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## Preamble

[10:30 to 10:45 not recorded – pre-consent]

## Introduction

[10:45 to 10:50 not recorded – dialogue]

## Session 1: [start 10:51 – 12minutes, 33 seconds long] Practicalities and process.

### Presentation of findings:

**Researcher 2:** I would love a set of conversations about the history before 2013. To be honest, that is before my time and before my reading, but I'd love to know more about that. What I'm interested in really is - at this point – mandates - So 2013, that takes the official US presidential memo and that gave instruction for publicly funded to be open access - to just people like NIH and just a longer history of the treatment administration elements, and anything with over $100 million in R&D expenditure has to make their publications open access - and as a result, a lot of organizations and funders, they moved towards open sites mandates. And we've seen that here, and with the Wellcome Trust too. We've seen that across Europe and the European Commission - ESRC are big supporters, as are the Gates Foundation. Most of this big infrastructure in place for this, it didn't appear out of nowhere - there is a history to this, leading up to this, and it is about reproducibility and replicability and introducing concepts. Next, major funders in Europe joined suit. And by 2021 we had ‘the S plan’, which asked its members to make publications open access compliant. As far as it's applicable, UNESCO then had a recommendation of open science reports. They wanted to standardise, in a form of protocol, the dissemination and sharing of scientific knowledge, which helps improve diversity. And it's a big movement, supporting that. And I'll come back that that as a separate note, which if anybody could help with that would be great. I really cannot find any literature focussed specifically on the global south. I've asked the SOAS library for advice on African libraries? There is nothing specific as of 2022, something I am struggling with. we have asked. And that, though, in August, then makes us ask are open access mandates marking a new beginning for open science? It states that by the end of 2025, 31st December specifically, research and data should be made freely available and accessible by default in agency designated repositories.

I'm not sure which that would refer to specifically - without any embargo or delay of publications. That's not just large ROIs, in excess of 100 million - I mean, they have six months. But it's also small ones, under 100 million. So, with federal funds, your data will be made open access. Will the UK, Europe and the rest of the world follow suit? I don't know. And our qualitative researchers ready for this? I don't know. I don’t feel - as a qualitative researcher that I would be prepared for that….

**Martin:** But at the moment UKRI already have policies about data sharing decisions. This is them catching up with us! No, seriously EPRSC have had data sharing requirements for more than a decade. When I was at the University of [Redacted], in 2011 we had to produce a road map for how we would comply with EPSRC, regulations around data sharing. Just, say, it may be that the AHRC and ESRC don't have exactly the same requirements. But UKRI and other research councils have had these requirements for more than a decade, and so has Wellcome - They are not exactly the same terms, you know, Wellcome has access policy since 2004, and what was RCUK – research council UK – had a position statement from about 2005, and so, once again, it, the Americans were catching up. I think it's really important that the European and particularly the UK. when you write this up, is represented. And it's, in we're not looking to the OSTP to guide us, they are catching up, seriously.

**Researcher 2:** That doesn't surprise me. I mean, in my substantive research [project], we have been advised, and I do, because I've worked for Wellcome Trust, they fund us – which means working through their policies, and I tend to deal with social media data. I'm having to adhere to that policy, yeah. And it's, the structure is quite difficult to work with. Um, coming from a background where I have been AHRC, and er, it's very different. And then the ESRC I feel has a very strong structure. I know where I stood with that, AHRC, not so much. Wellcome, a bit hit and miss in terms of the guidance. So, when I'm going through this as - in terms of, what I mean? Yeah. Yeah, you’re obviously right. I mean, the US is coming in later.

**Martin:** So, if you want to look at leadership in the early 2000s. Yes, really NIH and Wellcome, they were the key leaders of open access. And the RCUK - Research Councils UK - which were then formed around that time were and forming a policy because there was a Select Committee investigation into Scientific publications, which is published in 2004, and it was that, which I think it was called *Free for All?,* and that was the impetus, and RCUK funded in response to the fact that the select committee were looking at it. And all of the policies including 2012 Finch Review and Finch report for open access for the UK came out of that.

**Researcher 2:** Great, I’d love to have a chat with you about that sometime if that’s okay?

**Martin:** Yeah, yeah, that's okay. Yeah, that's actually fine. Yeah.

**Amy:** So, is it more that qualitative is often opted out of that, or that the thing that's changed here is the mandate?

**Researcher 2:** But it's more, there is a new mandate. and that's saved - by 2025 this - in the US - not just publications, but data will need to get open access. Yeah, and I'll be honest, there is a literature review in the background that I have not [yet] got to.

**Martin:** So, the difference here is around even access specifically to publications and other forms of data, which is open data, or other published outputs. So, the initial open policies around open access specifically as early as 2004 for NIH just so on what these gradually turned into the data sharing recommendations as well - of different levels of requirement recommendation. So, these have come on stream more recently, but the research councils - particularly EPSRC led this about 12 years ago - looking at their requirements, But, that didn't necessarily extend to all of the research councils and wasn't always mandated, it was kind of recommended, or strongly encouraged. So, it's a question of what you consider to be a mandate and what you consider to be recommendation.

**Jenni:** So, there are many exceptions too, so with ESRC, certain kinds of things can’t be shared. So, that's the sort of bracket around that, maybe?

**Martin:** Yeah, what exceptions you allow, and you don't know how easy it is to get an exception.

**Researcher 2:** Yeah. Absolutely. What's gonna give you privacy when we've got maybe four patients with a rare disease int he country, right? Yeah. Yeah. There's no real way of making that anonymous but yeah. No. I mean, that will form part of the literature which will be lovely. So, for the framework, as I go through that part, the way I'm approaching the reports is looking at socio-technical system and theory, that's self-defined as STS (science and technology studies). And really, I wasn't going to go into – you will probably get the idea of the concepts that will come to, the sort of regime landscapes, niches, configurations, and path dependency. It’s that idea that if a regime emerges round open access, and you take different configurations in different jurisdictions, working around policies. So, there may be one jurisdiction around in US - probably one of the UK - within that, you might get different niches. You might get one around the ESRC, you might get one around Wellcome, and these would be small networks, that sort of form an overarching regime, if you like - the grammar of the system. And sometimes it's not necessarily just a policy; the rules. It's also the institutional practices, how people go about doing them, and the path dependency followed that innovations pass along following earlier developments. So, a good example we talked about the NIH form Vannevar Bush, a very influential person, but this idea [he] forwarded that federal government should support basic science and that afterwards, applied version should be left here for markets, that was, rather than alternatives, later down the line we saw vaccines being developed. But so, funding the basic science, the application went to industry, and that's the path dependency. And that's the sort of basic framework I’m approaching data from. If anybody has any alternative ideas - please do bring up them, discuss them, everything is open to discussion.

So that's the framework. Then for the actual data. Obviously, the survey is, we’re not really interested in having statistical significance. It's not large enough, and that wasn't what we're interested in. It’s broad stroke, within just really in the free-text, sort of getting your idea what were the concerns, perceptions and challenges surrounding open research for qualitative researchers. And we are sort of finding is, there is a fairly even distribution over the range of people here. Early to mid-career, [almost] all of the research-intensive were Russell Group, which was quite surprising, and we had then by far the largest responders were mostly from London Yorkshire, and the Northeast. So, when we're looking at the data, there is a bias in there. It is really looking at researchers in midlife. For the most universities, you are based in London and Northern England. And whether that's represents the larger population of people who are interested in qualitative research, I don't know, but that's roughly where they're basis of some of the discussion and claims are coming up.

As we went through that, we still find that. Since asking people about their awareness of open research, qualitative was - it's mostly ‘unsure’ or ‘somewhat aware’ it's not parity. But it's the same with aware of open qualitative resources. And I wanted to expand on that, by examining what people’s thoughts and concerns were, so the by going through the survey and interviews we have some findings, and I’ve drafted these into statement for you to talk about or challenge, which I will cover as we go on. But first, should we take a short break?

## Break 1:

[No recording during break - from 11:00 to 11:20]

## Session 2: [start 11.20 – 40 minutes long]

[Recording error –– notes only]

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### Discussion of Statement 1:

**Statement:** There is a need for new guidance on making qualitative research open. It should encompass debates about flexibility for including different methods, approaches, and meta-data.

**Example quotes:**

Once you make your data open, you no longer have strict control… [Participants] might give consent to take part in the research that you're doing. But that might not necessarily mean they give consent to their data being used by other researchers for other purposes. (Jim)

Exist[s] in a kind of political economy [with a] hierarchy of what research methods are more important, and one of the things that I think weakens qualitative data collection in that hierarchy is its transparency…It's harder for us because of the nature of the data we've collected to be open about sharing that data… [That] leads us not to be open about how we're doing our analysis as well, which I think is really problematic…it also means that we maybe don't do enough about validation (Penni)

[Recording error –– notes only]

### ----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### Discussion of Statement 2:

**Statement:** There is a need for institutional change – both in existing practices and in the allocation of resources for making qualitative research open.

**Example quotes:**

**…***change publishing model so it doesn't cost £1,000's to publish open access (492V3998P45825QF)*

*…there is…extra funding to do fieldwork… extra funding for going on research visits, or institutional visits… extra funding for writing…. not extra funding for open source.’ (Ana)*

*...not outside my supervisors, and…that's overly encouraged…when they both instructed me through the ethics application, and* [at] *previous universities where they've encouraged how to search databases, and how to search for literature outside of that, I wouldn't say I've had any clear direction of how to make my actual research open access*’ *(Peter)*

*Just costing time into grants to enable researchers to prepare datasets and associated documentation as contract researchers are often already working to unrealistic timelines (874F8908K75524NE)*

*Junior researchers are working with more senior researchers who are not engaging with OS which is problematic for developing cultures for OS amongst new qual researchers. (742Q3026O13938LA)*

[Recording error –– notes only]

### ----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### Discussion of statement 3:

**Statement:** There is a lack of defining terms/processes around open qualitative data.

**Example quotes:**

…the poems I work [with] as data, but you know, like is that working with someone else's data when I, you know, if I cite a source - is that working with someone else's data? (Pauline)

…I interviewed…a musician [who] just uploads them on YouTube and people can, you know, listen to it. So that would be a form of making it open… I think that isn't enough guidelines on that… the university has like a data repository and there's a data management team, and they have guidelines on [uploading data] but that's mainly quantitative files…people in the arts and humanities don't really consider those things as data… the whole concept of open research needs then, a new vocabulary… It kind of started with STEM in mind, and I think it's still often STEM focussed. [It needs] to be more inclusive towards other art forms and other research formats. (Pauline)

I think there is still a lot of information missing on how to deal with specific examples/contexts where, for ethical reasons, it is not possible to share collected qualitative data. I also think that at the moment the focus is too much on applying traditionally quantitative focused Open Research standards on to the qualitative field, rather than focusing more on the specifics of qualitative research methods and qualitative data and looking at what would be appropriate Open Research principles and practices in relation to those in and of themselves. (836B5589A75903KC)

[Recording error –– notes only]

### ----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Lunch break:

[No recording during break - from 12:00 to 13:00]

### ----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Session 3 [start 13:02 – 1 hour, 1 minute, and 22 seconds long]

### Session opening:

**Researcher 2:** Obviously, if we finish a bit earlier that's good for everybody. So, I’ll move onto, I’ll jumps straight into a little recap of the first session on practicalities. We went over the first three statements. What we found was potentially, there is a need for a new language. A lot of debate around how to manage data – discussion was mostly about interviews were intrigued by different things. We found that this is pretty much a top-down push, so it's mandated. Yeah, And it's not necessarily something that is embedded in the process from PhD to early career onwards. It's not necessarily something that everybody sees the positive, or sees that'll be a smooth transition in their own private working practices, but that maybe captures anything that anybody else wants to pull up from the first half…

**Amy:** Just the discussion of research culture, which as you say, is generally part of that – that mandated.

**Ana:** Also, that they have to integrate all. Like they say excellence and then the whole research culture, and how so it is how then open research practices can be seen as part of a research culture.

**Researcher 2:** Brilliant, I'll jump onto the next one then, just like this. And it is a bit more of a fun session to be honest, and I’ve been through a bit of a recap, been through those three statements. Not sure why I set this slide up to be honest. In any case, we'll move on to the first of the three statements for session 2, okay?

### ----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### Discussion of Statement 4:

**Statement:** There a need for debate over the politics of making qualitative research open access.

***Example quotes:***

*waiving out copyright rights, it's not the way to go… I have to have the copyright, because otherwise I cannot publish… I don't agree with this [but]… Sometimes you have to go with it’ (Ana)*

‘*there's a real concern that it'll just be used for kind of extractive Big Data style analyses… [with] armchair researchers [who] basically treat fieldworkers like…data collection monkeys… subservient to these kind of bigger claims…open access is a pressure from people who actually don't conduct fieldwork… they want to be able to see what we're doing.’* (Jamie)*.*

*‘...political statements or actions, you know, could have negative effects on [participants] in the future [requiring] ongoing and dynamic conversations about the ethics of what of what that means… spoken scripts for [consent] that rather than signed forms…[because] there's a lot of anxiety around collecting written names on documents [following] a history of silence through governments.’ (Jamie)*

*If I was not at a well-funded research-intensive university, my knowledge of OA would be a lot less; there is a lack of general guidance or signposting to existing resources (371Y1446M52774IL).*

**Researcher 2:**

So - “*There is a need for debate over the politics of making qualitative research open access*”, which we have covered to some extent. So, some of the examples that led this being a statement involved concern over waiving out copyright, and whether that's the way to go. Sometimes it is mandated, simply because if you want to publish you have to go that way, and there's a sense that it's been pushed, being enforced rather than something that’s a decision. There's lots of real concern that I've used for kind of an extractive Big Data style analyses. And somebody searches who treats this qualitative field? Is this data collection monkeys and others who uses that if you like, build on that labour, this leads again. It's really notion of politics. And there's a passion from people who don't actually conduct field work that want to be able to see what we're doing. It's a sentiment of surveillance there. There's this political statement interactions such as negative effects in the participants in the future. that's interesting point in itself, in terms of what role was the researcher have in protecting a participant from harm. But what point does that become a point of contention? So, what, they suggest, here, Jamie from an interview, that doesn't see ethics as a static process. It doesn't seem static. It's something to know involving ingoing dialogue. It's a living, so, you can upload data on an open access basis, but it is living. And onto the ethics of what that means, and so some people would take spoken scripts for consent rather than signed forms in some parts and some situations where you take part of research. There's anxiety about collect9nbg written documents, especially if you're very longer and it places where there's a history of silence and the governments in the potential sense of danger.

The one is quite interesting. If I was not at a wealthy research-intensive university, my knowledge about, and time for research in open access would be a lot less. About that, I mean, there's a lack of guidance or signposts existing resources. So really, we’re talking about inequity it seems between institutions, we’re talking about and what level of protection of participant needs in terms of consent and if that can be seen as a dynamic process. So, should that be seen? Who does the maintenance, if a transcript is open – is it a static process where I take out the participant’s name and deposit it, and that's it, or should that be amendable in the future and how would the university control that formally. But it's a researchers’ responsibility. So, we’re dealing the sort of question of pulling out this really, a discussion of politics.

**Jim:** So, one thing that recently is, so is the, so last quote there is about inequity between universities. But I wonder of the whole push for open research and open access could be prejudicial to certain types of researchers, and create an enmity between different kinds of researcher. So, I know, for example, UKRN are currently looking at metrics for open research indictors, and they are looking at a suite of indicators, I think for example, something that universities can use to sort of, benchmark, their open research environment. But, as we sort of touched on this morning, I feel like open research and open data is perhaps a more challenging thing to do for a qualitative researcher. So therefore, these kind of open research indicators potentially, if they're not developed appropriately, they could be prejudicial to them. So, they could end up leading potentially to inequities between different researchers

**Jenni:** That, for me, goes back to, remembering Amy's point about precarity and how some researchers having the privilege of doing open research and others absolutely not.

**Jim**; Absolutely, yeah.

**Amy:** And I think, certainly, it feels dominated by quantitative research. You do get kind of like, a misunderstanding of qualitative, who have to defend their methods and themselves as a methodologist, and that is still being said to qualitative researchers. It’s, so the value of qualitative research as a particular skill set is still kind of being undermined, and if you have this kind of metric where it's the same…

**Jenni:** I agree:

**Martin:** Hmm. When anything is metricised, metricised, or whatever the terminology is, there’s a danger of it being used as a crude measure. Isn't there? And so, and measuring the openness of something is just as likely to be used as a crude measure as the impact factor of a journal.

**Ana:** Like we discussed in the morning, in arts and humanities, and even the social sciences, maybe, people keep thinking you are going to [poor recording] I mean, apart fromopen access, you know, publishing I don't know.

**Amy:** Yeah, across disciplines.

**Ana:** …and more the politics of it. I think that what I was trying to say that you, it was more like, how about the default - this copyrighting that I have just signed? So, I don't know – I am here at a workshop working on open research and I just assign the copyright to University of Sheffield, but I come from copyleft culture, so to me it is still a little bit problematic. Then you need it because you cannot apply for creative commons if there is no copyright, but at the same it circles again to controlling the protection, and I think that we need to shift in what does it mean protection? Not only excellence but also protection. And I think that the idea that the more we're restricted, and the more sense of something is more effective, could be a contrary argument that the idea that our communities about So what to do, from individual protection between community-based protection. So how can we be sure that someone is not now using a data is because the base epistemic community that is going to take care that, this is, yeah, to me I find it problematic also, because I work on design issues and there copyright is followed.

**Jenni:** We do have this emerging discourse on rights retention, particularly around publications, which is this kind of saying you can publish my work - publisher, but I retain the right - which means that I can then have control how I decided to share it. So I guess it's not holding on to the right for the purpose of kind of opening them up.

**Martin:** Well, I mean, which the top motion seems to be in that kind of space, isn't that, that waiting copyright? So, I have to say I get enormously frustrated by this because too many academics behave as though they're self-employed. You just think a university is paying you're an employee of a university, and according to copyright law, when you can conduct creative work, when you're employed, your employer owns the copyright of that work. That's a really clear legal situation. Although there is custom and practice in universities that has been allowing people to dispose of copyright the way that they see fit. That's custom and practice. The legal situation is fairly clear. If you're employed and conduct work in the course of your employment, the copyright lies with your employer, and yet too many academics behave as though they're self-employed people that don't have responsibilities to anybody else. Their work is funded by the for-reasons to disseminate their work. and their gonna think they own the copyright. I find it enormously frustrating and what gives them the right to think [that]? They're paid by public money, that they then have a right to?

**Ana:** But I will challenge you there, but if you're independent, yeah, then the University doesn't have the copyright then it should be the Creative Commons or a public domain before.

**Martin:** Yeah, the legal situation is your employer owners of copyright. But then there was the dimension that your employer itself funded by public funds or at least your research is. So, I think there is an obligation on the part of researchers. If you like to and make their work public because they are funded by the public to do the work, they did.

**Jim:** I guess a lot, **l**ots of research, especially now with the move towards, cross-disciplinary a lot of research will get done between university people and non-university people. How does that then? Or that PhD students are they?

**Martin:** Students are different. I don't know what the legal definition that they provide, might be different for students, generally and their own copyrights, and that's maybe got some kind of other legal dimension to it.

**Ana:** So that's, this was so similar to do that instead with a couple of actions. This is not like you're doing an interview. It's only, and then someone else waives the copyright to the university. These people are not employed by the university, they're probably not going to be paid to be there. They're doing it which is, the only reason they're doing it is they're good people. They believe the researchers are also working for the common good. People are doing research because they think they are contributing to something that is bigger than them, but then the university asks that they wave their rights to the university. The kind of so it raises the whole interesting.

**Martin:** So it raises a whole interesting question, I think. Which is the extent to which if you're collecting data and the extent to which that participant should have the right and can practically have the right or to control that data in some kind of way. Because there is an argument that says, once you've given that data on the understanding that it will be used for research, then that data has a life of its own and you don't have any more control. It's one position. Another is, you should have control every step of how that data is used, because it's your data, in the sense that you've given it up. And I think some of these comments relate to different notions of the participants’ rights in terms of the ongoing rights - in terms of the data that they've submitted basically.

**Researcher 2:** So, just to step back and think for a moment, to separate out the data and analysis completely, should the analysis be made open?

**Researcher 1:** I have a comment from one of the interviews I made with a researcher working in a research agency – a non- academic, and [they were] telling me that they didn't close that to the client, which would be the owner. I mean, they only give them the final results, yes. But that, they like the agency keeps the data unless the client makes a good case of why they want to have the data that they have. The agent has to anonymise the information because that's it, but the claim is not the only way of, you know, so maybe it could be applicable to the university.

**Researcher 2:** So, a bit like IT, you sell the product but keep the source code.

**Researcher 1:** Exactly. Yeah.

**Jenni:** I think as well, there is the question of whether qualitative data is more co-produced than quantitative things, so whether the subject of the data actually has, or should have, some kind of ownership.

**Researcher 2:** I mean, it's, one of the projects I work on deals with pharmaceutical companies, so I’d rather pass that over to the University as data controller to keep me safe. But there are other projects where I deal with rare disease patients, and I feel like I don't know what's gonna happen with the data, so I'd rather safeguard them as well as I can. It's different hats to wear, and I'm just wondering how we can negotiate that.

**Martin:** That third quotation there implies that some negative effects could be ? on the participants, and that implies that they are identifiable, or at least the group is identifiable from which they come. And that seems to me to be a particular instance. There may be many examples where there couldn't be any negative consequences for the individual because they're not possibly identifiable. So how could they experience negative consequence?

**Researcher 2:** Yeah, I think this is in a particular context, where there is strong history of social surveillance. And writing any comment that might be perceived as being negative towards the state can have repercussions not just for them, but their entire family. So, a lot of people will give verbal or consent, or a head-nod - as you would with a photographer or journalist, but they will not be written down the documents or anything recorded.

**Martin:** So that's one I very strong ground for saying we don't share the data, because if you are exposing groups of people, even if individuals are not identifiable, seeing negative consequences, but the research is still really important to get out there and for those voices to be heard, just have to say that's an instance where we don't share the data, full stop. It's a good ethical ground for not doing it. That's safeguarding is there to protect.

**Researcher 2:** Yep, yeah. And what, well we've been through this a bit, and thinking that these three [statements] so in n this part it’s about the connection and qualitative research being made opens a form of, if you like, extractive where we have these secondary researchers who kind of sit back and yield the fruits of your labour.

**Jenni:** It feels like there's something interesting going on that in terms of power relationships between different groups of researchers, and this data collection monkeys is kind of like as if the people that perhaps should be beneath you in a hierarchy might treat you like you are beneath them, and the kind of outrage of that possibly.

**Martin:** I’m, yeah, there are lots of layers here?, who are you attempting to protect the data from? Is it other researchers who perform other kinds of analysis on your dataset? So, they might perform a quantitative analysis on a large corpus of qualitative data, if that's not the kind of thing you do, surely, you would say ‘go ahead’, it gives a new insight gives It does something different, Why would you object that? And to say, they're sitting around waiting for me to gather my data and then they do have an easy job of it, which is the implication. but they have to set up all sorts of algorithmic type analysis that actually is beyond probably the competence of the person who's saying this - but it's a different expertise. Why would you not welcome that?

**Jenni:** I guess the distinction is in what [name redacted] was talking about before, about the contextualisation of qualitative data, they are treating this as decontextualized, whereas if it's number of people.

**Martin:** But that’s then a question of the validity of different methodological approaches. Yeah, and then it depends on how that large-scale data analysis is constructed. The design of it. Yeah. And extend to which it takes account of the possibility of different contexts and how it deals with that. So, I agree, it's a concern, but you could imagine certain things with the right caveats, and provisos in place that it could be welcome. So it’s, I realise it's a concern, but if you like, it's, I would say the principle as researchers, we ought to welcome secondary analysis on data we have collected, and particularly if it uses methods or asks questions that we're not asking of that data, because that's one of the points, isn’t it, that you can get something different from it.

**Jenni:** I think you’re right. It's not an open sciencequestion. It's a good science, bad science question.

**Martin:** Yeah, yeah. That's right.

[undecipherable recording]

**Researcher 2:** I’m just thinking, if you’ve got a lot of medical notes, you could call that a corpus, and you do a meta-analysis of thousands of patient records, and I don't know if they're talking about that…

**Martin:** But that's exactly the sort of thing, when new causes of certain medical conditions can be identified through massive analysis of that kind, you could never do by eye.

**Ana:** But not many medical humanities have done that for sure, and many good reasons, right?

**Martin:** So, it is a little bit of a strange argument to say ‘I won’t share my data because somebody may misuse it’. Right, yeah, okay, that's true, but all of our institutions have in place mechanisms and safeguards for research that support research integrity, and we're not doing a job of policing our research colleagues I guess you say some kind of anti-climate change nut might misuse it. That's true. But it's better, I would say, just to be able to say the data is there, you're misinterpreting it by making it clear, how they are misinterpreting it rather than it being behind closed doors where it depends who you believe.

**Amy:** And in a way this brings it back to precarious employment. The risks, the trauma and the emotional labour of fieldwork that people conduct in certain kinds of, to be able to be, there's got, there is a whole network of people working on all kind of research, and your wellbeing - because when you research something like inequalities or gender-based violence, your researchers go through so much and then nobody employs them after that. And then their data sits online and somebody else harvests it, and you can see that they could feel bitter about that. But bitter because the structure does actually treat some field workers like they are disposable. And it harms them through that process. And then, if the only thing we have to show for at the end is the data. That's their kind of asset that they could use. And it has to go elsewhere, or it has to be put online, then that could feel like something you would feel very negative about.

**Jenni:** And also the opposite, that in the act of showing that data you would have a doi to that data, it's one of your outputs, and it's kind of showing in all your other outputs.

**Amy:** Yeah, maybe it's that perspective that people think it's gone. Yeah, it's out there in the ether and it's not theirs anymore and they don't see it kind of retaining that traceable doi, they feel like they can follow.

**Ana:** Because, I think if people want to be out doing fieldwork, yeah, and on something because there's nothing better than secondary research I've only read, so it's like another, terrible task that I have to, to make it reusable. As you said, probably because some aspects of your relationship has been destroyed. Yeah.

**Amy:** So that's how it is framing this, yeah.

**Jim:** So, I see sort of, I get two things from that statement. So, the first is you get sense that the personal saying this feels like that process and gathering that data isn't recognized effectively. And that is something that we, to like, we need to make more of open dataset, their doi, but maybe that we need to make more of that you collecting the data is a thing in itself. It's not just that many sort of research output, but for doing that process, you should get equally acknowledged for doing the research as the paper that comes at the end of it. But then it’s the last bit, where they want to be able to see what we do. For me, that is kind of like, well yeah, that almost, it is like – yeah, that like the point. I get the trepidation. You get that with any research you do, you put the data out there andyou worry about is it correct? But that is the point of doing it.

**Amy:** Yeah, we had a seminar at [University name redacted] on imposter syndrome and it was our biggest internal seminar ever. The tickets on Eventbrite just went [redacted sentence] and I think that's it, and it wasn't necessarily with everybody always feeling like somebody is looking over their shoulder, waiting to be found out, and I think even though we can say we don't look to undermine~~s~~ people’s methods, my interpretation is that it's seem to be a thing in academia where everybody feels like they have somebody looking over their shoulder, and feeling exposed.

**Researcher 2:** I think one of the things about, you asked about [was] should you share the analysis? I guess, it's a question of what you mean by that? Because arguably, you shared analysis in the published outputs like a journal article, where you maybe identifying major themes. and that's the basis on which others could check your work I guess, whether they agree with your analysis, in that case you could share more detailed analysis of the sort of in-between states, like your NVivo file or whatever, and whether that's necessary or not, I'm not sure…and just the politics around that, because with the university, if I was to upload that to ORDA for example, but not the transcripts, right? But that’s now how it works, but then the analytical process is largely internal. It's getting this, that's really to understand my working out. It's how to communicate what's going in my head in my interpretation, and that's one of the challenges. I don't know if it's just one of the issues for qualitative research in general outside of open access, if you know…

**Amy:** it's like, I see so many reports that say like ‘doo, doo, doo, thematic analysis, so many interviews…’, and that’s it, and methods is like four lines. And, actually it was messy, and it went wrong, and it did this, it did that. But journals don't really want that. They just want to get through methods unless it’s a methods paper.

**Jim:** For me that’s where peer-review has gone wrong. If I saw a paper like that, I’d ask for more detail own hat you’re doing, but I guess that’s something you must do for different peer-review.

### ----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### Discussion of Statement 5:

**Statement:** There a need for theoretical debate over the epistemics of making qualitative research open access

***Example quotes:***

***…****the important thing from my perspective is the not necessarily the raw transcript* [but] *the coding method that I am using - the open transcript… if I just put the raw data in without the code, I think you, effectively you'd have a lock without the key*’ (Peter)

*…the kind of analysis you can do with an open access qualitative data set probably wouldn't do justice to the original collection method. Yet* [in] *anthropology, that kind of comparativist approach is quite popular…[Y]ou were the person that was there… epistemically, you're in a standpoint that has to be respected if you're aiming for interpretive analysis…qualitative open access puts you in a sort of weird spiral of legitimacy… tension between [being open] and making the process too anonymous…you need that extra level of data and detail to make the research usable. (Jamie)*

**Researcher 2:** Enjoyable, yeah, so in moving onto the next set statements then and next one. The need for theoretical debate over the epistemics is making qualitative research open. So, what one person said was the important thing from their perspective was not necessarily the raw transcript, but the coding method. And I guess that if you have the raw data without the code, then effectively you have a lock without the key. We touched on this in the last statement a little, is and love this term spiral of legitimacy, but you have this kind of anthropology and ethnographic immersion what you have is a comparative approach. That's a tradition where the originally supposed during the standpoint, it has to be respected as an activity. And you as the researcher if you anything to… And where they see this sort of tension, thus spiral of legitimacy, is between being open and making the process anonymous. So, let's see a sort of antimony in finding balance between making everything open - the whole process and not just the transcript analysis, everything and maintaining anonymity. With that, they are asking do you actually need that level of detail to make the research useful? I mean do I am reading this myself. It's not necessarily about the anonymity of individuals would have knowledge of a subject, but it could be a town, could be organization, otherwise in that way. What do you think about that? And in terms of whether you agree or disagree with the lock and key metaphor?

**Martin:** I have to confess Jamie is irritating me slightly. It's like, that's because it seems to me - that middle bit that is highlighted is: ‘Trust me, I'm a researcher’.

**Jenni:** I was thinking about that sentence as well. You were the person that was there, epistemically your standpoint has to be valid. Is that saying that the person who is the researchers is the guarantee or guarantor all of the data slash analysis slash study. And that if you disassociate the data from that context, that the immediate part of that person data goes off into the world, it then would lose meaning, it's an ambiguous sentence that one.

**Researcher 1:** Apologies. Yeah, I think it was because Jamie works in a very specific context, and with very easily identifiable groups in this place where they can be persecuted. So, he said that he has had to hold back a bit of the contextual information about that place, and that was his fear of putting it out there and without giving any context of what the person was going through and what was it going, all the general conditions, and that the data made available would be misinterpreted.

**Martin:**  So, I absolutely do understand that. So, we're looking at these - and that context is really helpful, because otherwise they can be read as more generalised statements. like ‘I would protect my research and you should trust me because I did it’, you know what I mean. And I just think that this is the whole point of this, that what it does is it exposes your analysis to scrutiny of others who can bring other things to it. And for them to actually be able to say, as part of the scholarly discourse, hold on - I don't think you're interpreting this correctly. I think you've actually misinterpreted your participants’, and it's possible to say that only when you can look at the data, and otherwise you have to take it on trust.

**Ana:** But I think there's something on, because they are working in anthropology, and you are taking, how to say, you are taking whatever your reading is like when you are here. But then, when you are there in a particular situation, and something that happened before, something that happened after, and the people are expressing in a certain way, and maybe they say something in a way that made you feel ‘hah, this is really **i**mportant for this person’. if you have, this is the problem.

**Martin:** Yes. Yeah, yeah, you need that background information.

**Ana:** What kind of story they wanted to do…[undecipherable] so unless you were there in an immersive recording for three months watching the research yourself, and then decide if they are right, I think that I'm talking for myself, It wasn't not to make everything available and transparent and shared elements, if you think about them. So that someone understands the context, because honestly whenever we do an interview there's so many things are senses, like where people are situated, how they have been spoken in the group. I don’t know, a lot of things, and you have to spell all of them out.

**Martin:** I believe you’re right, now for you that's probably the point of all the analysis, you present to say that you do the contextualization, and you justify the interpretation partly based on…

**Ana:** I know. But then you have to say, I've got this interview, I thought these words and these things are going on because this time. It's life. I don't know. Too many variables, you cannot reduce it to one or two words or to words of description or pictures of the earth, the environment, so again it is so funny that it's true. That's again what I'm saying. But qualitative needs and maybe this is more of what the interview was saying is that qualitative needs another kind of assessment, for sure. For all the people to be useful of what is. So, making your data shared is kind of an outcome. I like, your whole…

**Jenni:** Original output?

**Ana:** Not original output, but communication of the stuff. So, there is enough communication of output that I'm going to share with people, because they will help to understand what I'm doing. But maybe the applicability as such is not something that we sell.

**Martin:** It's interesting, that raises a methodological issue, doesn't it? Because for example, one approach, one methodological kind of frame that many people use in the qualitative area is grounded theory, and that according to whichever school of thought, you follow is generally thought to be conducted inductively, right? Which means you jettison a lot of your pre-suppositions and you try to focus on the data. Now many people are, they argue, I see that used an excuse by students. All right, I didn't do a very good literature review or something like that because it’s grounded theory. But anyway, the point of the thing is that there are some methods actually say you should be able to analyse the data, and if you remove yourself from all of these, presuppositions or prejudices you’re bringing today and just look at the data inductively. That's certainly not possibly in the second quotation is it, because he's arguing that context is absolutely fundamental to any kind of understanding.

**Ana:** I think that's the problem, you've got to assume that there's something such as an objective data that you can see with objective, specifically. I mean maybe someone is good, but you said there are different. Also, it’s not just about being there, but also becomes part of you, yeah.

**Jim:** But for me a big part of openness is not just allowing other people to use your information but it’s rigour, it’s also about quality, this idea of research excellence. So, like, for me, making my data open and being transparent in my methods, is all part of the process of trying to show that I've done a rigorous piece of excellent research. So as a qualitative researcher, how can you show that? What would rigour look like, what would research excellence look like from a qualitative researcher, what would have somebody else come along and say ‘yeah, you have, you know, done a good piece of research there’. Because if they can't be transparent about the data and the methods, whatever else can we do?

**Jenni:** I guess the question is do we need to find ways of protecting things that can’t be quantified if rigour tends towards the quantified? We don't want to shift the focus just into what can be quantified about research in this way, you know, what is lost on capturing what is not quantifiable? And kind of bringing that into a kind of framework of rigour, or something that people can think about different.

**Jim:** Yeah, and this is the thing for me. People talk about qualitative and quantitative research. Probably very different principles of open research, and I think it's from one of the previous slides about how one respondent said it felt like open research principles were developed around quantitative research and that they can't be applied, is important. And that was where a lot of the concepts probably don't apply; replicability doesn’t really make sense with a lot of qualitative research, you know. It’s almost like a research tool, and that, it's kind of subjective to interpret that isn't it.

**Martin:** So, it does seem to me that does go back to the whole question of what constitutes reliability or credibility, whatever you choose to call it in qualitative research, and people have really difficulties about that. And some of the more positivist end, and then that say if I gather a data set and interpret it, somebody else should be able to reproduce that, more or less reproduce that. Other people say, subjectivity and positionality of the researcher are such that you couldn’t possibly do that, and even trying to do it is nonsensical with qualitative analysis. And generally speaking, the people who are more in favour of openness, in my experience, tend to be at the more positivist end because they use concepts like reliability and reproducibility as grounds for sharing, and people are more reluctant - this is a bit of a generalization - but tend to be in the more constructionist or interpretivist end, because they say my subjectivity is part of this research. I think it's quite interesting, whether you can have a highly subjectivist position, but still be in favour of openness, or whether it does tend to be at the more positivist end. .

**Ana:** But I think that that's also, again, I think what do we expect out of this? Why are we doing it? Why are we doing open research? Is it because we were looking for reproducibility, or because we think that what we are producing might have outcomes, and so there might be something of interest there, and we want to tell part of the story. This is not like the whole thing, you are not going to be able to know by this transcript, by this poem, or by this thought that I had, you're not going to be able to replicate it exactly, but it can help you understand better if you have at least this particular thing, and then move on to use it for your own in whatever you want. I think that that is. And this is a difference between you being protective, and then saying that this thing is protected, because I'm thinking that we're building community, there's something different.

### ----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### Discussion of Statement 6:

**Statement:** There is a need for a new language surrounding open qualitative research.

***Example quotes:***

*….the whole concept of open research needs then, a new vocabulary… It kind of started with STEM in mind, and I think it's still often STEM focussed. [It needs] to be more inclusive towards other art forms and other research formats. (Pauline)* [Repeated from session 1]

*…qualitative data is contextual and relies on craft. I do not believe that others, who are less skilled, will be able to yield the kind of rich interviews I have based solely on the instrument of data collection (i.e., my interview guide). A lot of demands for open qualitative data sets seem to ignore the skill in collecting high quality qualitative data…a highly skilled ethnographer and a novice [will] yield entirely different data which shapes the social analysis done… [opens] discussion about the links of methodology and epistemology which the open qualitative discourse seems to miss out on. (409B3586F50021UF)*

**Researcher 2:** Brilliant. So, I'm gonna go into the next one. We’re making good time actually. The last statement, which is this one – and this goes back to an original point and repeated poorly again, the whole concept, both from research into a new vocabulary, that stuck out to me on the transcripts and doing analysis. With a chance to think about that, I think the language seems to focus, for lots of people we’ve interviewed. It needs to be more inclusive towards other art forms and other research formats, so that can include anthropological field notes, art, poems, film, and how we work around that is a good question. Something we need to work on, and what is qualitative data? As we've said, it is contextual, it does rely on a craft and give it to craft over the design. And I don't believe that others were less skilled, will be able to yield the same kind of rich interviews I have based face solely on interesting to data collection. So, the thing is a skilled craft, almost like the journeyman going through three masters and then getting to the end of the guild hood into research institutes. Suddenly, they're not licensed - that research and there's a lot of demands for open qualitative datasets seems to ignore the skill in collecting them. So, yeah, an ethnographer, a novice might yield entirely different data, which shapes social analyses. So that's the sort of levels of experience as well. And how you make that open? It's one for discussion as well, but sort of has been working through one of these we’ve been playing with this concept of re-renderable. So, in this sort of STEM, you have replicable, the same approach and methods getting to the same results would be reproducible, different methods or approach instead, but the same results would be reproducible. Re-renderable is about data, but more about detail – so some detail on analysis and context and researcher positionality. **I**t's not about making everything reproducible. It's more about making sure that the claims that are made of basis of the research be transparent and fairly evaluated. And so, playing with that, and throwing it out there to see what people think.

**Martin:** I think that's something, that is really interesting idea. And I think it does sit, instinctively it does seem to represent the qualitative area better than replicability but it might be an immediate reaction to it, but just while I think about it, just a question about that second quotation. I was just kind of running that in, I was doing a flip-flop test in the sense of, once again, I can even imagine a quantitative researcher saying 10, 15 years ago, ‘all this demand for data sharing underestimates the skill and the cost of all these lab technicians and all this equipment that I have to have in place to gather my data and then I'm asking me just share it with who knows who it's completely. It underestimates by skill as a scientist as a PI’ and all that kind of stuff. I can just imagine them saying this is the qualitative version of it, isn't it? And does it have more validity to say I shouldn’t share because I'm very skilled person. I'm not sure it holds water.

**Researcher 2:** So, it’s almost like a squirrel hoarding rather than...?

**Martin:** I think it's a tendency there, that we all have, right. Data mining is ‘what's mine is mine, what's yours is mine’ and that's the way we all like to think about it.

**Ana:** I think it’s interesting when you combine it with the first. You know. I think the moment you apply it to qualitative research and open research it is the same as 1, 2, 3, 4, STEM thing, and there is the conflict because there are two ways of, I don't know, being open. So, I would say I agree with what the second part says, and at the same time I agree that we should be open. So, it's true. And it's true of course that a novice will make a different analysis than you, but that's good. Maybe it was not so interesting in the first place or whatever, or the second is more, up to heights and are providing a fresh eyes to this problematic, but they still have the problem how are we going to define? What is that about this data or analysis is?

**Jenni:** I think this is something that I've been thinking about quite a bit because I'm designing a workshop that some people here will be involved with, about redefining open research and the values underneath it. And I think we need to find a way to disrupt our thoughts efficiently that we can begin to conceive it as from first principles. But it's just what form does that disruption need to take, but it's like jolting yourself out of that mindset/position.

**Ana:** Yeah, but then it still feels very much like the fact that I am a skilled with, and nobody will be better…

**Researcher 1**: And I think that this comes up a lot in feminist research, depending on your position you have access to different information as experience population groups, and it's not only matter of skills, but it’s also a matter of how you are embodied in the field and maybe that's also something that it needs to be a put out there, doing open research. You also need this detail because they affect the quality of the things that the groups you have access to, and also your positionality, because at the end of the day, those biases shape the analysis and the outputs. And I guess putting them out there, it's, it makes the research re-renderable and increases transparency and enables it to be fairly evaluated. And also, it gives chance to other researchers to understand how you came up to those conclusions. But that's also a lot of work.

**Jenni:** I think that's really crucial, that positionality is aspect in transparency. Yeah. And this is one of the ways in which I think a discussion about non-quantitative research can reflect about usefully for quantitative researchers, maybe the notion of positionalities is nowhere, but it is relevant.

**Researcher 2:** And maybe not just positionality, but context as well, and how you are making that transparent, if you think of somebody fantastic like Donna Haraway, I don't know the way then maybe the quality of their research should be far higher than a novice, having been taught a few lessons in humilities over their lifetime. But in terms of making the very quality of the research open, its researcher skill. And rather than it just being a name of the individual of internal orthodoxies. If it was, making that transparent, not within the open dataset necessarily, but within the projects as a the whole, then maybe…

**Martin:** …the interesting thing about that quote is that it's basically saying that the quality and rigor of the data gathering it's not sufficiently valued. Is that basically, and actually, you might say. Yeah, we agree with that. The community ought to value the quality of the dataset, not just the acumen that's derived from it. So you're right, in observing that, but this is not a problem with openness. In fact, you could argue that openness could even be that it highlights the quality of the dataset because it makes it available to other people who can see that it's been gathered in a rigorous way. But the point is that ought to be, in fact, you've done that a little bit, you can reuse it because it's such a good data, set ought to be something we value, not something that's grounds for you to say ‘I’m gonna keep it to myself’. But that's what I would argue ,that in some ways. I agree with the premise that it's insufficiently valued, but then the action from it is the opposite. It's to actually say let's share it. It's such a great dataset.

**Ana:** …but then, it’s like, I have an open dataset. I have an article, but your article gets cited, and your data doesn't get cited because nobody is reusing qualitative data. Yeah, so this is a problem. I think honestly, I am more, it is important that we have got a problem not of qualitative sharing, but of qualitative data usage.

**Researcher 2:** Because if people can see if I put this out in my profile, so I get more points. and I think because people recognise that I found these, and then they put it.

**Amy:** Then, you get lots of people using your data, that's great. Your university the provides a metric of reward based on people using your data, and your rare conditions never get any reward for metrics.

**Jim:** Do you know any publications that used qualitative data in a secondary way instead of use existing content data and have then published on it. Because obviously there's lots on quantitative research, it's dead easy to go out and find a quantitative dataset and probably published from that after marking numerous of my own papers, they'll just use existing data set that I don't need to go and collect data for. But I’m wondering if I would get something like that published, where I use data collected by whoever?

**Amy:** Yes, there are secondary data reuse, that's increasingly, yeah, it's not uncommon, it's not common. And you also wonder, if you had to go and do an ethnography for six months in one location, and then write up six months of fieldnotes, and then you finally get it all together and you release it, somebody takes it and just published form your research, would you feel bitter? After you've lived in the jungle for six months gaining access to something really hard to?

**Ana:** Either you give away all your rights or you have control of every step, either you don't use that or do you could say, Okay, I'm doing this research, for example, me, I'm doing this, just for myself. Really. Honestly, how many people out there have been living interviews? The same people that have Palms. We'll have access to these interviews. No. But that's part of my place, is I could say - these are the interviews that he, but I use these secondary sources. This is a quote that I find very interesting, but look, they said one year ago, they have changed their minds, Or these people is saying this because I interviewed these guys, I have read this on the ten interviews and some of the people say, some of the things so I could quote the data, not work on the type of producer that's a secondary but this is what I'm not doing it first. I don't think this is something a journal would publish, and even if they were I don’t know how to find them. I look for them, I can’t find any. But this could be done. This is a little thing is the same way as you put in an article, you don't go and take a whole new article based on an existing article, but you could add. Yeah, that I would have been pictures. my dataset, but not better.

**Researcher 2:** Just looking at, is it not almost thought that the value that you bring as a qualitative researcher is in that the skill that they're talking about, so if that's your skillset, that's your value that you bring to the research process, then why would you not then go and collect that date yourself rather than just using the data somebody else has already collected? But as a quantitative researcher my skills are within crunching numbers I suppose. So, I’m not sure I care too much where those numbers come from and so it comes from somebody else, or I can cut them myself, but for me it's that what they then tell you? So, I'm not necessarily through, by designing an experiment and that sort of thing. But I kind of do take that point that they are bringing skills to be able to gather that way. So, I guess, I can see it from their point, where they might be saying just might be making my data open and somebody else can use that. I'm not able to show my value through that, if like, I was going use somebody else’s secondary data.

**Jenni:** It feels like as well, that it is to so with instrumentalizing the research, that it's like taking it out of the context of the human process that’s created it, so like here’s the value, I snatch it up and I run off with it. It's like, I create something else. Whereas it's not an object of exchange, it’s value is a human value that extends into those processes of craft and things…

**Amy:** A lot of these people who were talking about skill set and research, it feels like they're coming from a defensive position.

**Martin:** Yeah. Yes. I wonder if one really helpful thing would be to have more kind of use-case. I know, I'm just doing it kind of a quick, search of articles out there about reuse of qualitative data [gestures to mobile phone] and there are quite a few, but it's quite clear, it's still a rare thing. And I wonder if there's more of a case to be made, for actually, qualitative researchers, when they're gathering their data. Almost like building the possibility, encouraging reuse into the way that they present that data, and actually going out marketing their datasets. So, you reuse this, it's really valuable stuff, not to just be stored somewhere and nobody ever looks at again. We don't have that sense of encouraging reuse like that, we've got the answer.

**Jenni:** But, I think you'll published article is you advertising your data, like here it is come and get it.

**Martin:** Yeah, yeah, but at the moment it's done like, here’s my article, if you must you can do something, but I don't really want you to! At the moment it's not usually something you usually give access to.

**Researcher 2:** So that’s quite interesting, about valuing open access but not wanting to do it, so it almost needs some sort of platform or some way of bringing those together. that's maybe outside academia, so where do you then have that – that sits on a laptop there, or in somebody's notes there, and those things quite interesting. But said we would finish a little bit early, so I just wanted throw around this idea of re-renderability again and see what your thoughts are on that. Does it fit, does it not, and feel to challenge it, but then putting that into perspective, I com at his as a bit of a visual sociologist, where you put your work in progress up for critique. This is work in progressive. Feel free to rip into it, or disagree, or just what do you think the concept?

**Jenni:** Is this your concept Matthew [Researcher 2]? It’s just that I haven’t come across it.

**Researcher 2:** Well, so, in one of the interviews, one of the people interviewed mentioned render and it stuck out, and when think about, render, I think of that stuff on the front of the house, and when I look it in the dictionary I thought, no actually you can use it to boiling down fat. It's also the term, does tend to be used for rendering something visible, or traditional if you think of reading, writing, and arithmetic there was also wroughting – so when you think if like that it is also about making something understandable and legible, and you can see that. Does that make sense I mean, I haven’t done a search on the term yet, and I imagine there it has been used in places – I doubt I will have pulled it out of anywhere. But yeah, it's not something I've taken from any other work.

**Martin:** Hmm, it’s a nice idea. And when I think about does a web page render for example, which is about how all the code comes together to present something that is recognisable to an audience, and there you're saying could somebody else do the same, in effect, make it recognisable to somebody else. So that's, I think that's quite nice. A lot of qualitative research. The idea replicability is really problematic, because you know, there you'd say exactly the same data set, somebody else will perform exactly the same analysis on it and I don't ever think that's possible. It's like saying that somebody else would from a completely different perspective would choose to identify exactly the same categories. I don't think that makes sense for a lot of qualitative analysis, but the question is are you being fair to your participants on the data? Are you correctly interpreting and inferring from the data certain interpretations - that can be tested and challenge differently if you're being unfair to your participants for example.

**Jim:** So, I mean, certainly for replicable, maybe less for reproducible, but there certainly should be a yes or no answer to that, your research can either be replicated or it cannot. Reproducibility, I'm not so sure. I think there it depends on how you are measuring whether these work gets reproduced or not. And what would re-renderable have like a yes or no answer to it, like how would you – this is me coming at this as a quantitative researcher! – how would you measure re-renderability itself pretty successfully?

**Jenni:** Does a qualitative researcher want to give you a ‘yes’ / ‘no’ answer. I mean it seems like the answer is going to be yes the sense of X, and no in the sense of …So I don't think it has to have a yes/no answer to be a valid question.

**Jim:** Yea, yeah, no, I just mean, I’m just thinking through how it…

**Ana:** I think we could maybe agree that in qualitative, we can’t think in terms of reproducibility, so like with reproducibility and replicability once you date the data out of the question, and maybe not a lot of others, but we are talking really about reuse. What happens when somebody makes reuse of something I have produced. But I find it more interesting in relation to reuse, because its maybe this data is not there to be reused as data, maybe this data have become something else. I published open, and then the data has produced something that had made the researcher re-renderable, and not reproducibility and replicability, because that’s the problem. If you think of data and doing analysis, but it something more about what can be done with the data.

**Jenni:** Maybe it’s something were getting to, maybe it's those whole three things that's what the data is in the context of quality, and qualitative is the story and the content. Yeah.

**Martin:** One of the things about qualitative research, it seems to me though, is which is unlike quantitative at least to assess a sentence is that you can use on your data potentially different theoretical lenses, right? And in that case, if you use a radical feminist lens on a dataset, and somebody else uses a Marxist lens on it, there may well be some overlap in terms of the analysis and the results, but there’s going to be also divergence because your priorities are different, the way in which the perspective you're bringing to the data is different. Now is that a problem? I would say it's not, because it's bringing something new out of the data, and then it's also part of the scholarly conversation. Other people can look at it and challenge the way you've done it. That's one of the points of it, so we shouldn't assume that you're always going to get the same results out of the dataset, to me, and I think it can be used with different purposes and with different lenses and that's the value.

**Jenni:** But I think the point is, your Marxist should be able to read the radical feminist analysis, and I see ‘oh this is from a radical feminist perspective’ and follow it…

**Martin:** And to challenge it – the other way around, say this is not a valid interpretation of data and say why, and yeah, I agree, but I think that's part of the discourse that we value. And now we've ought to value that debate and discussion.

**Jim:** Yeah, I think, that is why I do like that renderability idea, because that's about allowing somebody else to see how you've got to where you got to, whether they gave that or not, but they can see how you've done it. It's like you've rendered it to them. So yeah.

**Martin:** I like that, that is a very good description, isn't it, of what renderability is? So everybody can see how you got to where you've got. Yeah.

**Researcher 2:** Sort of a little bit like back in school. They made me show my working out in maths, and then described why I did so horribly!

### ----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### Summary and close of session

**Researcher 2:** So, it’s about time, because I did say we would finish a little bit early. But before I close up, is there anything anybody wanted to add, or say, and burning lats minute things, or any comments or questions?

**Jim:** I've really enjoyed the discussions, just sit down for a few hours and talk this through.

**Jenni:** It feels quite so refreshing, to be able to have this conversation.

**Researcher 2:** Yeah, yeah, I agree.

**Jim:** So, what’s your, what do you see happening next?

**Researcher 2:** I’m working on a fellowship application for a completely different project. But, um, actually but this one, I am able to take up to 20% off that one. So, on t this, I'm hoping we can do something with UKRI new Catalyst scheme, and if it's something that I'd like to put together for a grant to take it forward we can, if we did it in different work streams, you have particular work should you be interested in that. I'm going to say that's one direction and I think we'll try and make paper, I don't know, if we’ll go for Qualitative Research or which journal - on the concept re-renderability. But before we do that, with this dataset we’ve also got, I’ve done a bit of literature search on eight academic databases, so I’ll parse those together, done a bit of literature review, as I say cannot find It is very much global north literature - it's, so form JSTOR and academia, but we’re really struggling with literature from the Global South.

**Martin:** I think Dimensions maybe has more of a scope on the Global South, and you can also do searches on SciELO which is a Latin American hub – a platform. Yeah.

**Researcher 2:** Yeah, it's just, I expected more to the library itself, looking like the sort of it's in that field. But yeah, so we'll get the report published. Obviously, funding has run out now, so its life after money, and we are putting together a grant, and I mean we'll be presenting a more theoretical piece on this at OpenFest – it’s the day after I get back from Mexico, so I might a bit [head nods] with jetlag. After that, it’s really still part of the open qualitative research network and we’ll hopefully input more into that. For now, it’s transcribing, getting the report written up, that will all go open access maybe on ORDA – and I can roughly show you what that looks like if you interested.

**[recording ended]**