and Epistemology: the Debate about Feminism and Research.' pp. 10–26 in *Researching Women's Lives from a Feminist Perspective*, edited by M.Maynard and J.Purvis. London: Taylor and Francis.

Maynard, Mary and JunePurvis. 1994. *Researching Women's Lives from a Feminist Perspective*. London: Taylor and Francis.

McCall, Leslie. 2005. 'The Complexity of Intersectionality.'*Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*30:

1771–1799.

McCormack, Coralie. 2004. ‘Storying Stories: A Narrative Approach to In-Depth Interview Conversations.’*International Journal of Social Research Methodology*7(3): 219–236.

McDermott, Elizabeth. 2004. ‘Telling Lesbian Stories: Interviewing and the Class Dynamics of ‘Talk’.’*Women's Studies International Forum*27: 177–187.

McNay, Lois. 1993. *Foucault and Feminism: Power, Gender and the Self*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.

Mies, M.1983. ‘Towards a Methodology for Feminist Research.’ In *Theories of Women's Studies*, edited by G.Bowles and R.Duelli Klein. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Miller, Jean Baker. 1976. *Towards a New Psychology of Women*. London: Penguin Books.

Mirza, Heidi Safia. 1998. *Black British Feminism: A Reader*. London: Routledge.

Mohanty, Chandra Talpede. 1988. ‘Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses.’*Feminist Review*30: 61–88.

Mohanty, Chandra Talpede. 1991. ‘Under Western Eyes: Feminism and Colonial Discourse.’ In *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*, edited by C. T.Mohanty, A.Russo, and L.Torres. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Mohanty, Chandra Talpede, AnnRusso, and LourdesTorres. 1991. *‘Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism.’*Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Mol, Annemarie. 2002. *The Body Multiple: Ontology in Medical Practice*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Munday, Jennie. 2006. ‘Identity in Focus: The Use of Focus Groups to Study the Construction of Collective Identity.’*Sociology*40: 89–105.

Naples, Nancy A.1996. ‘A Feminist Revisiting of the ‘Insider/Outsider’ Debate: The ‘Outsider Phenomenon’ in Rural Iowa.’*Qualitative Sociology*19: 83–106.

Naples, Nancy A.2003. *Feminism and Method: Ethnography, Discourse Analysis, and Activist Research*. New York and London: Routledge.

Narayan, Kiran. 1993. ‘How Native is a ‘Native’ Anthropologist?’*American Anthropologist*95: 671–686.

Oakley, Ann. 1974. *Housewife*. London: Allen Lane.

Oakley, Ann. 1981. 'Interviewing Women: A Contradiction in Terms.' pp. 30–61 in *Doing Feminist Research*, edited by H.Roberts. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Oakley, Ann. 1998. 'Gender, Methodology and People's Ways of Knowing: Some Problems with Feminism and the Paradigm Debate in Social Science.'*Sociology*32: 707–731.

Olesen, Virgina. 1998. 'Feminism and Models of Qualitative Research.' In *The Landscape of Qualitative Research: Theories and Issues*, edited by N. K.Denzin and Y. S.Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Olesen, Virgina. 2005. 'Early Millennial Feminist Qualitative Research.' pp. 235–278 in *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by N. K.Denzin and Y. S.Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Oyewumi, Oyeronke. 2000. 'Family Bonds/Conceptual Binds: African Notes on Feminist Epistemologies.'*Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*25: 1093–1098.

Patai, Daphne. 1991. 'U.S. Academics and Third World Women: Is Ethical Research Possible?' pp. 137–153 in *Women's Words: The Feminist Practice of Oral History*, edited by S. B.Gluck and D.Patai. New York: Routledge.

Pini, Barbara. 2002. 'Focus Groups, Feminist Research and Farm Women: Opportunities for Empowerment in Rural Social Research.'*Journal of Rural Studies*18: 339–351.

Pollack, Shoshana. 2003. 'Focus-Group Methodology in Research with Incarcerated Women: Race, Power, and collective experience.'*Affilia*18: 461–472.

Presser, Lois. 2004. 'Violent Offenders, Moral Selves: Constructing Identities and Accounts in the Research Interview.'*Social Problems*51: 82–101.

Presser, Lois. 2005. 'Negotiating Power and Narrative in Research: Implications for Feminist Methodology.'*Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*30: 2067–2090.

Pryke, Sam. 2004. '"Some of Our People Can Be the Most Difficult." Reflections on Difficult Interviews.'*Sociological Research Online*9.

Ramazanoglu, Caroline. 1989. 'Improving on Sociology: The Problems of Taking a Feminist Standpoint.'*Sociology*23: 427–442.

Ramazanoglu, Caroline and JanetHolland. 2002. *Feminist Methodology: Challenges and Choices*. London: Sage Publications.

Reinharz, Shulamit. 1979. *On Becoming a Social Scientist*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Reinharz, Shulamit. 1992. *Feminist Methods in Social Research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Reinharz, Shulamit. 1997. 'Who Am I? The Need for a Variety of Selves in the Field.' pp. 3–20 in *Refelxivity and Voice*, edited by R.Hertz. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Reynolds, Tracey. 2002a. 'Re-thinking a Black Feminist Standpoint.'*Ethnic and Racial Studies*25: 591–606.

Reynolds, Tracy. 2002b. 'On Relations Between Black Female Researchers and Participants.' pp. 300–310 in *Qualitative Research in Action*, edited by T.May. London: Sage Publications.

Ribbens, Jane. 1989. 'Interviewing – an Unnatural Situation?'*Women's Studies International Forum*12: 579–592.

Ribbens, Jane. 1994. *Mothers and their Children*. London: Sage.

Ribbens, Jane. 1998. 'Hearing my Feeling Voice? An Autobiographical Discussion of Motherhood.' pp. 24–38 in *Feminist Dilemmas in Qualitative Research: Private Lives and Public Texts*, edited by J.Ribbens and E.Rosalind. London: Sage.

Ribbens, Jane and RosalindEdwards. 1998. *Feminist Dilemmas in Qualitative Research: Private Lives and Public Texts*. London: Sage.

Richardson, Laurel. 1988. 'The Collective Story: Postmodernism and the Writing of Sociology.'*Sociological Focus*21: 199–208.

Richardson, Laurel. 1997. *Fields of Play: Constructing an Academic Life*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Riessman, Catherine. 1987. 'When Gender is not Enough: Women Interviewing Women.'*Gender and Society*1: 172–207.

Rose, Hilary. 1994. *Love, Power and Knowledge: Towards a Feminist Transformation of the Sciences*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Sawicki, Jana. 1991. *Disciplining Foucault: Feminism, Power and the Body*. New York: Routledge.

Schutte, Ofelia. 1993. *Cultural Identity and Social Liberation in Latin American Thought*. Albany: Suny Press.

Schutte, Ofelia. 1998. 'Cultural Alterity: Cross-Cultural Communication and Feminist Thought in North-South Dialogue.'*Hypatia*13: 53–72.

Schutte, Ofelia. 2000. 'Negotiating Latina Identities.' In *Hispanics/Latinos in the United States: Ethnicity, Race and Rights*, edited by J. E.Gracia and P.De Grief. London: Routledge.

Scott, Joan W.1992. 'Experience.' pp. 22–40 in *Feminists Theorize the Political*, edited by J.Butler and J. W.Scott. London: Routledge.

Scott, Joan W.1994. 'A Rejoinder to Thomas C. Holt.' In *Questions of Evidence: Proof, Practice and Persuasion across the Disciplines*, edited by J.Chandler, A. I.Davidson, and H.Harootunian. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Shohat, Ella. 2001. 'Area Studies, Transnationalism and the Feminist Production of Knowledge.'*Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*26: 1269–1272.

Skeggs, Beverley. 1997. *Formations of Class and Gender*. London: Sage.

Smith, Dorothy. 1974. 'Women's Perspective as a Radical Critique of Sociology.'*Sociological Inquiry*4: 1–13.

Smith, Dorothy. 1987. *The Everyday World as Problematic: A Feminist Sociology*. Milton Keynes, UK: Open University Press.

Smith, Dorothy. 1989. 'Sociological Theory: Methods of Writing Patriarchy.' In *Feminism and Sociological Theory*, edited by R. A.Wallace. London: Sage.

Smith, Dorothy. 1999. *Writing the Social: Critique, Theory and Investigations*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Song, Miriam and IanParker. 1995. 'Commonality, Difference, and the Dynamics of Disclosure in In-depth Interviewing.'*Sociology*29: 241–256.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1993. *Outside in the Teaching Machine*. New York: Routledge.

Stacey, Judith. 1991. 'Can There be a Feminist Ethnography?' pp. 111–120 in *Women's Words: The Feminist Practice of Oral History*, edited by S. B.Gluck and D.Patai. New York: Routledge.

Stanley, Liz. 1994. 'The Knowing Because Experiencing Subject: Narratives, Lives, and Autobiography.' pp.

132–149 in *Knowing the Difference: Feminist Perspectives in Epistemology*, edited by K.Lennon and M.Whitford. London: Routledge.

Stanley, Liz and SueWise. 1983. *Breaking Out*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Stanley, Liz and SueWise. 1990. *Feminist Praxis: Research, Theory and Epistemology in Qualitative Research*. London: Routledge.

Stanley, Liz and SueWise. 1993. *Breaking Out Again*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Stone, Sandy. 1991. 'The Empire Strikes Back: A Post-Transsexual Manifesto.' In *Body Guards*, edited by J.Epstein and K.Straub. New York: Routledge.

Tang, Ning. 2002. 'Interviewer and Interviewee Relationships Between Women.'*Sociology*36: 703–721.

Taylor, Janette Y.2002. 'Talking Back: Research as an Act of Resistance and Healing for African American Women Survivors of Intimate Male Partner Violence.'*Women and Therapy*25: 145–160.

Taylor, Verta and Leila J.Rupp. 2005. 'When the Girls are Men: Negotiating Gender and Sexual Dynamics in a Study of Drag Queens.'*Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*30: 2115–2140.

Temple, Bogusia and RosalindEdwards. 2002. 'Interpreters/Translators and Cross-Language Research: Reflexivity and Border Crossings.'*International Journal of Qualitative Methods*1(2), Article 1.http://www.ualberta.ca/~ijqm/ Date of access: December 12, 2006.

Thapar-Bjorkert, Suruchi and MarshaHenry. 2004. 'Reassessing the Research Relationship: Location, Position and Power in Fieldwork Accounts.'*International Journal of Social Research Methodology*7: 363–381.

Wahab, Stephanie. 2003. 'Creating Knowledge Collaboratively with Female Sex Workers: Insights from a Qualitative, Feminist, and Participatory Study.'*Qualitative Inquiry*9: 625–642.

Warr, Deborah J.2005. '"It Was Fun … But We Don't Usually Talk About These Things": Analyzing Sociable Interaction in Focus Groups.'*Qualitative Inquiry*11: 200–225.

Weedon, Chris. 1987. *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Weeks, Kathi. 1998. *Constituting Feminist Subjects*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Westmarland, Nicole. 2001. 'The Quantitative/Qualitative Debate and Feminist Research: A Subjective View of Objectivity.'*Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research*2.

Wilkinson, Sue. 1999. 'Focus Groups in Feminist Research: Power, Interaction and the Co-Construction of Meaning.'*Psychology of Women Quarterly*23: 221–244.

Wilkinson, Sue and CeliaKitzinger. 1996. *Representing the Other: A Feminism and Psychology Reader*. London: Sage.

Wolf, Marjery. 1992. *A Thrice Told Tale: Feminism, Postmodernism and Ethnographic Responsibility*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Zavella, Patricia. 1993. 'Feminist Insider Dilemmas: Constructing Ethnic Identity with 'Chicana' Informants.' pp. 42–62 in *Situated Lives: Gender and Culture in Everyday Life*, edited by L.Lamphere, H.Ragone, and P.Zavella. London: Routledge.

- feminist research
- interviews
- feminism
- qualitative interview
- knowledge
- identity
- research methods
- social change
- rapport
- critique

https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446212165