

Kevin's survey most egregiously uses the offensive term "shemale", and also uses terms like "transsexual" in ways that would be considered passe or problematic by people active in the area of queer politics. There are many of such people within furry.

When pressed, Kevin countered that "shemale" is acceptable because it is "used in professional literature". He cited me two examples: one from 1993, the other from 2011. I reviewed the 2011 (Escoffier) paper, in which "shemale" is only used as a descriptor for a mainstream pornography category. Kevin's use of this paper as a rationalization strikes me as either disingenuous or wilfully misleading. His willingness to defend offensive terminology on specious grounds is consistent based on my conversations with him.

I advised him to use the GLAAD media guidelines as reference for appropriate use of language. Kevin replied: "The GLAAD guidelines are merely guidelines, and they are catered to the media, which we are not. They don't dictate the discourse in academia, research, or really anything."

Kevin drafted survey recruitment essays for publication on furry websites in a way to avoid the appearance of breaching IRB guidelines

Looking to publicise his survey, Kevin wrote:

"I remembered something recently during a research meeting that we don't actually have express IRB approval to make posts however we like to recruit participants. When we submitted this study for IRB approval one and a half years ago now (fall 2013 - yes, it's been that long), we only came up with something generic for posting purposes. It's always been a bit of a paradox that you need IRB approval to even begin work on a study, but throughout the course of doing a study, many things can change, either because your thinking changed or because you talk to people (in this case, a lot of furies) and gain different perspectives and new ideas for approaching how to recruit.

Long story put a bit shorter, if I were to draft something for [adjective][species], it would be best if it were in your POV and not mine (you aren't held to the IRB the way that I am as a researcher at my university, and since it's a survey, they have no control over how it might be spread outside the researchers' hands once it exists)."

Kevin went on to write a short piece intended for publication on furry websites (Adjective Species and another site named Dogpatch Press) in the 'voice' of a disinterested observer. A version of his piece was published on Dogpatch Press on 5 March.

Thanks for your time. These issues are the major concerns I have with Kevin's conduct. I have other concerns that are either less serious or less easily-summarised, however hopefully this email provides you with useful information.

Please don't hesitate to contact me with any questions. I can be found on this email address or on [REDACTED] - due to timezones please call in the morning US time.

Regards,
Matt Healey