International Journal of Social Research Methodology

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: www.tandfonline.com/journals/tsrm20

Methodological challenges of designing a survey to capture young people's (non-binary) affiliations in relationship to religion, sexuality and gender

Mary Lou Rasmussen, Sulamith Graefenstein, Andrew Singleton, Anna Halafoff & Gary Bouma

To cite this article: Mary Lou Rasmussen, Sulamith Graefenstein, Andrew Singleton, Anna Halafoff & Gary Bouma (2020) Methodological challenges of designing a survey to capture young people's (non-binary) affiliations in relationship to religion, sexuality and gender, International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 23:6, 695-709, DOI: 10.1080/13645579.2020.1763692

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2020.1763692

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL RESEARCH METHODOLOGY
2020, VOL. 23, NO. 6, 695–709
https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2020.1763692

Methodological challenges of designing a survey to capture young people's (non-binary) affiliations in relationship to religion, sexuality and gender

Mary Lou Rasmussen [a], Sulamith Graefenstein [a], Andrew Singleton [b], Anna Halafoff [b] and Gary Bouma [c]

[a]Australian National University, Canberra, Australia; [b]Deakin University, Geelong, Australia; [c]Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

ABSTRACT

Large-scale population studies surveying young people in relation to their worldviews have tended to frame their identities in a fixed and limited capacity while also treating the topics of religion/spirituality and sexuality/gender as discrete categories of scholarly analysis. We highlight the affordances and limitations of foregrounding fixed religious, sexual and gender-based identity categories in the process of collecting and analysing data related to the worldviews of young people. In this paper we argue the value of studying the complexities and intersections of these identities and worldviews *together* in one study. We do this through reference to the Australia's Generation Z (AGZ) study: the first nationally representative sample focused on providing an evidence-based understanding of both the religious/spiritual/non-religious and sexuality/gender identities and worldviews of young Australians aged 13–18. We discuss how we built on existing surveys in designing the AGZ survey. We also demonstrate how this survey allowed for the incorporation of young people's non-binary understandings of religion, sexuality and gender.

ARTICLE HISTORY
Received 10 September 2019
Accepted 18 February 2020

KEYWORDS
Quantitative survey methods; young people; identity categories; worldviews

Introduction

In Australia, like elsewhere in the world, the issues of religion, gender and sexuality often intersect in public and political discourse (Shipley, 2017; Taylor & Snowdon, 2014). Leading up to the 2017 Australian Marriage Law Postal Survey, for instance, religious and political leaders contributed to the highly politicized discussion on the vote for marriage equality. They often did so to the effect of constructing religious worldviews and worldviews embracing sexual and gender diversity as oppositional, implying that the ideological values they represent are inherently incompatible with one another (Coley, 2017). This perceived division between the two worldviews, which pitches religious and sexual freedom against each other, shapes many debates, including those on educational policy and school curricula development.

Young people's views are largely absent from these debates given that previous large-scale studies have often focused on religion/spirituality and sexuality/gender as discrete categories of analysis. The current literature engaging with these issues in Anglophone countries,[1] including Australia, predominantly focuses on young people and religious education (Arweck & Jackson, 2014;

CONTACT Mary Lou Rasmussen marylou.rasmussen@anu.edu.au Research School of Social Sciences, Australian National University, Haydon Allen Building, Acton ACT 2601, Australia

This article has been republished with minor changes. These changes do not impact the academic content of the article.

Australian Consortium for Social and Political Research Inc [ACSPRI., 2018; Madge et al., 2014) or on young people, sexuality, and health with a special focus on sexual practices (Fisher et al., 2019; Mitchell et al., 2014). While in the American context, intersections between gender identity and religion have not been addressed extensively, some studies explore how religion shapes sexual practices amongst adolescents. They tend to do so as part of broader health-focused research agendas (National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health [Addhealth], n.d.; Pearce & Denton, 2011). For the most part, these studies do not provide an integrated analysis of how young people's identities and worldviews are shaped by religion, spirituality and non-religion *as well as* gender and sexual diversity.

Only in recent years have a limited number of studies begun to examine the interconnected topics of youth, religion and sexuality. This research, which predominantly emerged out of North America and Europe, shows that the spiritual, religious and non-religious identities and worldviews of young people intersect with their identities and worldviews relating to sexuality and gender (e.g., Regnerus, 2007; Shipley, 2017; Yip & Page, 2013). For example, Jones et al. (2016) found that 29% of young American respondents in their study attributed their religious disaffiliation to 'negative religious teachings about or treatment of gay and lesbian people' (p. 7). These findings indicate that research projects examining how the understandings of young people are shaped by the interconnected topics of religion, sexuality and gender have important contributions to make.

Implementing the agenda of treating these topics not as discrete but intersecting categories of scholarly investigation, however, confronts researchers with significant methodological challenges. One such challenge presents itself in trying to ask questions in a way that resists 'fixed' identity categories. Research indicates that increasingly, people in general and young people in particular are often ambivalent about 'fixed' identity categories (Halafoff & Gobey, 2018; Rasmussen, 2006; Shipley, 2018). With this in mind, we designed a research method for our project that promotes an understanding of young people, religion, sexuality and gender *without foregrounding fixed religious or sexual identity categories in the process of collecting and analysing data.*

We argue that this approach helps uncover the diverse range of identities and worldviews held by young people without predetermining who they are or what they might believe in. We achieved this, in part, through the Australia's Generation Z study (AGZ). The primary aim of this research was to explore young Australian's worldviews and how their worldviews intersected with the increasing diversity that characterises contemporary Australian society. As part of its study design we collected data using a random, nationally representative survey of young people (aged 13–18) in relation to their worldviews, reasoning that many young people are influenced by debates about sexuality *and* religion, even if they do not identify as gender and sexually diverse or religious. Critically, we did not lead the survey with questions regarding their religious/spiritual/non-religious or gender/sexual identities, and when we did ask about them, we did so in ways that allowed for more complex, hybrid, and fluid self-identification. Hence, the process of surveying Australian teens was not tainted by prior assumptions about how young people's worldviews about religion, spirituality, gender and sexuality may intersect but was rather open to discovering how they did so.

In the following, we engage with the studies that have been most instrumental in designing the AGZ study's survey questionnaire. In doing so, we focus on the contributions they make in helping to dissolve rigid identity categories. We also focus on their methodological limitations in terms of adequately capturing the breadth and depths of young people's values, opinions and beliefs. Given that the current literature on young people's identities and worldviews is often divided, we first engage with the literature on young people and religion; second, we discuss previous work on young people, gender and sexuality; third, we assess the research that has been carried out examining young people in relation to the interconnectedness of the topics of religion, gender, and sexuality; fourth, we address the methodological advantages of our AGZ study design which adopts a survey approach that promotes a broadened understanding of the conceptual term 'worldview'.

Surveying young people on religion, spirituality and non-religion

In the past decade, sociologists of religion have increasingly called for scholarship to move beyond the use of narrowly defined identity categories such as 'religious' and 'secular' when conducting surveys about religion (see McGuire, 2008). In our survey, we used a number of large-scale international and Australian studies on young people and religion to inform the development of our study design questions in response to these debates on diversifying identity categories. One important body of research we relied on has come out of the Warwick Religions and Education Research Unit (WRERU). Scholars from the WRERU, and partner Investigators on the AGZ study, completed one of the first large-scale projects on the attitudes of young British people to religious diversity.

Our study takes a cue from this research project by adopting the focus on worldviews to provide information on the Australian context. The term 'worldview' is a translation of the German philosophical concept 'Weltanschauung' and describes the underlying values and beliefs held by individuals/groups that shape their understandings of the world and drive their actions (Jackson, 2014, p. 70). The term is often used in religious education research instead of religion to allow for a broader investigation of religious/non-religious 'views on life' (Kooij et al., 2013, p. 210). In this sense, religious or non-religious outlooks are subcategories of worldviews (Jackson, 2014, p. 70) that interact with and shape other views on life, such as in our study's case those related to gender and sexual diversity. The way the WRERU study used the conceptual term 'worldview' to design its survey questions is indicative of how worldviews have been studied traditionally, namely in relation to religion and religious practice. Students were asked whether they had no religion, self-identified as Buddhist, Hindu, Jewish, Muslim, Sikh, Christian or with any other faith (see Table 1 Religion

Table 1. Religion and spirituality survey question by chronological comparison.

SURVEY NAME	QUESTION ON RELIGIOUS IDENTITY	NOTES
2005: Australian 'Spirit of Generation Y'	'Do you consider yourself to be Christian, Buddhist, Jewish, Hindu, Muslim, another religion, or don't you identify with a particular religion?'	• Didn't ask a follow up question about non-religious identities (i.e. atheist, agnostic, humanist, something else)
2011: 'Religious Diversity and Young People' by WRERU	'What is your religion? No religion 1 Buddhist 2 Hindu 3 Jewish 4 Muslim 5 Sikh 6 Other world faith (please specify) 7 Anglican [. . .] 8 Baptist 9 Methodist 10 Pentecostal 11 Presbyterian [. . .] 12 Roman Catholic 13 URC 14 Christian, no denomination 15 Other Christian denomination (please specify) 16'	• Didn't ask a follow up question about non-religious identities (i.e. atheist, agnostic, humanist, something else)
2013: 'American National Study of Youth and Religion' (Fourth Wave)	'Do you generally consider yourself to be Catholic, another kind of Christian, Jewish, Muslim, another religion or not religious?'	'[IF DOES NOT BELONG RELIGION/ DENOMINATION, OTHER, OR DON'T KNOW] Do you consider yourself to be an atheist, agonistic, just not religious, or something else?'
2015: 'US Religious Landscape Study' by the Pew Research Center	'What is your present religion, if any? Are you Protestant, Roman Catholic, Mormon, Orthodox such as Greek or Russian Orthodox, Jewish, Muslim, Buddhist, Hindu, atheist, agnostic, something else, or nothing in particular?'	• The follow-up question is already embedded in the initial question
2017: 'Australian Generation Z Study'	'Do you consider yourself to be . . . ? (READ OUT) INTERVIEWER NOTE: this item refers to the respondent's MAIN religion if they have more than one (RESPONSE FRAME) 1. Christian 2. Muslim 3. Buddhist 4. Jewish 5. Hindu 6. Sikh 7. Another religion (SPECIFY), or 8. Not religious 98. (Don't know) 99. (Refused)'	'Do you consider yourself to be an atheist, an agnostic, a Humanist, just not religious, or something else? (RESPONSE FRAME) Atheist Agnostic Humanist Not religious Something else (SPECIFY) (Don't know) (Refused)'

Source: Spirit of Generation Y Questionnaire (SGY, 2005); WRERU Questionnaire (WRERU, 2011); NSRY (UND, 2013); PEW RESEARCH CENTER (Smith et al., 2015); Australian Generation Z Questionnaire (AGZ, 2017).

and Spirituality Survey Question by Chronological Comparison to see different framings of survey questions on this topic in surveys that informed the AGZ study). They were also asked whether they considered religion the most important part of their identity, how they related to God and how often they engaged in religious practices (Warwick Religions and Education Research Unit [WRERU], 2011).

Building on the WRERU study, we propose that the conceptual term 'worldview' is instructive in helping dissolve fixed identity categories in survey research on spirituality types if it is used to broaden response options for participants beyond the category of religious denomination and associated beliefs/practices. The need for this approach is substantiated by research which shows a decrease amongst young people in prescribing to lifestyles that directly relate to and are bound by memberships in religious organizations (Mason et al., 2007). That does not mean, however, that all of those who do not identify with a formally organized religion have no spirituality or belief in the transcendent (Singleton et al., 2004, p. 253).

It also does not mean that all those who self-identify as non-religious relate to the notion of secularism in the same way. As Linda Woodhead (2016) notes in relation to the UK, although institutionalized religion is on decline, '[t]he idea that the British are uniformly drifting towards a thoroughgoing atheism resembling that of Richard Dawkins, is false' (p. 43). Hence, this complex process of self-identification requires an expansion of traditional identity categories reserved for religious 'nones' like simply 'having no religion'. It also calls for an investigation into religious and spiritual practices outside the realm of institutionalized forms of religion.

Compared to the WRERU-study, which primarily aimed to determine how young people's levels of tolerance towards religious diversity are influenced by their religious and non-religious worldviews and experiences of religious education, one major additional goal of the AGZ study was to capture the complex empirical diversity of worldviews as they are shaped by religion/spirituality/non-religion as well as gender/sexual diversity. We acknowledge that this added goal required a different method. Hence, our evaluation of the WRERU-questionnaire reflects that drawing attention to the fact that while we adopted the conceptual term 'worldview' we used it to specifically broaden response options to fit the purpose of our study.

In addition, when designing our questionnaire, we took inspiration from important studies on religious beliefs and practices, the *US National Survey of Youth and Religion* (NSYR) (Pearce & Denton, 2011; Smith & Denton, 2005; Smith & Snell, 2009) and the Pew Research Center *Religious Landscape Studies* (Lugo et al., 2008; Pew Research Center, 2015). We paid close attention to the ways these surveys respond to the declining levels of religious affiliation amongst young people by introducing diverse response options beyond the label 'non-religious'. The NSYR study is a longitudinal, nationally representative study tracking the religious and spiritual lives of teenagers (ages 13–17) onward in four waves. It started in 2001 and uses a phone survey and semi-structured interviews as an evidence base. During the first wave, the respondents were teenagers. Given that this paper discusses this age group, we focus on the first wave questionnaire here. In line with this survey instrument, young people were asked whether they identified as 'Catholic,' 'another kind of Christian,' 'Jewish,' 'Muslim,' 'another religion, or not religious' (University of North Carolina [UNC], 2003, p. 57). Apart from the option of 'not religious,' it also offered 'something else' and 'Don't know' (UNC, 2003, p. 57). All those who did respond within the framework of the last three categories were also asked whether they considered themselves to be 'an atheist, agnostic, just not religious, or something else' (UNC, 2003, p. 57).[2]

Equally, the 2015 Religious Landscape Study conducted by the Pew Research Center, which was based on a nationally representative telephone survey of American adults, asked respondents the following question: 'What is your present religion, if any? Are you Protestant, Roman Catholic, Mormon, Orthodox such as Greek or Russian Orthodox, Muslim, Buddhist, Hindu, atheist, agnostic, something else, or nothing in particular?' (see Table 1). The report states that by providing respondents with the option to choose from religious and non-religious identity categories, it intended to address 'marginally religious people' hoping to make it easier for them to identify as

non-religious (Pew Research Center, 2015, p. 116). Hence, asking an open-ended question and introducing a broader set of response options allow for more diverse expressions of self-identification amongst the group of 'religious nones'. Paired with asking respondents about their beliefs and not only religious but also spiritual practices, this approach helps move towards capturing the contemporary empirical complexity of personal religious, spiritual and non-religious identification.

These recent studies also collected data on a range of spiritual and religious beliefs and practices which enabled the researchers to identify more complex patterns of identity and practices. (e.g., see Mason et al., 2007). The value of this approach lies in the ways it helps complicate conventional understandings of what it may mean to identify with a specific label, as the data collected on what respondents believe in or practice is not always consistent with those understandings. It also helps promote a broadened understanding of worldviews and how they relate to organized religion but also spirituality that is lived outside the realm of churches, mosques, synagogues and mandirs, and non-religious ways of being in the world.These studies examine the increasingly complex religious, spiritual and non-religious identities in the population. However, only the NSYR study explores religion and spirituality and teen attitudes towards sexuality/gender. This shows how divided these topics tend to be in current large-scale studies, as teenagers and the topic of sexuality is traditionally explored more in health-based literatures. We turn to assessing this body of research next.

Surveying young people on sexuality and gender

International and Australian surveys researching young people, gender and sexuality mainly explore issues pertaining to respondents' sexual practices and sexual health rather than soliciting information on how they relate to discussions on gender and sexual diversity (Addhealth, n.d.; Mitchell et al., 2014). The few studies that discuss young people, religion, gender and sexuality in conjunction do so mainly to determine how religious faith affects young people's sexual practices (e.g., Addhealth, n.d.; Pearce & Denton, 2011; Regnerus, 2007). Hence, issues of gender/sexual diversity are raised if they touch directly on questions of personal preferences for sexual partners or sexual practices rather than worldviews of gender/sexual diversity. The survey designs used in this field nevertheless provide useful insights into how questions about sexuality and gender can be used to construct identity categories that are less rigid and help represent the complex reality of gender and sexual diversity more accurately.

Particularly in relation to the issue of gender, major sociological surveys continue to provide only the response options 'male' and 'female'; they do so despite the increasing public and scholarly recognition of the fact that gender is not binary, a factor that increasingly contributes to the rejection of these limiting categorizations amongst respondents (Sumerau et al., 2017). The tendency to fall back on binary gender identification categories in development of survey questions also goes for some of the studies in religious sociology (see Table 2 Gender Survey Questions by Chronological Comparison to see different framings of survey questions on gender in surveys that informed the AGZ study). *This exemplifies the need we have identified to address the increasing complexity of religious, spiritual, non-religious, gender and sexual identity categories amongst young people together in one survey.*

We show in the following that research on the sexual health of teenagers, which arguably is at the forefront of capturing current nuances in how young people self-identify through the categories of gender and sexuality, has only recently begun to include more diverse survey participant response options. Large-scale population studies like the NSYR study, for instance, did not include questions about gender diversity beyond the categories of 'boy,' 'girl' and 'male,' 'female' in the first, second and third wave survey questionnaires (UND, 2008, p. 6; UNC, 2003, p. 4, 2005, p. 119). Only the follow up survey in the fourth wave asked respondents, who were already young adults at that time, about the gender of sexual partners offering the following options to choose from: 'male,' 'female,' 'transgendered' or 'genderqueer' (see Table 2 for a comparison between first and fourth wave

Table 2. Gender survey questions by chronological comparison.

SURVEY NAME	QUESTION ON GENDER IDENTITY	NOTES
2003: 'American National Study of Youth and Religion' (First Wave)	'Is [your teen] a boy or a girl? [IF REFUSED: Okay then for the purpose of being able to continue with the survey I will assume that the child is a boy.] 0. BOY 1. GIRL'	• Didn't ask respondent about their gender, but the parents who had to consent to the participation of their teen in the survey
2005: Australian 'Spirit of Generation Y'	'Record respondent gender 1. Male 2. Female'	• Didn't ask respondent to self-identify with any of the two gender categories
2011: 'Religious Diversity and Young People' by WRERU	Are you? Male 1 Female 2'	• Didn't provide any other response option
2013: 'American National Study of Youth and Religion' (Fourth Wave)	'Which of the following best describes your romantic partner? 1. Male 2. Female 3. Transgendered or genderqueer'	• Didn't collect data on the gender identity of the respondent
2013: National Survey of Australian Secondary Students and Sexual Health (Fifth Iteration)	'In addition to "male" and "female", for the first time students were given the option of "other" when reporting their gender.'	'23 students chose the option of "other". These students were not included in the sample for the report due to low cell size'.
2015: 'US Religious Landscape Study' by the Pew Research Center	'Are you male or female? [DO NOT READ LIST] Male Female Other (VOL.) Don't know (VOL.) Refused (VOL.)'	• Interviewer instructed not to read out any other response option apart from the two
2017 'Australian Generation Z Study'	'Can I please confirm your gender? If you would prefer, please just say the number before each option I read. Do you think of yourself as? [. . .] One, Male Two, Female Three, Trans Four, Intersex Five, Gender Queer Other'	• Did provide response option other than the ones listed and encouraged respondents to specify what 'other' meant to them
2018: National Survey of Australian Secondary Students and Sexual Health (Sixth Iteration)	For the first time, besides 'male' and 'female,' students were given the option to identify as 'trans and gender diverse (TGD).' The study explains that 'TGD students self-identified as transgender, gender diverse, and other similar identities.'	• For the first time, the report includes results for TGD-identifying respondents, but notes that the number of responses from this group was too small to produce statistically usable results

Source: NSRY (UNC, 2003, p. 4); Survey Questionnaires of SGY (2005); WRERU (2011); NSYR (UND, 2013); NSASSSH (Mitchell et al., 2014, p. 7); PEW RESEARCH CENTER (Smith et al., 2015); Australian Generation Z Questionnaire (AGZ, 2017); NSASSSH (Fisher et al., 2019, pp. 15–16).

questionnaires). This demonstrates how only recently, awareness of these complexities is affecting changes in how young people are being asked about non-binary gender identities. *At the same time, it is important to note that respondents were asked to define the gender identity of their sexual partners but were not encouraged to state their own*. Therefore, the answers do not provide insights into how any of the individuals who were being labelled would have described themselves nor does it diversify the gendered understanding of the respondent pool.What the fourth wave NSYR study did achieve was a more diverse understanding of how respondents described their sexuality. Again, while direct questions about sexual identity were completely avoided in the first, second and third wave surveys (UND, 2008, p. 6; UNC, 2003, p. 82, 2005, p. 112), they were introduced in the fourth wave survey instrument. This is another example of how recent these changes of diversifying respondent identity categories relating to gender and sexuality are. Respondents were asked which of the following options best described them: 'heterosexual (straight), 'bisexual,' 'homosexual,' 'asexual (not sexually attracted to others),' 'other, please specify' (see Table 3 Sexuality Survey Questions by Chronological Comparison to see different framings of survey questions on sexuality in studies relevant to the AGZ project). While this is an important step towards expanding response options, there are limits to this study too, as it invariably misses out on counting a significant

Table 3. Sexuality survey questions by chronological comparison.

SURVEY NAME	QUESTION ON SEXUAL IDENTITY	NOTES
2003: 'American National Study of Youth and Religion' (First Wave)	Respondents were asked about the people they spend the most time with providing the option of naming their 'boyfriend or girlfriend [A ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIP]'	• Didn't collect data on how respondents describe their own sexual identity
2013: 'American National Study of Youth and Religion' (Fourth Wave)	'Which of the following best describes you? 1. Heterosexual (straight) 2. Bisexual 3. Homosexual 4. Asexual (not sexually attracted to others) 5. Other, please specify.'	• Did provide response option other than the ones listed and encouraged respondents to specify what 'other' meant to them
2013: National Survey of Australian Secondary Students and Sexual Health (Fifth Iteration)	Respondents were asked whether they were attracted 'only to people of the opposite sex', 'people of both sexes', 'only to people of my own sex', or 'not sure'.	• Didn't collect data on how respondents describe their own sexual identity
2015: 'US Religious Landscape Study' by the Pew Research Center	'Do you personally think of yourself as **[READ IN ORDER]** ONE **[IF MALE, INSERT**: gay**,; FOR ALL OTHERS, INSERT**: gay or lesbian,], TWO, straight, that is, not gay, or THREE, bisexual?'	• Didn't provide any other response option apart from the ones listed
2017: 'Australian Generation Z Study'	'If you would prefer, please just say the number before each option I read out. Do you think of yourself as?' (READ OUT) (MULTIPLE RESPONSE) IF NECESSARY: Please remember your answers are strictly confidential One, Straight, that is heterosexual Two, Lesbian/Homosexual/Gay Three, Bisexual Four, Questioning Five, Queer Something else – SPECIFY (Don't know) (AVOID) (Refused) (AVOID)'	• Did provide response option other than the ones listed and encouraged respondents to specify what 'something else' meant to them
2018: National Survey of Australian Secondary Students and Sexual Health (Sixth Iteration)	Students were given the option to identify as 'heterosexual or straight,' 'gay or lesbian,' 'bisexual' or 'not sure'.	• Respondents were asked about their sexual identity for the first time

Source: NSRY (UNC, 2003, p. 82); NSYR (UND, 2013); NSASSSH (Mitchell et al., 2014); PEW RESEARCH CENTER (Smith et al., 2015); AGZ (2017); NSASSSH (Fisher et al., 2019, p. 19).

proportion of young people who are questioning their sexuality and refusing fixed sexual identity categories.

One of the most influential research projects on the topic of young people and sexuality in Australia is the *National Survey of Australian Secondary Students and Sexual Health* (NSASSSH) in its 2013 and 2018 iterations (Fisher et al., 2019; Mitchell et al., 2014). The survey instrument was altered only recently to accommodate a broader range of sexuality and gender-based identity categories for respondents to choose from. In recording sexual diversity amongst young people, the 2018 survey asked students whether they identified as 'heterosexual or straight,' 'gay or lesbian,' 'bisexual' or 'not sure' (Fisher et al., 2019, p. 19). In 2013, the study had only asked respondents about who they were attracted to rather than how they self-identified (Mitchell et al., 2014, p. 23) which, again, testifies to the recent trend in thinking more critically about how these questions are asked (see Table 3).

In relation to gender identity questions, the survey instruments from 2013 and 2018 raise a number of important issues. Besides the previous response options offered in 2013 of 'male,' 'female' and 'other' (Mitchell et al., 2014, p. 7), the 2018 NSASSSH also included 'trans and gender diverse (TGD)' identity categories for the first time (Table 2). It is noteworthy that the report of 2013 highlights that the number of respondents who identified as 'other' was too small to even be included in the sample (Mitchell et al., 2014, p. 7). This indicates that in 2013 the added category of

'other' was perhaps too vague, as it hardly allows respondents to express their gender identity on their own terms. Compared to the categories 'male' and 'female,' 'other' also implies that respondents who choose this category are somehow less valued given that the survey did not encourage them to even specify what 'other' meant for them.

The 2018 NSASSSH reports that the sample size of respondents who identified as TGD was substantial enough to be included, but too small to be tested statistically which means that statistical comparisons could only be reported between those respondents who identified as male and female (Fisher et al., 2019, p. 15). Contrary to the category of 'other' used in 2013, 'TGD' appears concrete and at the same time capacious enough for respondents to express a diverse range of gender identities. However, we like to draw attention to the fact that the ways in which questions about gender identity are phrased may encourage or deter respondents from being open about how they identify. As we discuss later on in this article, in an attempt to acknowledge the sensitivity of this issue our AGZ study adopted an approach that allowed respondents to be open and at the same time protect their privacy in responding to questions about their gender and sexual identity.

Collecting data on diverse gender and sexual identities provides an opportunity to initiate changes in educational policy, for instance, based on data that evidences the experiences of members of sexual/gender minority groups. Nevertheless, a distinct advantage lies in obtaining information on the views of *all* young people relating to discussions in the wider public about gender and sexual diversity, not only of those who explicitly identify as LGBTQI+. This is because such a broadened focus helps deepen understandings about how young people relate to those discussions and how they are intertwined with other topics like religion (Jones et al., 2016).

We turn to these recent advances in research next focusing specifically on the methodological issues such projects face given that religion and sexuality are highly contested categories and too often constructed as in opposition to one another in social and political discourses. Trying to break up this division and dissolving fixed identity categories in research on young people of school age is particularly difficult because schools act as gatekeepers and often are reluctant to grant researchers access to their pupils.

Surveying young people on religion, spirituality, non-religion, sexuality and gender

Only a limited number of studies have examined how young people's worldviews related to gender and sexuality as well as religion and spirituality intersect and can be considered together (Shipley, 2017; Taylor & Snowdon, 2014; Yip & Page, 2013). In line with this research, we emphasize the need to bring religion/spirituality/non-religion and sexuality/gender together in scholarly research. At the same time, we also acknowledge the significant methodological difficulties that arise when attempting to analyse such contentious issues in relation to young people.

One major difficulty relates to the process of obtaining ethical approval from educational institutions and government departments to conduct research in schools which can significantly impede the recruitment process of respondents who are underage. For instance, the 2013 NSASSSH reported a drastic decrease of response rates for schools since the first iteration of the study (Mitchell et al., 2014) which ultimately led to the decision to conduct an online survey in 2018 rather than continuing with the previous online and school-based research model (Fisher et al., 2019).

In the context of this discussion, it is noteworthy that the three studies which have been the most instructive in designing the AGZ study because they are at the forefront of research on young people and the intersecting topics of religion, sexuality and gender focus on an older age group of 18 +. Andrew Yip, Michael Keenan and Sarah-Jane Pages' UK-based landmark survey entitled *Religion, Youth and Sexuality: A Multi-Faith Exploration* analyses the experiences and identities of young people aged 18–25 living in the UK in relation to their sexual and religious values (Yip & Page, 2013). This study was adapted for use in Canada by Shipley and Dickey Young (2014). The Canadian mixed-method study, *Religion, Gender and Sexuality Among Youth in Canada*, also focused on young people aged 18–25 (Shipley & Dickey Young, 2014). Taylor's qualitative ESRC-funded (Economic and Social

Research Council) project *Making Space for Queer Identifying Religious Youth* presents data on interviewees aged 17–34 (Taylor, 2016).

None of these studies explore the educational experiences of young people of school age which explains the significance of our study and the challenges of conducting such research with people under 18. Yip and Page (2013), distributed their survey questionnaire via post, e-mail, and a project website. The Canadian online survey was disseminated through the professional networks of the lead researchers, various websites, a Facebook page and social media; it was also shared in universities and with religious and non-religious youth organizations (Shipley & Dickey Young, 2014). Taylor (2016) recruited interviewees through a project website and Facebook-group and distributed leaflets to congregations/youth groups.

We propose that capturing the differing ways in which young people relate to religion, spirituality, gender and sexuality requires a method of data collection that goes beyond an online sample recruitment process which has biases that make it difficult to generate a representative sample. Paired with a method that does not use fixed identity categories as starting points for scholarly investigations, this approach offers the capacity to attract the widest and most diverse group of young people in survey research focused on worldviews, sexuality and religion.

Previous research on young people, sexuality and religion mainly relies on respondents who self-identify as religious (e.g., Yip & Page, 2013) or LGBTQI+ (e.g., Taylor, 2016). Yip and Page (2013) focus on respondents who describe themselves as religious belonging to one of the following faith groups: Christianity, Islam, Buddhism, Hinduism, Sikhism, Judaism and mixed-faith. Taylor focuses on LGBTQI-identifying young people investigating how they negotiate their queer and religious affiliations in various public and private spaces (Taylor, 2016). Given that knowledge on how both sexual minorities and self-identifying religious young people reconcile the various religious and sexuality/gender-related aspects of their lives with one another is rather limited, this research continues to be incredibly important in trying to grasp these young people's experiences. It has, however, also its inherent limitations.[3] Using fixed identity categories as a starting point for investigating religious and sexual/gender identities affect the kinds of results one is able to generate because of who may choose or refuse to participate. Young people who do not identify as straight but resist sexual and gender identity labels may be reticent to take part in such studies. Also, people who are non-religious and/or spiritual but not religious may feel deterred to participate. While it is important to capture the proliferation of identity categories it is also important to recognise that many young people continue to identify with fixed categories. Further, as categories proliferate their value in representing the opinions of specific groups becomes harder to grasp and demonstrate. There may be a need to group categories in order to ensure that the proliferation of identifications doesn't result in people's views being unable to be counted because of scarcity of numbers.

An effective measure to help avoid assigning identity categories to respondents so as to not deter certain groups of young people from participating in research on religion, gender and sexuality has been adopted by Shipley and Dickey Young whose study was not limited to individuals who identify as religious or gender/sexually diverse but instead invited all young people to participate (Arweck & Jackson, 2014). In the presentation of their findings, the authors note that many young people express support for not only overcoming what they perceive as outdated religious norms surrounding gender, sex and sexuality but also refuse to be confined by the traditional identity categories presented to them and instead create their own (Shipley & Dickey Young, 2014, p. 291).

We argue that dissolving rigid identity categories in research on sexuality and religion and focusing instead on diverse and complex identities and worldviews not only increases the chances of soliciting information from young people of diverse religious and spiritual backgrounds but also helps counter the pitfalls of research which is not focused on religious or LGBTQI+ young people, as it often runs the risk of erasing their experiences altogether, or, of providing a sample so small that it is difficult to draw solid conclusions about these young people's experiences. In the following, we elaborate on the approach adopted by the AGZ study with the aim to evaluate its methodological advantages.

Capturing the intersecting worldviews of Australian teens

In 2017, we conducted a nationally representative random-digit-dial (RDD) telephone survey of teenagers as part of the AGZ study. The survey was funded from a grant awarded by the Australian Research Council, without this substantial funding we would not have been able to undertake such an ambitious survey.[4] The funding allocated does not allow for the administration of follow up surveys using similar questions. The challenges of obtaining funding to administer surveys that comprise nationally representative samples may also become more difficult to justify in funding applications in an era when social researchers often rely on the much more accessible and affordable approach of recruiting participants through targeting specific populations via targeted online advertising and peer sharing.Notwithstanding the emergence of online surveys, the RDD survey mode is still regarded as the arguably most effective way to reach a representative target population (Pew Research Center, 2017). The survey data were collected by the Social Research Centre (Melbourne) using CATI software. Respondents from *all* Australian States and Territories were selected randomly using both cell phone (90% of respondents) and landline numbers (10% of respondents) and 1200 surveys were completed. The mix of cell and landline numbers ensured the closest possible coverage of the population. The cooperation rate ('response rate') for the survey was 34.7%. To improve the representativeness of the survey, the data are weighted by age, gender, location and telephone status (landline or cell), and consequently the sample is very representative of the population of Australian teens aged 13–18. In probabilistic terms, the maximum margin of error to apply to our survey is ± 2.8%.

Paired with a broadened focus on worldviews to help break up fixed identity categories as starting points for scholarly investigations, we figured this survey approach helps encourage participation of a wide range of respondents from a variety of different backgrounds irrespective of how they identify. To keep respondents open-minded about the purpose of the research, prospective participants were told that the survey was about 'the values and opinions of young people growing up in Australia'.

To be effective in unearthing the empirical complexities of young people's intersecting worldviews, we see a need for large-population studies to respond to a recent shift in the ways that young people tend to negotiate their position in the world. As we show in the following, we tackled this issue through offering more capacious response options to survey participants and through the ways in which we structured the interviews associated with administration of the survey.

Detecting young people's worldviews

Fewer teens than ever before identify with a faith tradition, nonetheless, all teens have worldviews, beliefs and practices (see Bouma & Halafoff, 2017; Mason et al., 2007). Cognisant of this broader social shift, we decided to lead in our questionnaire with questions about nonreligious and 'spiritual' topics. Only later did we address conventional religion (i.e. identification; belief; practice). Further, if respondents identified with a religious tradition, we also gave them the opportunity to say if they identified with more than one (Table 1). We also included questions about self-identification, making sure that respondents who reported not identifying with a particular religion (a 'religious none') would be able to suggest a term that they saw fit in describing their identity.

The group of young people who reported not identifying with a particular religion were asked: 'Do you see yourself to be an atheist, an agnostic, a Humanist, just not religious, or something else?' (s, 2017). Since research in the social sciences is yet to determine what exactly it means to identify as a 'religious none' (Hemming, 2017), we used our survey to discover more about how trust in science, humanism and reason figured in teen worldviews. Accordingly, we asked our survey participants a few items designed to tap into this kind of approach to life. Space does not permit us to report our survey results in detail here. That said, we used the data to create a sophisticated typology that maps teen worldviews, drawing on more than 15 survey items (see Singleton et al.,

2019). In discovering six 'types' of teen worldview, our approach moves beyond conventional religious/non-religious or spiritual/non-spiritual binaries.

Young people, sexuality and gender

Similarly, our study points to the proliferation of Australian young people who identify *as, trans and gender diverse* and as *not heterosexual*. Like with the data on religious and non-religious identities, it was possible to unearth this information through refraining from the use of fixed identity categories at the beginning of the survey and through the way in which we solicited information from respondents about their gender/sexual identities. We asked these questions not at the beginning of the survey, like it is commonly done at least with gender-related questions, but in the middle. This helped young people to establish a rapport with the person administering the survey before sharing this information which we know is sensitive at least to some respondents. The question relating to their gender identity was posed in the following way:

> Can I please confirm your gender? If you would prefer, please just say the number before each option I read out. Do you think of yourself as? [. . .]
>
> 1. One, Male
>
> 2. Two, Female
>
> 3. Three, Trans
>
> 4. Four, Intersex
>
> 5. Five, Gender Queer
>
> 96. Other (SPECIFY)
>
> 97. (Don't know) (Australia's Generation Z [AGZ], 2017)

The questions about sexual identity were asked in a similar way offering respondents the options of 'One, Straight, that is heterosexual,' 'Two, Lesbian/Homosexual/Gay,' 'Three, Bisexual,' 'Four, Questioning,' 'Five, Queer, 'Something else – SPECIFY,' '(Don't know)' '(Refused)' (see Tables 2 and 3). In asking young people about their gender and sexual identity through stating a number, we specifically tried to encourage respondents to be open. At the same time, we intended to help them protect their privacy by not forcing them to say out loud how they identified. This approach was adopted to provide participants with the freedom to share this possibly sensitive information if they wanted to do so without having to 'come out' to their family in case relatives were in the room while the survey was being conducted.

As these examples of gender and sexuality questions exemplify, the categories we chose offer opportunities for individual expression, which ultimately allows for a deeper understanding of how young people are identifying. The need for breaking up fixed identity categories is arguably of particular importance in the study of young people given that debates on gender/sexual fluidity have become more mainstream (Sumerau et al., 2017). One might ask, for instance, whether this has helped broaden the views of young people about diverse gender and sexual identities (Hinsliff, 2019). Australian research shows that the number of people identifying as non-heterosexual is higher at younger and lower at older ages (Mitchell et al., 2014; Wilson & Shalley, 2018). Both our study and other recent surveys point to the proliferation of Australian young people who identify as trans/gender diverse and as not heterosexual. In relation to sexual identity, for instance, the 2018 NSASSSH states that while a majority of 74% interviewees reported being heterosexual or straight, *21% of survey participants* identified as gay/lesbian or bisexual (Fisher et al., 2019, p. 19). The AGZ-survey found that in relation to sexual identity *close to 14%* of respondents reported *not identifying as straight* (2% identified as lesbian, homosexual or gay; 7% said reported being bisexual and 4% were questioning. About 1% said queer or something else, and 1% said they didn't know).

Conclusion

Our focus in this paper is on developing surveys that can provide a rigorous, empirically based exploration of how religion/spirituality/non-religion *and* sexuality/gender intersect in the lives of young people. We have illustrated the methodological tendency in survey research to distinguish between questions of religious and cultural identity and questions of gender and sexuality. At least in the Anglosphere, we believe that how young people think about gender and sexuality is fundamental to the ways in which they develop their worldviews. Such perspectives are especially salient given young people's role in the proliferation of sexual and gender identities. We have illustrated how surveys focused on young people and sexuality are often motivated exclusively by questions of health or education and do not specifically probe young people's perspectives on religions and worldviews.

The tendency to bifurcate young people's experiences is understandable because of the different disciplinary orientations adopted within the diverse fields of sociology of religion, youth studies and health and sexuality education. However, the team that designed the AGZ study was originally assembled precisely to address what we perceived as a lacuna in research on young people's worldviews. We demonstrate how researchers designing surveys related to young people's worldviews might adapt their instruments to better represent this group's thinking on issues related to religion/spirituality/non-religion and gender/sexuality. We have also pointed to the ways in which such surveys might be administered in order to maximise the opportunity for diverse young people to participate, enabling them to articulate their worldviews and information about their gender/sexual identity, even when privacy issues might otherwise impede full participation. It is our hope that researchers can draw on this discussion of survey methodology in order to marshal robust evidence that can better capture young people's lived and complex understanding of religion, spirituality, non-religion, gender and sexuality.

We recognise that categories that young people deploy in relation to religion and belief, and, in relation to gender, sex and sexuality are constantly under construction. There are obvious methodological challenges posed by changing terminology in relation to how comparisons might be drawn across generations, between nations, and between studies. The particularity of differences in identification that may be surfaced in survey research that allow for individual and local expressions of difference to emerge has the potential to enrich the field. We might also gain understanding of how identifications pertinent to young people's worldviews proliferate, or not, by opening up the opportunity for expression in diverse survey instruments.

Notes

1. We acknowledge that all these countries' engagements with the topics of religion, gender and sexuality have their own traditions affected by unique local and national as well as socio-political and cultural factors. We therefore do not propose that all approach research on these issues in exactly the same way, but rather that they are influenced by similar scholarly discussions in relation to controversial issues related to progressive sexuality education and religion. Research on English-speaking countries in particular not only produces interconnected discourses that rely on cross-referencing, even in relation to the development of study questionnaires (see e.g., Mason et al., 2007), but also on collaborative work. This project exemplifies this point, as the AGZ team collaborated with the Warwick Religions and Education Research Unit (WRERU) scholars Elisabeth Arweck, Robert Jackson and Leslie Francis on this project who are Partner Investigators since 2014.
2. The fourth wave questionnaire about non-religious identities, which was used in 2013 when respondents were in their twenties, was not changed significantly compared to the first wave NSYR study survey instrument (Table 1).
3. It is significant to acknowledge that in the case of both studies, this limitation only applies to the quantitative aspect of data collection. Both projects adopted a mixed-method approach whereby the qualitative component in the form of follow up in-depth interviews and video diaries were specifically designed to *not* use fixed religious and sexual identity categories allowing for broadened response options. Given that this paper specifically focuses on the design of survey questionnaires, we do not elaborate on this aspect further.
4. Australian Research Council Discovery Project 160102367.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Funding

The AGZ study was funded through an Australian Research Council Discovery Project Grant [DP160102367].

Notes on contributors

Prof.Mary Lou Rasmussen has undertaken research in the US, Canada, New Zealand and Australia. Her research focuses on building transdisciplinary understanding of sexuality and gender across diverse lifeworlds, taking account of issues related to sexual citizenship, cultural and religious difference and technologies of sexuality, education and health. She is co-editor, with Louisa Allen, of the *Handbook of Sexuality Education* (Palgrave).

Sulamith Graefenstein (PhD) is a Visiting Fellow at the Centre for Heritage and Museum Studies at the Australian National University. She has undertaken research in Europe, North America and Asia. Her work in the area of Memory Studies and Museum Studies focuses on developing an understanding of how human rights museums and human rights memorial museums help promote notions of (trans)national justice and solidarity in an era of circulating Holocaust memory and human rights. She is author of the book *The National Museum of Australia and the Debate about Australian Colonial History*, published in German (Lit-Verlag 2013).

Andrew Singleton (PhD) is a Professor of Sociology and Social Research at Deakin University. His research interests in the sociology of religion include secularisation, youth religion, personal belief, and alternative religions. Singleton has published extensively in these areas, both nationally and internationally. He is a co-author (with Michael Mason and Ruth Webber) of the book *The Spirit of Generation Y: Young People's Spirituality in a Changing Australia* (Garrett Publishing, 2007) and the author of *Religion, Culture and Society: A Global Approach* (Sage, 2014).

Associate Professor Anna Halafoff is a sociologist of religion and a member of the Alfred Deakin Institute for Citizenship and Globalisation at Deakin University. She is also a Research Associate of the UNESCO Chair in Interreligious and Intercultural Relations –Asia Pacific at Monash University. Anna's current research interests include: religious diversity; interreligious relations; countering violent extremism; and education about religions and worldviews. She is the author of *The Multifaith Movement: Global Risks and Cosmopolitan Solutions* (Springer, 2013) and co-editor (with E. Arweck and D. Boisvert) of *Education about Religions and Worldviews: Promoting Intercultural and Interreligious Understanding in Secular Societies* (Routledge, 2016).

Gary Bouma is the UNESCO Chair in Intercultural and Interreligious Relations –Asia Pacific and Emeritus Professor of Sociology at Monash University. Current research interests include changing worldviews, religion and right-wing extremism, religion and social justice. He is an Associate Priest in the Anglican Parish of St John's East Malvern. Author of over 25 books and 390 articles, he was invested as a Member of the Order of Australia (AM) for services to Sociology, to interreligious relations and to the Anglican Church of Australia.

ORCID

Mary Lou Rasmussen http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6679-8110
Sulamith Graefenstein http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8386-9446
Andrew Singleton http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5545-2149
Anna Halafoff http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4274-5951
Gary Bouma http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2093-5738

References

ACSPRI. (2018). *The Australian survey of social attitudes - 2018 – religion.* Australian Consortium for Social and Political Research Incorporated. https://www.acspri.org.au/aussa/2018

Addhealth. (n.d.). *Add health*.The National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health, Carolina Population Center, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill https://www.cpc.unc.edu/projects/addhealth

AGZ. (2017). *Young Australians' perspectives on religious and non-religious worldviews survey version 1*. Unpublished Research Questionnaire, Australian National University, Deakin University, Monash University.

Arweck, E., & Jackson, R. (2014). *Religion, education and society*. Routledge.

Bouma, G., & Halafoff, A. (2017). Australia's changing religious profile—rising nones and pentecostals, declining british protestants in superdiversity: Views from the 2016 Census. *Journal for the Academic Study of Religion*, *30* (2), 129–143. https://doi.org/10.1558/jasr.34826

Coley, J. (2017). Reconciling religion and LGBT rights: Christian universities, theological orientations, and LGBT inclusion. *Social Currents*, *4*(1), 87–106. https://doi.org/10.1177/2329496516651639

Fisher, C. M., Waling, A., Kerr, L., Bellamy, R., Ezer, P., Mikolajczak, G., Brown, G., Carman, M., & Lucke, J. (2019). *6th national survey of Australian secondary students and sexual health 2018*. Australian Research Centre in Sex, Health and Society, LaTrobe University. https://www.latrobe.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0004/1031899/National-Survey-of-Secondary-Students-and-Sexual-Health-2018.pdf

Halafoff, A., & Gobey, L. (2018). "Whatever"? Religion, youth, and identity in 21st century Australia. In P. Gareau, S. Bullivant, & P. Beyer (Eds.), *Youth, religion and identity in a globalizing context: International perspectives* (pp. 255–277). Brill.

Hemming, P. J. (2017). Childhood, youth and non-religion: Towards a social research agenda. *Social Compass*, *64*(1), 113–129. https://doi.org/10.1177/0037768616683333

Hinsliff, G. (2019, February 14). *The pansexual revolution: How sexual fluidity became mainstream*. The Guardian. https://www.theguardian.com/society/2019/feb/14/the-pansexual-revolution-how-sexual-fluidity-became-mainstream?CMP=Share_iOSApp_Other

Jackson, R. (2014). *'Signposts': Policy and practice for teaching about religions and non-religious worldviews in intercultural education*. Council of Europe Publishing.

Jones, R. P., Cox, D., Cooper, B., & Lienesch, R. (2016). *EXODUS: Why Americans are leaving religion—and why they're unlikely to come back*. Public Religion Research Institute, Washington D.C. https://www.prri.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/PRRI-RNS-Unaffiliated-Report.pdf

Kooij, J. C., Ruyter, D. J., & Miedema, S. (2013). "Worldview": The meaning of the concept and the impact on religious education. *Religious Education*, *108*(2), 210–228. https://doi.org/10.1080/00344087.2013.767685

Lugo, L., Stencel, S., Green, J., Smith, G., Cox, D., Pond, A., Miller, T., Podrebarac, E., Ralston, M., Kohut, A. and Taylor, P. (2008). *U.S. religious landscape survey: religious beliefs and practices: Diverse and politically relevant*. Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life, Washington D.C. http://www.pewresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/7/2008/06/report2-religious-landscape-study-full.pdf

Madge, N., Hemming, P. J., & Stenson, K. (2014). *Youth on Religion: The development, negotiation and impact of faith and non-faith identity*. Routledge.

Mason, M., Singleton, A., & Webber, R. (2007). *The spirit of generation Y: Young people's spirituality in a changing Australia*. John Garratt Publishing.

McGuire, M. (2008). *Lived religion: Faith and practice in everyday life*. Oxford University Press.

Mitchell, A., Patrick, K., Heywood, W., Blackman, P., & Pitts, M. (2014). *National survey of Australian secondary students and sexual health 2013: Results on the 5th national survey of Australian secondary students and sexual health*. Australian Research Centre in Sex, Health and Society, LaTrobe University, Melbourne, Australia. https://www.latrobe.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0005/576554/31631-ARCSHS_NSASSSH_FINAL-A-3.pdf.

Pearce, L., & Denton, M. (2011). *A faith of their own: Stability and change in the religiosity of America's adolescents*. Oxford University Press.

Pew Research Center. (2017). *Are telephone polls understating support for trump?* Pew Research Centre, Washington D.C.

Rasmussen, M. (2006). *Becoming subjects: Sexualities and secondary schooling*. Routledge.

Regnerus, M. (2007). *Forbidden fruit: Sex and religion in the lives of American teenagers*. Oxford University Press.

SGY. (2005). *PR0178 youth spirituality main study version (D12) final*. [Unpublished Research Questionnaire]. Christian Research Association.

Shipley, H., & Dickey Young, P. (2014). Values and practices: How are youth in Canada integrating religion and sexuality in their daily lives? In H. Shipley (Ed.), *Globalized religion and sexual identity: Contexts, contestations, voices* (pp. 276–294). Brill.

Shipley, H. (2017). Religious and sexual orientation intersections in education and media: A Canadian perspective. In P. Aggleton (Ed.), *Education and sexualities* (pp. 233–250). Routledge.

Shipley, H. (2018). Apathy or misunderstanding? Youth's reflections on their religious identity in Canada. In P. Gareau, S. Bullivant, & P. Beyer (Eds.), *Youth, religion and identity in a globalizing context: International perspectives* (pp. 191–210). Brill.

Singleton, A., Mason, M., & Webber, R. (2004). Spirituality in adolescence and young adulthood: A method for a qualitative study. *International Journal of Children's Spirituality*, *9*(3), 247–262. https://doi.org/10.1080/1364436042000292176

Singleton, A., Rasmussen, M. L., Halafoff, A., & Bouma, G. D. (2019). *The AGZ study: Project report*. ANU. Deakin and Monash Universities. https://sociology.cass.anu.edu.au/sites/default/files/docs/2019/10/AGZ_Report_FINAL_single_pages.pdf

Smith, C., & Denton, M. (2005). *Soul searching: The religious and spiritual lives of teenagers*. Oxford University Press.

Smith, C., & Snell, P. (2009). *Souls in transition: The religious and spiritual lives of emerging adults*. Oxford University Press.
Smith, G, Cooperman, A, Mohamed, B, Martinez, J, Alper, B, Sciupac, E, & Ochoa, J. (2015). *America's changing religious landscape*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.
Sumerau, J., Mathers, L., Nowakowski, A., & Cragun, R. (2017). Helping quantitative sociology come out of the closet. *Sexualities*, *20*(5–6), 644–656. https://doi.org/10.1177/1363460716666755
Taylor, Y. (2016). *Making space for queer-identifying religious youth*. Macmillan.
Taylor, Y., & Snowdon, R. (2014). Mapping queer, mapping me: Visualizing queer religious identity. In Shipley, H. (Ed) *Globalized religion and sexual identity* (pp. 295–312). Brill, Boston, USA..
UNC (2003). *National study of youth and religion: Wave 1 survey instrument*. The University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. https://youthandreligion.nd.edu/assets/102499/survey.pdf.
UNC (2005). *National study of youth and religion: Wave 2 telephone survey instrument*. The University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. https://youthandreligion.nd.edu/assets/102498/final_w2_survey_gen_public.pdf.
UNC. (2008). *National study of youth and religion: Wave 3 telephone survey instrument*. The University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. https://youthandreligion.nd.edu/assets/102497/w3_survey_appendix_08_2008.pdf
UND. (2013). *National study of youth and religion: Wave 4 survey instrument*. The University of Notre Dame. https://youthandreligion.nd.edu/assets/140961/w4_survey_instrument.pdf
Wilson, T., & Shalley, F. (2018). Estimates of Australia's non-heterosexual population. *Australian Population Studies*, *2*(1), 26–38. https://doi.org/10.37970/aps.v2i1.23
Woodhead, L. (2016). Intensified religious pluralism and de-differentiation: The British example. *Society*, *53*(1), 41–46. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12115-015-9984-1
WRERU. (2011). *Religious diversity and young people*. Unpublished Research Questionnaire. University of Warwick.
Yip, A., & Page, S. (2013). *Religious and sexual identities: A multi-faith exploration of young adults*. Ashgate.