Okay. It's my field of research is, okay, broadly within some museum gallery, heritage studies, I, to work, I said it's a bit complicated. I have a slightly odd contract here at the university, in that the school underwrites my post, and then people can buy my time. So, I do quite a wide range of work, all broadly linked to heritage, but you know, covering quite a range of stuff within that. A lot of it is focused on older people, so, sort of area of cultural gerontology and the impact that cultural engagement has on people's lives.But I also get hired into other bits and bobs as well. So typical research methods would be interviews, focus groups.

I don't do it very often, bit I do really enjoy it, sort of fine-grained, observation of behaviours, and analysis of - sort of embodied interaction - that I don’t get as much of that as I would like, and then, you know, surveys, questionnaires, and stuff like that. Pretty much whatever works.

Okay. Yeah. So, for the interview, focus group data we use, I use Nvivo a lot, and a mixture, depending on who I'm working with - a mixture of either, mediated, inductive, or deductive. I sometimes like, have to do quite a deductive sort of approach, where people are interested in a particular set of issues and they'll give me a framework they want me to apply, and look through that. But I prefer to work more inductively. I quite like trace description of an iterative analysis, where you [are] sort of moving back and forth between theory and inductive approach, because I don't think you're ever entirely, you never come to it entirely with a blank slate. You're always got a theory there, floating in your head. So I think that description of an iterative way of working fits better. For the survey data, you know, usual descriptive statistics, and all that sort of stuff. And then for the sort of embodied interaction stuff, then it's the technical - has a description, really, just that careful attention to behaviour, and what behaviour is doing, and trying to understand the interaction between different modalities and interaction, so spoken and embodied, and all rest of it. I don't know if that necessarily has a name, but it's basically video, and then transcribing video, but also attending quite carefully to embodied behaviour in the transcription. There's no. There's no formalized, you know, in the way that's say, for example, in conversational analysis there are formal ways of transcribing conversation analysis. There isn't a generally accepted formal way of doing that for interaction, embodied interaction analysis. So you sort of make it up,

It is very fun. I love it. I just don't get to do it very often.

No, I think. I think it I tend to go with you know, was it Panicky argued first, having a network, we called an appropriate epistemology that your theoretical framework depends on what you're studying. um, so I think we can take quite a different sort of approach, depending on, you know, what the subject is. I suppose. Broadly, I would say, for myself, most comfortable with like, critical realism.

Um, so I do quite a lot of qualitative data. I mean most of it's probably you know, interview type data encoding that I say, I tend to, towards coding inductively or sort of iteratively and then drawing out themes and ideas out of that, and then maybe sitting with that, thinking about that, and going back and then doing a sort of so tend to do quite a open, non-hierarchical coding, which tends to be a bit sort of, some keep shifting between a sort of latent content coding, automatic coding, you know, and then thinking about it, and then going back and doing a second round of coding with a particular focus to it. For example, so, one example, I did some stuff on volunteering and then took that, and then start with it for a while, and I went back and then recoded it - according to linking it to ideas of wellbeing and stuff like that or, yeah. Actually, there's another one, another one I guess would be. I did some work for somebody else. Which was coding walking interviews in the historical Istanbul. It's one of those projects where I got hired into it, and [had] to do the qualitative analysis, so I did that for them. And then I thought there was something interesting in the data, which was not [at] all what they were interested in. But something that I found interesting. So that, I did a second round of coding, much more around my interest in the data and drawing that out, and I’m trying to get that published at the minute.

um, so, so sort of aware about I guess, like I am aware of it. So amongst the many things I [have] been asked to do have involved writing data management plans for other people's projects, or editing data management plans for other people's projects For example, my colleagues are working on a large, European project, and as part of that project they have to write a data management plan, and part way through they had to revise the data management plan. I got hired in to help with that, so then I got more into sort of open research, and some of, you know, qualitative data in that, and figuring out how we've got what you know - archive, we were going to use, we’re using ORDA in the end. I think, there's some issues, which are sort of implicit in - you know, like in your participant and information sheet about notions of quality. And also, what goes into issues around what around the metadata that makes the data meaningful. That needs a bit more, yeah, you

So, god, I think in principle, it's a good, well, I don't think you've got a choice. Have you really because, I mean, most of the public funding is pushing people towards making their data publicly accessible. So one way or another, you've got to deal with it. I think that our issues around see, alright, so let's go back to you, like in your participant information sheet. Yeah. Then you've got these ideas about reproducibility and replicability which draw on quantitative scientific methods, yeah, and there's a real debate. I mean, I don't know if you've read O'Reilly & Kiyimber’s book on advanced qualitative research, so there's a really nice debate in that discussion in there about the notion of quality in qualitative research, and the different models of quality that are around, and what they draw out is there's not! When they were writing, there was not a great deal of consensus about what constitutes quality in qualitative research, and certainly a resistance to just wholesale dragging stuff, from quantitative methods and you know, physical sciences across. And what they do, in the end is they outline certain areas by which you demonstrate quality. So things like rigour and transparency, and so on. So, I think that you need a certain openness to what you mean by quality. In, when you're doing this, and how you want to show that. So, you know I mean, that you have to deal with that when you're writing the paper anyway, but then, so I think this, there's a debate there. About not, and I would probably resist that whole - just wholesale taking what quality means from quantitative research and expecting it to work in qualitative research. I think. And you put, you know, qualitative research, steeped in Interpretivism, which is fair enough. But I think there's sort of there are some underlying issues again about, as irrelevant, you know, how many ticks? It's like, you know, when you do qualitative research and you get people who do like, and we're doing who do interrate to reliability, you know, you get two people to code the same data, and you get that comparison, and you say If they agree, then we've got the right analysis. Which, which, which relies on a whole theory of reading that nobody's stopped to think about. Or they, it doesn't look like it stops, think about it, whereas it, you know. So it depends on how you think reading works, as to how you think analysis of qualitative research works. And if you think reading is an interaction between the text and the reader, then inevitably two people are going to read the data in different ways - and that's not a bad thing. But it's an inevitable thing. You might think, I don't think it's, so I think this, yeah, there's some stuff that needs a bit of thrashing out in there, to make sense of that. I am really wondering around sorry.

So I think then the issue was, so issues, make it if you've got those notions of quality, then that sort of, it somehow needs to be reflected in the metadata I guess, and being clear about process and what you did, I think there are issues around, you know, sensitivity and anonymity. And that, there's a real difficulty you know, sort of shifted, there's that whole shift from talking about anonymity to talk about the identification because actual full on anonymity is quite difficult. Even if you anonymize and take out all the names and all the references to the places, it's still possible to start to get a sense of, you know who's somebody is aware, they're talking from and all the rest of it, and like the project on walking and choosing Istanbul . In the end, the team decided there was a debate within the team. And some people were worried that what people the interviewees were saying was politically sensitive and might pull them at risk, so then they got that permission - on that basis to not make the data publicly accessible, because it had, you know, to protect the participants. So I think there are issues around that I suppose. The last one brings to mind, is because I work in the NorthEast of England where people have a really strong accent, you know, and then how you represent that in the text. so that it's because if you, you know, if you if you're transcribing for yourself, you know, it's like, okay. For example, it's very normal in the Northeast, if instead of saying, I don't know, you'll say “I Divinna” (I didn't know), right? How do I transcribe different now? You know? And then if I'm trying to, just me, that's fine. I can, I can transcribe it, given now I Divinna, and that's fine If it's going to a public archive. Do I have to worry about the fact that that is meaningless to somebody else who doesn't come from the Northeast and, you know, all that. So there's the whole, like that process of transcribing, and whether you [are] retaining or facing the speaker’s voice, and is that intelligible to somebody else and so on. I probably worry about that.

Yeah. Yeah. Okay, so, I think, being able to talk about the barriers, ones I can think of which, about sort of sensitivity, genuine anonymity, I think link to that. There are wee national variations in people's willingness to have their data archived. So, colleagues who work in Germany have commented, how there is a much great, much less willingness to have their data archived, they're happy to be used in research, they don't want it going to an archive. So then, we have to construct the consent forms in that way. So there's a clear distinction between “Yeah, I'm happy to use my data”. “I'm happy to transcribe it”. “I'm not happy for you to put it in an archive” and then we have to, you know, yYou have to date that, then it’s a whole process about, okay, you transcribe it. And then some of these are going to get used, and some of these [are] going to get archived. So some have to be further than, you know, the identified in a particular way, and some don't, and you have to keep track of everything. I think that the other thing to that, then, is that the whole issue, doing [a] whole, you know, I've been in a project where they did wholesale DNA identification before it. Got to analysis, and that produced a massive backlog in [the] project or a massive bottle neck because the day it took ages for the people at the identifying, identifying all the interviews that were done. And then pass them down, and even then, I mean the problem is, if you know, if you know the area, you can still be interfered. I was being talked about, so it's like, it's definition, enabling factors, I don't know.

Okay. Yeah, so I think, I mean, the funders definitely put that requirement in, and I think that the Depends how you do your project time, doesn't it? Because you'd like some older, some academics I think just make up a number. They sort of, like, figure out their budget, they stick their fit like their thumb, stick it in the air, see which way the wind is blowing and go, oh we'll be about £300,000. I tend to work on a much more, I break everything down, and break all the activity down, and then break down the car, the time, and the costs, and everything else to budget for it. So then, knowing that I'm going to archive, it means I need to allocate time for the whole process of sitting at the data archive and transcribing, and anonymizing, and everything. So I think you know, knowing that that's a requirement then means I plan for it. Is fine, I think. I probably haven't really when we put [REDACTED] and [had] no dough for the [REDACTED] project, there was, it wasn't a lot of metadata so that's probably one thing I haven't really done is really grappled with what makes good metadata for open qualitative research. What I would want to put in there and I think I probably go back to those quality indicators and try and make sure I've covered those. I've been very clear about, you know, the transparency, clear about the process and what I've done but I know there are guidelines for it, but I've not really grappled with that side of it because the funder just didn't really ask for anything.

um, so. So you tend to build it into the consent form as a separate statement to make sure, very clear. We're really clear about what will happen and whether they want that data, they want their data being in there. Different projects have gone different ways with it. So like I say the one, excuse me, which was on impact of visual arts activities for people with dementia. Then it was all really rigorously de-identified. It's like, you know, they [know] as well - as in, there were no names in it. But also they took all the city names, they took out all the organization names so you know it'll just be like contemporary Art Gallery, Northern City 1. So that sort of thing instead of the name of it, you know, really time consuming. And you still need which gallery it was. Because yeah. Anyway, I do anyway. So sorry that's digression so far as that's how we do that. Just by, yeah. And making sure none of the file names have any reference to the original person. That sort of thing. So, just by going off, you know, for one project, because I was doing one project where we're working across multiple museums. So it came with a whole like system for identifying people, according to what venue, what wave, what participant number, and so on. So we could track them. I could track all the data and keep it linked to a person but there was nothing in it. There was identifiable.

I think it's all right. I don't see a problem with it, I think, I think you, I think someone will, aside from the issues we talked about, which is like - things like the participant’s voice and understanding where people are coming from. You know. I think you. It's [an] interesting one actually. I think you'll read everyone, each research will read the data differently and I think that's entirely legitimate. I think sometimes. You will, if you don't know the subject, then you might miss a lot of what's going on. You might also attend to different aspects that, you know, the route that I might overlook. Does that make sense? So, I'll give you two examples. So, with the, with the, with the Istanbul data, the research team, we're really interested in people's experience of living next to the areas called the Theodosian Land Walls or historic structures in Istanbul. So, that was their, that was what they focussed on. But there was a shedload of stuff about their experience of urban redevelopment, and I could link that to notions of all the people's resilience, and they were not interested in that. But I could see, I could interpret that from the data. So, my, I think that's a valid way, every interpreting the data and that's fine. Okay, with that. Another project I'm doing at the moment is with colleagues and business school, and we interviewed um, stakeholders around museums, the business school people don't work with the cultural sector. And the cultural sector has its own sort of language and reference points, and all the rest of it. So I, you know, there's all sorts of things that the interviewees that were saying that were implicitly linked to all sorts of debates around the sector which there's someone who works in the sector. I was, I could see that happening and they were entirely missing that. So, I think there's an issue that, when you know, if you, if you come to something in the secondary way you might get something out of value. Everybody will, also might be a big risk that you're missing stuff. I don't know. Well, if that's a problem or not really. I guess it is actually, I don't know. I'd worry about it. But yeah, in principle, I think it's okay.

so, I think it comes down to whether you think that there is about this thing about here, hermeneutics, it's about whether you think there's a correct reading of a data. Most the qualitative work would say that, you know, you bring yourself to the data and you interpret the text, whether that text be, you know, a book, a policy statement or in it or an interview transcript, the act of reading is the same so, there are some disciplines that seek to face them. You know, like, so inter-rater reliability. That is all about facing the researcher and saying that there's a correct reading, or we are more confident in this reading because two people read it the same way. Whereas a lot of qualitative researchers, I think will kick against that notion of that, theory of reading, if you like, Yeah.

Why, I think, well why? Because I think we're expected to, I think you have to, you know, [have] good reasons why not. So I think if there are issues around sensitivity of data, then you might not, I think. I think you might know, if you know, if you're doing something and so many people, you know, if nine-tenths of your interviewees say “No, you're not. I don't [want] my data publicly accessible”, then there's [not] much point in archiving it I think. However, in principle, so, the first principles, yes, I will. And certainly I've got, filling [an] application in, and that's all built around the idea that I'll be made, you know, the data will be archived and made open access and all the rest of it. Yeah.

I thought about question because like, it's like, in principle, yes. But the only time I ever go looking for data, secondary datasets, is that point in the funding application. You know, when you write funding applications and they say “Has any other data, are there any other datasets that already explore this problem?” And you go looking and go? “No”, or maybe there's something interesting that, but I don't, I don't habitually. I think I should go and look for secondary data. Well, mostly I don't, certainly not qualitative data. I've just had a thought. I'm going back to the barriers and challenges is about the archiving of coding. So, whether you know you can archive some version of the transcript and whatever, whether you are kind of, you’re coding as well, and then different software manufacturers have been more or less open to, there’s notions of interoperability and openness and all the rest of it. So it's very difficult to, so you can't, yeah, NVivo is less open to archiving processes. So what you can archive is like your coding tree or whatever, and you know, your code book, those sorts of things. But the actual project remains not non-interoperable. So that's a bit of a barrier, and actually, then you'd have to make sure you have a clear set of project process. Because if you go, if you were going to make your projects, archived, and you'd have to make sure that your data was anonymized before it got into the, before you're going to the analysis stage. I'm at. So anyway, would I do it? In principle. Yes, I probably could, would you [use] secondary data sets? Um, probably given like the stuff on Istanbul was in essence, might be analysis of somebody else's data, but I mostly don't go look for it. Maybe I should, Maybe I should.

No, no, nothing like that. I mean, that I've done a little bit of re-analysis recently, just because trying to, but it's not qualitative, this, you know, really analyzing survey data, just to try and get a handle on some issues that we started to think about exploring. But yeah, no, it's more pragmatic.

Okay, so there's guidelines from the UK Data Service on metadata for qualitative data sets. And resources. So obviously there are various, we're talking like, you know, data archives. So that obviously there's nothing. Yeah. So see, has its own data archive, UK Data Service, our university has its own data archive which we can make you so. So you know, you might offer to the UK Data Service and they make a decision about whether they think it's worthwhile or not. And if not, then it might go to our own archive and then you're here, European projects, we used Zenodo because that's the one preferred by the EU sort of open air programme, because it was a European project that was [the] best fit.

So, I think probably, The most useful. Probably the guidelines around the metadata. That would be helpful, you know, having this as a guidelines around that. It really isn't that clear. Statements from the funders, that they won. Well they've already said that they won, you know, data to be archived. So therefore the statement that “You're allowed to budget for archiving” or maybe that's there. No, otherwise, I think that's probably the main…

Okay, so, the way I go about my data management plan is a fairly sort of, how to describe it. Programmatic sort of way. I tend, I think about what activity, I'm going to do. So break it down to. “I'm gonna do, you know, this… This many interviews…I'm gonna do all, you know, this many focus groups or whatever…”And then I think about how much data and what sort of data that will generate. So, you know, it'll be next. So each interview generates an audio file, let's say which is then transcribed, which creates a Word document, and work out the file size of that. I then think about which of all those data sets are likely to be archived, and then mark those out, and then think about “Okay, if those are the archived”. It's a data, then they'll need converting into interoperable file formats. So that, you know, they'll need to be anonymized and turned into interoperable file formats, and then work [out] how many of those there'll be, what the file formats will be, what the file size will be and then at the end of that. I do this all on the spreadsheet, so I can map it out at the end of it, then I've got [a] sort of process laid out, and I've also got a rough estimate of the amount of file space on need, both my active sort of data analysis phase, and for the archiving phase, so that I can go to like our IT service and say I'm doing this project, and it will be this big, and then we start discussing how we're going to handle that. So that's how I think it out. Where usually it does, because I do the same thing, I can use that same format also, for working out time. So I can start to estimate, you know, if I'm going to do this many interviews, I can, and where they're going to be, I can figure out how much time that I'll take and then that goes into the budget as well. So my data management plan and my time planning in my budgeting are all sort of wrapped up together.

Probably not very well, because I've not done it very much. I've gone looking for them. I've not really done a lot of digging around in, you know, qualitative research datasets are probably, no is probably the answer to that one.

Nothing. That's, that's fine. No, I know. I supposed, the only thing I’m also intrigued or, you know, just wanted to sort of one thing that certainly about your Information sheet, yeah, was the first sentence is “reproducibility and replicability are our mainstays for assessing research in normal science”, yeah, and it's like they begin to make this contrast between normal science. you know, the sentence on the other hand, qualitative research and it's like, almost feel like it's setting up that tension between normal science, quantitative methods and qualitative research. I wonder whether people will take umbrage at that. There's, there's an implication already built into it.

There's a particular, there should be a way of doing things. I think qualitative researchers are more fluid about that about, you know, with the the rightness of the method is very much built around the problem, and the people and everything else. So that, that, you know, that I should I suspect. That's where the issue about quality is, is not so much in there, needs to be. The definition of quality needs to have a certain amount of openness within it, or flexibility within it to recognize the diversity of qualitative research without pinning it down to a normal way of doing things I think.

Researcher 1: Perfect. And are you still happy with the consent? You gave at the start of the interview? And would you prefer to be pseudonymised or directly named in the outputs?

Um, I'm fine. You can directly name me. I've not said anything terribly sensitive or anything?

Researcher 1: Perfect. Anyway, I will, I will send you the link to the transcription in case you want to edit or redact any statement, it is possible to do so.

Okay.

Researcher 1: So yeah, that's it for me. I will stop recording now. And thank you very much for your time. This was a very interesting interview. I really enjoyed hearing your perspective and how you frame and I will read more about reading. I found that term really interesting.