



# Concealing researcher identity in fieldwork & social media: Sexuality and speaking for participants

DOI:

[10.1111/area.12736](https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12736)

## Document Version

Final published version

[Link to publication record in Manchester Research Explorer](#)

## Citation for published version (APA):

Sou, G. (2021). Concealing researcher identity in fieldwork & social media: Sexuality and speaking for participants. *Area*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12736>

## Published in:

Area

## Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on Manchester Research Explorer is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Proof version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version.

## General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Explorer are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

## Takedown policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please refer to the University of Manchester's Takedown Procedures [<http://man.ac.uk/04Y6Bo>] or contact [uml.scholarlycommunications@manchester.ac.uk](mailto:uml.scholarlycommunications@manchester.ac.uk) providing relevant details, so we can investigate your claim.



# Concealing researcher identity in fieldwork and social media: Sexuality and speaking for participants

Gemma Sou<sup>1,2</sup> 

<sup>1</sup>School of Global, Urban & Social Studies, RMIT University, Melbourne, Vic., Australia

<sup>2</sup>Humanitarian and Conflict Response Institute, The University of Manchester, Manchester, UK

## Correspondence

Gemma Sou, School of Global, Urban & Social Studies, RMIT University, Melbourne, Vic., Australia  
 Email: [gemma.sou@rmit.edu.au](mailto:gemma.sou@rmit.edu.au)

## Funding information

Research Councils UK, Economic and Social Research Council.

Researchers often conceal or reveal parts of their identity to ensure the success of fieldwork. Yet, connection between researchers and research participants can now be maintained via social networking sites. This raises new questions about the ethics and practicalities of negotiating identity during and after fieldwork. The paper draws on a narrative ethnography of concealing my lesbian identity during and after ethnographic research in Bolivia. I demonstrate that in a socially mediated world the “curation” of researcher identity is no longer temporally and geographically bound to the periods and locales of fieldwork. Second, I argue that a researcher’s decision to conceal elements of their identity may be informed by essentialist assumptions about research participants. Third, researchers may effectively colonise and silence research participants because they speak for them and remove any opportunity for participants to respond to the element of the researcher’s identity being hidden, such as sexuality, class, or religion.

## KEYWORDS

Bolivia, ethnography, fieldwork, identity, sexuality, social media

## 1 | INTRODUCTION

It has been more than 25 years since England (1994) questioned fieldwork in geography, advocating for greater reflexivity. This paper speaks to this by critically discussing how ethnographers self-consciously conceal or reveal parts of their identity during fieldwork (Godbole, 2014; Lewin et al., 1996). The paper then goes further to discuss the ethical and practical implications of this decision, for researcher–participant relationships that are maintained via social networking sites, once fieldwork has ended. This is a particularly salient question because connection between researchers and research participants can now be easily maintained via social networking sites, such as Facebook, Twitter, or Instagram (Hall, 2009).

This journal has included several key debates on this topic (Cupples, 2002; Diprose et al., 2013; Hall, 2009; Maguire et al., 2019; Sharma, 2019; Widdowfield, 2000) and I contribute to this discussion by extending scholarship on the way researchers manoeuvre their identity within and beyond fieldwork by bringing social media into the conversation. Ethnographers have long grappled with self-reflexivity in how identity is presented “in the field” (England, 1994). Yet, with a handful of exceptions (Hall, 2009; Maguire et al., 2019), there is limited scholarship that reflects on how we present ourselves to research participants on social media, once we exit case sites. By drawing on my ethnographic narrative as a lesbian researcher, this paper also contributes to literature on negotiating LGBTQ+ identities during fieldwork (e.g., Browne & Nash, 2016; Lewin et al., 1996), but which, as of yet, has not tackled the implications of queer researchers staying connected with research participants on social media.

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

The information, practices and views in this article are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the Royal Geographical Society (with IBG).

© 2021 The Authors. *Area* published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd on behalf of Royal Geographical Society (with the Institute of British Geographers)

Whyte (1993) argues that one's private life and identities can be kept separate when fieldwork is carried out during a certain time and in a physically bounded place. However, this paper demonstrates how maintaining relationships with research participants via social networking sites suggests that the "curation" or concealment of researcher identity is no longer temporally and geographically bound to the locales and periods of fieldwork. I also suggest that identity curation is not simply to ensure good relationships and successful fieldwork (Ballamingie & Johnson, 2011), but may also be symptomatic of the subjective biases that researchers bring to fieldwork. More specifically, researchers may inadvertently essentialise research participants when they actively "protect" them from knowing about elements of their identity. I argue this strips people in field sites of their agency because the researcher speaks for people in field sites, reifying and reproducing the asymmetrical relationship which ethnographers seek to avoid. As such, this paper supports feminist and postcolonial critiques that researchers do not enter field sites with objective, impartial, and value-free knowledge (England, 1994; Madge, 1993; Rose, 1997).

Methodologically, I draw on my "ethnographic memoir and narrative ethnography" (Tedlock, 1991, p. 81) as a lesbian conducting ethnographic research in an evangelical Christian community in Bolivia (see Sou, 2015, 2018). Fieldwork took place over an initial nine-month period in 2012, as recorded in fieldnotes and a personal diary, plus two visits in 2015 and 2017, as well as reflections on my continued relationship with research participants via Facebook. I do not want this paper to be an example of academic navel-gazing about my personally difficult time. Challenging experiences are to be expected when one carries out research in societies that are very different to what one is used to/familiar with. My intention is to use my lived experiences because discussions of the way researchers construct their identities during fieldwork requires intimate understanding (Crapanzano, 2010).

The first section reviews current scholarship on the manoeuvring of identity during research, paying particular attention to work by researchers who self-identify as LGBTQ+. The second part draws on my experience conducting ethnographic research in Bolivia, discussing how and why I concealed my sexuality during fieldwork and afterwards on social media. The conclusion considers implications for wider scholarship on positionality and the negotiation of researcher identities.

## 2 | CONSTRUCTING RESEARCHER IDENTITY

Researchers must often negotiate their identity during ethnographic work, which, in turn, affects their research (see Jones & Ficklin, 2012; Smith, 2016). That is, the fieldwork self is always, to some extent, shaped by the cultural context and social relations found in/of the field (Coffey, 1999). As Bondi (2005) stresses, data collection of any kind draws the researcher into relationships, and it is these relationships that shape the context in which aspects of identity are expressed or repressed. When your data consist of interviews, those relationships involve other people, and this raises issues of positionality and manoeuvring one's identity during data collection (Chong, 2008; Widdowfield, 2000).

Every researcher has a range of personal and social identities that comprise who they are, ranging from gender, age, nationality, class, qualifications, and religion. During fieldwork, certain aspects of a researcher's identity are more significant while others are less important, influenced by a combination of factors, including the research topic, location, methodology, and relationship with respondents (Dam & Lunn, 2014). Some have divided researcher identities into two types variously labelled in the literature. For example, "prescribed" and "ascribed" (Herod, 1999) or "real" and "perceived" (Chacko, 2004). The former are aspects of identity that are visible or less easily disguised, such as skin colour, nationality, and gender, although they are interpreted differently in different contexts. The latter are aspects of identity that can be more easily disguised, but that people assume based on appearance or behaviour, such as clothing or jewellery. For example, class, religion, or education.

Thus, there are some aspects of identity that are easier to construct than others. As Valentine notes when discussing interview methods:

Identifications and disidentifications we make are complex, with many different notions of sameness and differences operating at the same time. Both researchers and interviewees directly or indirectly claim points of sameness or difference during interviews based not only on knowledge which is exchanged during these conversations but also on what is read off from each others' performances. In other words, as the interview develops, we are constantly reproducing "ourselves" so that both researcher and interviewee may be multiply positioned during the course of an interview. (2002, pp. 120–121, cited in Ng, 2011, pp. 437–456)

From this, various studies have discussed the ethics of strategically revealing, concealing, emphasising, or downplaying elements of identity that are within our control, for the benefit of the research, including to develop rapport with people, to

gain access to communities, and to gather data (Godbole, 2014). Many of these discussions have been made by LGBTQ+ researchers who consider the negotiation of their queer identities during fieldwork (e.g., Browne et al., 2009; Browne & Nash, 2016; Di Felicianantonio et al., 2017; Goodman, 1996; Lewin et al., 1996; Maguire et al., 2019; Rooke, 2010). However, much of this research is empirically biased to Global North contexts (Kulpa & Mizielska, 2016) and, as of yet, has not tackled the implications of queer researchers who conceal their sexuality during fieldwork, yet connect with participants on social media after fieldwork.

Some ethnographic research is covert and depends on deception (and tends to be subject to very stringent ethical procedures). For instance, Maguire et al. (2019) commented how they occupied a “closet” space when carrying out covert research with anti-LGBTQ+ groups. Yet most researchers are not acting under cover and often researchers will engage with groups whose interests, values, and beliefs do not align with their own (Chong, 2008). In such instances, matters of identity negotiation can be experienced more acutely as researchers conceal part of their identity, which can come at the emotional costs of self-repression, along with the struggle to conform to conflicting values (Jansson, 2010). For instance, Drake and Harvey (2014) discuss how, when working in the “extreme” environment of prison, researchers engage in impression management and “role strain” as they performed particular identities as prison researchers.

Uncertainty also surrounds whether deliberately manipulating your identity constitutes deceit. Ethical guidelines call for transparency in our dealings with research participants (ESRC, 2019). One aspect of this is informed consent, which includes a full explanation of the purpose of our research, being clear about people's involvement, and assurances of confidentiality. This raises questions about whether transparency also means being honest about your identity. Dam and Lunn (2014) suggest that deliberate manipulation of identity can be acceptable if you are fully aware of it and if it does not cause harm to you or your participants. Yet, concealing parts of identity reproduces and reifies an asymmetrical power dynamic, where the researcher is the informed “knower,” who only reveals their background to research participants (“the known”) if and when she/he decides to (Stacey, 1988).

Despite methodological debates about researchers manoeuvring their identities, discussions predominantly focus on the fieldwork period. That is, there is minimal discussion of how researchers negotiate their fieldwork identities once they leave “the field.” Ending fieldwork is a distinctive part of the process of ethnography. In traditional ethnographic research, ethnographers usually ended up going “home” at some point, which suggests that the end of fieldwork provides a temporal and physical boundary between the field and the self, and involves ending relationships or altering the intensity of them (Coffey, 1999). However, an abrupt end to fieldwork is not always the case, particularly where researchers revisit the same fieldsite over a lifetime of research. This is further complicated when “ethnographic friendships” are formed with research participants (Powdermaker, 1966). To complicate things further, social networking sites such as Twitter, Instagram, and Facebook can instantly connect researchers to the “researched” (Hall, 2009).

Social networking websites mean that remaining separate from, and exiting the field, may no longer be so easily achieved. It presents a new (technological) challenge for ethnographers in the face of an “old” problem of developing friendships with participants, sharing personal information, and emersion from the field (Powdermaker, 1966). Maguire et al. (2019) touch on this when discussing how their gay, lesbian, and LGBTQ+ ally identities may be googled and discovered by the anti-LGBTQ+ groups that they covertly researched. Hall (2009) discusses the ethics of connecting with her research participants via Facebook, and raises concern about privacy, suggesting that social networking sites make available information about researchers' personal lives that they may not intend to give to participants.

Yet, missing from this is an explicit discussion about how researchers negotiate their fieldwork identity, after fieldwork, when relationships are maintained via social networking sites. These platforms allow all people to create “doctored” realities and identities (Gündüz, 2017; Lee, 2018). Though, for ethnographers who decide to “deceive” participants in the field, the question goes further. They must decide whether to continue (re)constructing their particular fieldwork identities. This may require careful editing of their social media self to suit the perceptions of their research participants in particular. Should “deception” continue? How? Why? And what does this tell us about the reasons why researchers conceal parts of their identity during fieldwork in the first place? These are the questions this papers examines.

Against this background, the following sections draw on my experience of conducting fieldwork in Bolivia to discuss the ethical and practical implications of constructing a “fieldwork identity,” when maintaining connections with research participants via social networking sites.

### 3 | SOCIAL MEDIA AND IDENTITY CONSTRUCTION BEYOND THE FIELD

#### 3.1 | Constructing a heterosexual self

My research project set out to explore the risk perceptions of low-income populations, living in environmentally hazardous neighbourhoods, in Global South cities. After arriving in Cochabamba, and researching the area, I identified “*Lourdes*” as a suitable case site. Located in the lower income southern region of the city, *Lourdes* was prone to landslides and populated by low-income households of indigenous ethnicity. There were many Christian churches in the area, and conversations revealed that many people identified with different denominations of Christianity. Although religion was not something I was particularly interested in exploring for my project, it came to influence my fieldwork experience and identity construction.

As someone who had been out as a lesbian to family, friends, and teachers for many years, and living in Manchester – the “gay capital” of the UK – I had not given serious thought to concealing my sexual orientation for a long time. However, when I began fieldwork, I decided it would be better to invisibilise my lesbian identity (Goodman, 1996). I assumed the Christians that I was to live among would have conservative expectations of appropriate behaviour for a young woman and presenting myself as an out lesbian probably would undermine my chances of completing my PhD research. Yet, the assumption of heterosexuality in most everyday contexts (Valentine, 1993) is so strong that people in *Lourdes* took it for granted that I was heterosexual. However, to those who asked about life “back home,” I identified myself as unmarried, straight, and in a relationship with a man, despite being in a relationship with a woman. I was not simply concealing my sexuality, but actively constructing an alternative heterosexual self. I maintained this story throughout fieldwork. It was a feeble disguise, since I had no pictures of my boyfriend.

Maguire et al. (2019) identify this as a “closet” space that is produced when researchers suppress their sexualities. However, that I can construct a “closet” for myself also demonstrates my privilege and power as a queer researcher who can shift positionality and hide parts of my identity (Williams et al., 2009). Adopting this disguise implied that people should not, or did not need to, know such things about me as a researcher, reflecting the knowledge hierarchy between the researcher as the informed “knower” and research participants as the “known” (Stacey, 1988).

I gained access to *Lourdes* via an Evangelical Christian church because my Bolivian contact knew people within this particular church, and churches were the only community-based organisations present in *Lourdes*. From the beginning I was honest about my atheism. I helped out with cleaning, preparing food, and acting as a teaching assistant during Sunday classes and attended multi-day church trips into the countryside. Through conversations it became clear that church leaders viewed homosexuality as “a sin.” Memorably, during my first church trip to the countryside I attended a class where the teacher drew a “stick person” on a whiteboard and listed “*lujuria*” (lust), “*avaricia*” (greed), and “*pereza*” (sloth) to the side. Written above the stick person was “*homosexuales y prostitutas*” (homosexuals and prostitutes). This experience consolidated my decision to continue the façade of my boyfriend back home.

I lived with a Christian Bolivian family who were kind and generous. We ate together most evenings, and at meal times I came to know about their opinions on homosexuality. “Homosexuality is a mental disorder” and “Homosexuals are a mistake by God; a defect in the population.” These comments neither surprised nor upset me. A fundamental part of fieldwork is often living among populations that have antagonistic views to your own, and which may oppose aspects of your identity (Maguire et al., 2019). We politely disagreed with each other. During one evening Mauge, the mother, commented, “You can catch homosexuality by being in close contact.”<sup>1</sup> I had not anticipated the belief that homosexuality could be “contracted” between people – epidemiologically speaking. This made me particularly uncomfortable because Mauge and her husband had two small children and I did not want them to worry they may have “caught” homosexuality. The Research Ethics Framework (ESRC, 2019) states “Harm to research participants must be avoided,” and so I took the position that it would be unethical to potentially cause distress in this regard.

Despite the fact they articulated unpleasant homophobic views, I found myself sharing a sense of connection and warmth with people in *Lourdes* and established “ethnographic friendships,” which resonates with Valentine’s (2002) experience of simultaneously liking and disliking interviewees. As Luff (1999) points out, people are far more complex than labels such as “moral right” or “homophobic,” no interaction with research participants is entirely negative, there is always some moment of connection or rapport. I started to feel uncomfortable that I was deliberately hiding my identity. Blackwood (1999) found playing the deceptive role of the heterosexual woman to be a significant emotional strain when conducting an 18-month ethnography in Sumatra. Tired of the deceit and pretence of having a “boyfriend,” she told her Sumatran “mother” that she was a lesbian. Her “confession” was met with acceptance, but Blackwood was warned that she should not engage in homosexual practices while in Sumatra. In Bolivia, I decided to stick with the niggling feeling and

not go with the honest approach. I didn't want to potentially spoil the impression and relationships I had built. This was also pragmatic because I was under time and funding pressures to complete my PhD (see also Ballamingie & Johnson, 2011).

I returned to Bolivia two more times to share research findings. I stayed with the same family and visited with “ethnographic friends.” I set up a Facebook profile and received “friend requests” from people I had established friendships with during fieldwork. It may be viewed as unethical to accept their requests because we would be able to view private information about each other, and other people would be able to view that they were on my “friends” list. However, I accepted all requests because ignoring or rejecting an invitation may be considered unethical, and may signal that our friendship was only bound to the research, almost a pretence (Hall, 2009). Interaction is now minimal, with congratulations and good wishes exchanged during birthdays and at Christmas.

Social networking sites allow researchers to easily maintain relationships with people in field sites. Yet, your identity remains on display. My sexuality could easily be identified through photos with my partner or the LGBTQ+ events that I posted about or was “tagged” in. I was faced with the decision to “come out” or continue deceiving my “ethnographic friends” in Lourdes. After deliberation I decided to continue the façade of heterosexuality, and hid photos of me with my partner and any posts I made about LGBTQ+ events, politics, or otherwise.

Curating researcher identity is nothing novel. However, connecting with research participants on social media raises new questions for researchers once they end fieldwork. In the next section I argue that my decision to continue (re)producing my heterosexual fieldwork identity on social media exposes my researcher subjectivities, and reproduces a colonial hierarchy within the researcher–researched relations.

### 3.2 | Staying “closeted” on social media and essentialising ethnographic friends

My construction of a heterosexual self reflects how researchers can, with intentionality, engage strategically in acts that essentialise certain elements of their subjectivities (Danaher, 2001). As Spivak emphasised, the term “strategy” is something that “suits a situation” and implies “matching the trick to the situation” (Spivak cited in Olla, 2011 p. 79). That is, strategic essentialism does not involve forsaking critique of essentialism, but rather a situated calculation not to engage explicitly in such critique in a particular circumstance. To ground this idea in the current case, I essentialised my supposed (hetero)sexuality to suit my situation in an evangelical Christian context in Cochabamba.

I was of course concerned about successfully completing my PhD (Ballamingie & Johnson, 2011) and that people may think less of me or that our friendship was a “sham” because I had actively deceived them (Blackwood et al., 1999). I was also concerned that some people may worry that they or their loved ones had “contracted” homosexuality.<sup>2</sup> This latter point resonates with Dam and Lunn (2014) argument that deliberate manoeuvring of identity can be acceptable if you are fully aware of it and if it avoids harming your participants. However, through personal reflection on how I negotiated my identity on social media after fieldwork, I realise that my decision to conceal my sexuality was also informed by the preconceptions of Christian Bolivians that I brought with me to Bolivia and that were solidified by some experiences in Lourdes. Assumptions that people would be angry, upset, disappointed, disgusted, or otherwise by homosexuality, which speaks to feminist and postcolonial critiques of the “impartial” researcher (England, 1994; Madge, 1993; Rose, 1997).

Before beginning data collection, I had already homogenised the population in Lourdes because I was laden with my subjective biases and assumptions about Christian Bolivians. Therefore, when living in Cochabamba, I had already essentialised my “ethnographic friends” as intolerant of homosexuality and assumed they would be unwilling to interact with people with identities that they oppose – homosexuals in the current case. I recognise that I viewed my ethnographic friends through an orientalist gaze, in which people have fixed identities that are anchored in the past. This is in opposition to people who may be “enlightened,” “modern,” and open to change. This is an artificial binary based on ideal types that are not “real” (Germond-Direct, 2016). Homi Bhabha's work on cultural hybridity demonstrates that societies are composed of a mixing of modernity with traditional customs. Individuals can only be described through the ambivalence of their identities, and erasure of their hybridity will result in the oppressive essentialisation of peoples (Bhabha, 2012).

One could argue that my decision to continue presenting as a heterosexual is paternalistic. I have tried to “protect” people from something that they disagree with, dislike, or may feel uncomfortable knowing. I have taken actions to maintain an essentialised idea of a “fragile” and “traditional” culture and belief system. This reductively suggests that people living in Lourdes are entirely separate and unexposed to the constant unpredictable circulation of “modern” ideas and images – global cultural flows – that may challenge their worldviews (Appaduari, 1996). Yet, homosexuality was legalised in Bolivia in 2009, and although same-sex marriage remains illegal and homophobia is widely reported (Lamotagne et al., 2018), the LGBTQ+ rights movement is growing nationally and more broadly across Latin America (Corrales, 2020). Images of

LGBTQ+ marches and events are increasingly common in Cochabamba and studies have revealed the lively, albeit hidden, queer “scene” in Bolivia (Wright, 2006). Through social media, I was also fortunate to discover a small lesbian scene outside of Lourdes, comprised of two inconspicuous “gay bars,” populated by middle class and mestizo queer Bolivians, who were predominantly from the more affluent north of the city. In sum, my “ethnographic friends” and indeed others living in Lourdes were exposed to homosexuality in Bolivia.

It is also likely there were people with a diversity of opinions towards queers and/or who were queer people (closeted or “out”) living in Lourdes (Andersson et al., 2011). Yet, by constructing a heterosexual identity I may have silenced queers or queer allies living in Lourdes, who might otherwise have spoken to me. Interactions with queers living in Lourdes might have potentially de-centred the biases that I came and left the field with, despite my exposure to queers in the more affluent part of the city. As uncomfortable as it is to admit, my assumption that all people in Lourdes were heterosexual is naïve at best and colonial at worst. I homogenised people in Lourdes and viewed them through a western/Anglo-American queer perspective, which erases queer experiences and visibility in the Global South (Kulpa et al., 2016).

By entering the “closet” I also took away the agency of “ethnographic friends” to respond, and in ways that may challenge my assumptions. For instance: (1) to maintain a cross-group friendship in spite of their views on homosexuality; (2) to express their understanding about why I hid my sexuality; (3) to reduce their prejudices; or even (4) to “come out” to me. This act of essentialising and ultimately colonising people’s voices reproduces and entrenches the colonial relations that post-structuralists have long critiqued and researchers try to subvert when conducting research in the Global South (Smith, 2013).

In the concluding section I reflect on the implications of my narrative ethnography for literature on fieldwork and positionality.

#### 4 | CONCLUSION

Strategic curation of researcher identity is one of the “tools” that ethnographers draw on when “in the field as interactive members of a group on a temporary basis” (Bornstein, 2007, p. 485). Revealing and concealing identity is a privilege that researchers “enjoy” to complete fieldwork. Yet, connecting with research participants via social networking sites means that the practical and ethical implications of “deceiving” people in “the field” endure far beyond the temporal and physical boundaries of fieldwork. Researchers must decide if and how they will (re)produce their fieldwork identity to research participants, once fieldwork ends. This raises new dilemmas for researchers wanting to navigate “the field” in the most ethical manner. When and if field training for ethnographers is provided, the average researcher is still preconceived as white, European, male and heterosexual (Caretta & Jokinen, 2017). Yet, there is much more diversity among researchers now (Sharp & Dowler, 2011). Hence, it is important to improve fieldwork preparation practices by acknowledging that researchers embody diverse positionalities that may need to be negotiated when “leaving the field” in a global context where social media is ubiquitous.

This narrative ethnography suggests that (re)production of fieldwork identities after exiting the field may reveal the subjective biases that researchers arrive and leave field sites with (England, 1994; Madge, 1993; Rose, 1997). In particular, decisions to conceal aspects of researcher’s identities on social media after fieldwork may be informed by essentialist ideas of Global South people that reify and reproduce colonial relationships. When researchers conceal elements of their identity they may inadvertently colonise the voice of research participants, because they remove the opportunity for research participants to perceive and respond to the particular element of the researcher’s identity in question, i.e., sexuality, class, religion. As such, I argue for heightened disciplinary debate and awareness surrounding the reasons researchers construct their identities during and after fieldwork and in ways that link to the debates on decolonising geography specifically research more generally (Noxolo, 2017; Radcliffe, 2017). This question is increasingly important in a socially mediated world and I call for greater discussion of the biases that possibly underlie the construction of fieldwork identities.

This discussion also contributes to literature on negotiating LGBTQ+ identities during fieldwork (e.g., Browne et al., 2009; Browne & Nash, 2016; Goodman, 1996; Maguire et al., 2019; Rooke, 2010; Lewin et al., 1996), and which, apart from Maguire et al. (2019), has minimally tackled the implications of queer researchers connecting with research participants on social media.

Traditionally, the relationship between researchers and “researched” suggests that the former is the “knower” who maintains control over what she or he reveals about their background to the “known” (Stacey, 1988). Yet, understandably and unsurprisingly, people living in field sites may well be curious to learn more about the person who is researching them (Powdermaker, 1966), and this information is increasingly accessible online. In light of this an interesting line of inquiry is whether social media, and the Internet more broadly, are challenging the long-established knower–known research dichotomy.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank you to Tanja Bastia for reading through the first draft of this paper. Your feedback was invaluable. Thank you to the two reviewers who engaged so thoroughly with this paper and helped me to strengthen it much more.

## DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Research data are not shared.

## ORCID

Gemma Sou  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8434-2723>

## ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Pseudonyms are used throughout this paper.

<sup>2</sup> After great consideration I concluded that the probability of people living in Lourdes accessing this paper and discovering my sexuality is extremely low.

## REFERENCES

- Andersson, J., Vanderbeck, R.M., Valentine, G., Ward, K. & Sadgrove, J. (2011) New York encounters. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 43(3), 618–633. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a43202>
- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Ballamingie, P. & Johnson, S. (2011) The vulnerable researcher. *Qualitative report*, 16(3), 711–729. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2011.1084>.
- Bhabha, H.K. (2012) *The location of culture*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Blackwood, E., Wieringa, S.E. & Wieringa, S. (Eds.) (1999) *Female desires*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Bondi, L. (2005) The place of emotions in research. In: Davidson, J., Bondi, L. & Smith, M. (Eds.) *Emotional geographies*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, pp. 231–246.
- Bornstein, E. (2007) Harmonic dissonance: Reflections on dwelling in the field. *Ethnos*, 72(4), 483–508. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00141840701768292>
- K. Browne J. Lim & Brown, G. (2009). *Geographies of sexualities: Theory, practices and politics*, Farnham, UK: Ashgate Publishing, Ltd.
- Browne, K. & Nash, C. (2016) Queer methods and methodologies. In: *The Wiley Blackwell encyclopedia of gender and sexuality studies*, pp. 1–5. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Caretta, M.A. & Jokinen, J.C. (2017) Conflating privilege and vulnerability. *The Professional Geographer*, 69(2), 275–283. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00330124.2016.1252268>
- Chacko, E. (2004) Positionality and praxis. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography*, 25(1), 51–63. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0129-7619.2004.00172.x>
- Chong, K.H. (2008) Coping with conflict, confronting resistance. *Qualitative Sociology*, 31, 369–390. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11133-008-9114-0>
- Coffey, A. (1999) *The ethnographic self*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Corrales, J. (2020) The expansion of LGBTQ+ rights in Latin America and the backlash. In: *The Oxford handbook of global LGBTQ+ and sexual diversity politics*, p. 185. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Crapanzano, V. (2010) “At the heart of the discipline”. Critical reflections on fieldwork. In: Davies, J. & Spencer, D. (Eds.) *Emotions in the field: The psychology and anthropology of fieldwork experience*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, pp. 60–61.
- Cupples, J. (2002) The field as a landscape of desire. *Area*, 34(4), 382–390. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-4762.00095>
- Danaher, P.A. (2001) The researcher as occupational traveller. *Journal of Nomadic Studies*, 4, 66–78.
- Dam, R. & Lunn, J. (2014) First impressions count: Identity, access and the ethical dilemmas of being a ‘native’ or a ‘foreign’ researcher. Fieldwork in the Global South: Ethical challenges and dilemmas, 96. London, UK: Taylor & Francis.
- Di Feliciano, C., Gadelha, K.B. & DasGupta, D. (2017) ‘Queer(y)ing methodologies: Doing fieldwork and becoming queer’ – Guest editorial. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 24(3), 403–412. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2017.1314950>
- Diprose, G., Thomas, A.C. & Rushton, R. (2013) Desiring more. *Area*, 45(3), 292–298. <https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12031>
- Drake, D.H. & Harvey, J. (2014) Performing the role of ethnographer. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 17, 489–501. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2013.769702>
- England, K.V. (1994) Getting personal. *The professional geographer*, 46(1), 80–89. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0033-0124.1994.00080.x>
- ESRC. (2019) *Research ethics*. Economic and Social Research Council. Available from: <https://esrc.ukri.org/funding/guidance-for-applicants/research-ethics/> [Accessed 23rd December 2019].



- Germond-Duret, C. (2016) Tradition and modernity. *Third World Quarterly*, 37(9), 1537–1558. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2015.1135396>
- Godbole, G. (2014) Revealing and concealing. In: *Fieldwork in the Global South*. London, UK: Routledge, pp. 107–117.
- Goodman, L. (1996) Rites of passing. *Out in the field*, 1, 49–57.
- Gündüz, U. (2017) The effect of social media on identity construction. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 8(5), 85–85. <https://doi.org/10.36941/mjss>
- Hall, S.M. (2009) 'Private life' and 'work life'. *Area*, 41(3), 263–272. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-4762.2009.00880.x>
- Herod, A. (1999) Reflections on interviewing foreign elites. *Geoforum*, 30(4), 313–328. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-7185\(99\)00024-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-7185(99)00024-X)
- Jansson, D. (2010) The head vs. the gut. *Geoforum*, 41, 19–22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2009.10.013>
- Jones, B. & Ficklin, L. (2012) To walk in their shoes. *Emotion, Space and Society*, 5(2), 103–112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emospa.2010.10.007>
- Kulpa, R. & Mizielinska, J. (Eds.). (2016) *De-centring western sexualities*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Lamontagne, E., d'Elbée, M., Ross, M.W., Carroll, A., du Plessis, A., & Loures, L. (2018) A socioecological measurement of homophobia for all countries and its public health impact. *European Journal of Public Health*, 28(5), 967–972. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/cky023>
- Lee, J.S. (2018) The language of social media. Edited by Philip Seargeant, Caroline Tagg. 2014. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, xii+260. *World Englishes*, 37(4), 722–724.
- Lewin, E., Leap, W.L. & Leap, W. (Eds.) (1996) *Out in the field*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Luff, D. (1999) Doing social research: Issues and dilemmas. *Sociology*, 33, 687–703.
- Madge, C. (1993) Boundary disputes: Comments on Sidaway (1992). *Area*, 25(3), 294–299.
- Maguire, H., McCartan, A., Nash, C.J. & Browne, K. (2019) The enduring field. *Area*, 51(2), 299–306. <https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12464>
- Ng, I. (2011) To whom does my voice belong? (Re)negotiating multiple identities as a female ethnographer in two Hong Kong rural villages. *Gender, Technology and Development*, 15(3), 437–456. <https://doi.org/10.1177/097185241101500306>
- Noxolo, P. (2017) Introduction: Decolonising geographical knowledge in a colonised and re-colonising postcolonial world. *Area*, 49(3), 317–319. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/area.12370>
- Olla, N. (2011) Building for difference: Essentialism in the work of Judith Butler and Gayatri Spivak. *The Mellon Mays Undergraduate Fellowship Journal*, 78.
- Powdermaker, H. (1966) *Stranger and friend*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton.
- Radcliffe, S.A. (2017) Decolonising geographical knowledges. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 42(3), 329–333. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/tran.12195>
- Rose, G. (1997) Situating knowledges: Positionality, reflexivities and other tactics. *Progress in Human Geography*, 21(3), 305–320. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1191/030913297673302122>
- Rooke, A. (2010) *Queer in the field*. Farnham, UK: Ashgate, pp. 25–41.
- Sharma, S. (2019) Me again. *Area*, 51(3), 508–515. <https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12493>
- Sharp, J. & Dowler, L. (2011) Framing the field. In: *A companion to social geography*, pp. 146–160. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Smith, L.T. (2013) *Decolonizing methodologies*. London, UK: Zed Books Ltd.
- Smith, S. (2016) Intimacy and angst in the field. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 23(1), 134–146. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2014.958067>
- Sou, G. (2015) *The relationship between risk perceptions and responses in disaster-prone cities of the Global South*. Thesis. The University of Manchester.
- Sou, G. (2018) Mainstreaming risk reduction into self-build housing. *Climate and Development*, 10(6), 526–537. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17565529.2017.1318746>
- Stacey, J. (1988, January) Can there be a feminist ethnography? *Women's Studies International Forum*, 11(1), 21–27. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-5395\(88\)90004-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-5395(88)90004-0)
- Tedlock, B. (1991) From participant observation to the observation of participation: The emergence of narrative ethnography. *Journal of Anthropological Research*, 47(1), 69–94. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/jar.47.1.3630581>
- Valentine, G. (1993) (Hetero) sexing space. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 11(4), 395–413. <https://doi.org/10.1068/d110395>
- Valentine, G. (2002) People like us. In: *Feminist geography in practice: Research and methods*. (pp. 116–126). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Whyte, W.F. (1993) *Street corner society*, 4th edition, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Widdowfield, R. (2000) The place of emotions in academic research. *Area*, 32(2), 199–208. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-4762.2000.tb00130.x>
- Williams, C.L., Giuffre, P.A. & Dellinger, K. (2009) The gay-friendly closet. *Sexuality Research & Social Policy*, 6(1), 29. <https://doi.org/10.1525/srsp.2009.6.1.29>
- Wright, T.R. (2006) *Bolivia: Making gays in a queer place. AIDS, modernization, and the politics of sexual identity*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California.

**How to cite this article:** Sou, G. (2021). Concealing researcher identity in fieldwork and social media: Sexuality and speaking for participants. *Area*, 53, 473–480. <https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12736>