Hmm. Okay, so basically, what I do in my work, is, I'm, so I'm doing a PhD and I'm a second year, PhD student. And basically, what I do my work is, I work in a series of different perspectives on the relation between identity and politics. And currently I'm doing a case study - comparative case, study - of Spain and Portugal. So I'm doing a lot of qualitative data and graphic interviews, and so on, and I will use quantitative data for part of the thesis, so it's a real mix of methods.

Okay. So I guess you're more interested in the qualitative part.

Okay. Well, the quantitative part basically uses FCA, and the qualitative part, so what I'm basically doing is, that the main trunk of data is just interviews, personal interviews with, with discontentences to see, basically trying to understand how their constructions have identity, explain the different ways of political mobilization. And I just planned the analytic phase, is not very defined at the moment, but basically I'm planning to do, I'm definitely going to use Nvivo because it's the thing I'm Familiar with, and then comfortable with, and I'm thinking of various phases where I just on the one hand, because theory building and theory testing. So, I guess, I'm, I'm thinking of something that is first inductive and then goes through [an] iterative round focussing on static, but also causal analysis. But yeah,…that's not very defined at the moment.

I am. So the project is a very strong theoretical orientation, which is Grampian, trying to focus on a different way of understanding the ratio between identity and politics. That focuses on, on the everyday is lived experience on the analysis of common sense and how common sense builds identities and what is considered possible or not possible or politically viable or viable. So that, that's, that's the broad frame, and working on that and, and ethnographic immersion, focussing on the data.

Okay, so the experience I have is, I have done qualitative. I've used qualitative methods before when I worked in a policy centre. I've used qualitative methods before when I did my master's dissertation, and when I worked as research assistant and I am using them now, so it's not a lot of experience obviously, but it's what I'm most experienced in.

Sorry, the question was specifically..?

…as in good or bad, or what kind specifically of qualitative data I use?

Okay, I'd say, it's always been my focus, because it touches it for my substantive interest which is discourse and the lived experience, and the actual carrying discourse, and because it isn't methodologies that I enjoy, I guess. So, it's always been kind of the match between what I enjoy, what I'm good at, and topics I'm interested. Um, I'd say, I have used different fieldwork methods. I've been, I've done focus groups, I've done interviews, I've done a bit of ethnographic, but currently I'm specializing on interviews. In the interviews, and tackling sensitive topics and sensitive samples. That's what I enjoy. That's what I'm focusing on. I basically also have Focus on qualitative methods, we get, I think they're richer in the way they let you engage with certain theoretical debates that are complex, that you can never, you can, you cannot outreach in the same way by using quantitative data.

I don't know that answers the question. Okay. Okay.

Um, So as I was saying it, I don't have much of an opinion basically, because, it's, it's not something that I've experienced, though, it is never a question in the work I've done. It did become a question when I was starting to plan my qualitative fieldwork for my PhD, and at that moment I did my ethics review, and my department, my data management plan, and doing the data management plan. I did discuss the issues, of course. There's different ways of calling it, isn't there, but I think at the time, we were talking about, yeah, I can't remember the term, but there was different term, but we basically talking about the same thing, and archiving we talked about archiving, there once, and I talked to librarian that specialized in [the] research sector because she was, she was encouraging me to integrate the possibility of archiving data, and making it open access for publications once I start publishing results. I decided not to follow her advice after discussing [it] with a few people, for a variety of reasons, and is that interesting for the, I don't want to ramble [on] with that…

…actually talked back to these people because, I was like, since I'm gonna do this, you want to be sure, you know what the reasons were, in that, when I was deciding about this, because I didn't really remember that much. But basically, what happened is this woman was like, you know, it's kind of, you know, the progress of science, and making it more open and whatever. And, you know, I would say to methods, I'd read a lot of quantitative stuff. I'm used to quantitative data being open too, code being open and publicly available. So it did sound like a reasonable idea, but I decided not to go that way for variety of reasons. First because I don't use consent forms, I use verbal consent - because of the kind of people I'm interviewing, or the kind of contexts I'm going to. It is hard to convince people that they should sign something for someone that they don't know. I, also because I don't think that signing a consent form actually makes the research any more ethical, or so, that person. So, I'm no big fan of consent forms, and if they started considering archiving, then I would have had to do a consent form with the variety of boxes, because you can't just, you know, it's not that simple anymore. And even if I [had] done a consent form, I decided, I wouldn't want to propose archiving because I think because I know from experience that people are very, they're very reliant on you as a person they trust. And the person they like, and when, when they disclose, when they participate, and when they accept participating, and I can imagine that the idea of being like - because what am I, one of my winning tropes, so to say, to convince people to participate, and to be honest in the interview - because you can substantively affect the data, it's just being like, you know, it's just me seeing this. It's just, and, and that gives people a lot of confidence. And I think, even if I was okay with the consent forms, which I'm not, if I had to introduce the archiving option, there would be two problems. The first one is, I would have to explain something that is complex to people. And they wouldn't really understand the way we understand that within the profession, it might be something good. It's very hard to come across as something approachable, something understandable, and the second thing is, I just think that it would affect the quality of the data or it would just affect that, the recruitment. I do imagine a lot of people being like, you know, even if you anonymize the data, being uncomfortable. The idea that whatever they say is just going to be archived, that people can access. So yeah, that was more or less that the, the reasoning behind me, saying actually, no, I'm not going to go through archiving. I think, I think it's not the safest option.

No. Sorry. I mean, I mean, not the safest for the, for the, for the research.

Yeah, but because participants wouldn't feel safe, of course, but yeah.

Uh, no, I have used [it] for quantitative work, I do use code and whatever as I was saying, I think it's something fantastic. And, and that's becoming very very mainstream. Although it's very different, but I'm, yeah, that's my own experience with open data, when [I] actually use other people's code, other people's - never used other people's data. Back certainly used other people's codes to do something, and I think it's important in quantitative terms,…

…for instance, because it helps people like me. You know, you don't, you don't particularly, you know, I'm not [a] massive expert in quantitative methods, and I have to struggle a lot to get to do properly, analysis. For instance, I'm gonna have to learn the method, and go through it and whatever, and it's really useful to have that kind of results. I don't think in qualitative methods, open data can have that sort of toolkit function. But yeah, that's something I think. Definitely is supposed to think about in quantitative methods,

…as it, as I said, I did think about it, because I think intuitively it's something that is good and that is, that definitely in itself, something good, and useful. And I think of my own work, and I'm like this, there's so much work that I criticize because, in so many, because part a big part of my thesis is saying, you know, previous qualitative research is actually not. It's a bit of ramble, but basically, the point is, one of my main arguments is saying, a lot of qualitative research is basically about description and they, they are reaching. They are tapping into causal relations, but because they are scared, not scared, but like shunning of the idea of doing quite causal analysis, which is something we associate with quantitative analysis, they don't, they don't have the capacity to leverage the causal insight that there is in their data, which brings me to think obviously if, then, I had open access to that data, you know, some other people could come and be like, no, but actually, if we, if we put a different frame, a different light to the same data, we can actually see that. This is not just, you know, I'm describing how people see the world, where you're actually seeing how these descriptions shape certain behaviours, for instance, or how these ideas shape other ideas. So, intuitively. Yes, I'm saying. Sorry, this was a bit of ramble. Basically I do think it generates something good.

Definitely, obviously, has to be something good and it's also something that from the perspective of the work I do, I can see that it could be useful when you engage with other research.

For many, for many particular perspective, or just in general?

Well, I can see on the one hand, what happened to me is a key barrier. You know, the idea that you, that there's there's some samples, or even if irrespective of the sample, you know, it adds another barrier. So to recruitment, and to convincing people, and to guarantee that they get to a point where they're comfortable, and disclosing and honest. That, it's just very hard to say yes to, because I think intuitively, any person to win, collecting qualitative data will think that just making their life more, let's just making them, the life that [will] be harder. Um, so I think that's definitely [an] obstacle. It's a real obstacle. I don't think it's, I don't think it's, I think it's very evident you know explaining to people that you, they, because I've seen, it because you know that, well, nobody's gonna see this apart from you, is it? I'm like, no, and yeah, I, I worked in a, well I worked before. I was like, you know, you can be sure because the other people in the team don't even understand this language. So you know, you’re completely safe, you know. I'm just gonna see it myself and that's here. So, I do think there's that. I'd say that's the main thing then. I don't know, I guess there's a culture to it, of, because the data in quantitative terms, the data speaks for itself. And You know, I can't imagine that the rails, they could be over certain demographic datasets, so to say so, and then how people could endlessly go round and round and round in circles, discussing with that, with the data actually means, and actually is giving away. And you could say that's something good, of course. But on the other hand, there's always another principle of qualitative research, is that the data doesn't speak for itself? That you're also the person that's been in the field and understood contextually what was going on in that interaction? And what those words mean in that context, in that country, whatever. So, at the same time, you could be like, here, it'd be interesting to look, and so on. But then, there's always a very reasonable way of just defending oneself by saying, you know, I was there, and I, this is my interpretation, and it's better than any other because I was the one to collect the data, and see all that whatever. So, as is it definitely ethical, not sure. It's very productive in general.

Mmm. As. Enabling for other people or enabling for people to make it open access.

I mean. I have funding for instance, from a private foundation, and you know, they got these regulations on how you have to publish. And for instance, they force me to [have] public open access. Not, not the data, but the, the, the research out itself,…

…not as much as enabling. Maybe constraining. But yeah, the only constraining factor I could imagine, that could force people to move into [a] different culture is, you know? They, if funding, for instance, started to be strings attached on a basis of, you know, asking for open access data. Otherwise, I can't really think of any incentives besides, just the ethical feeling of, you know, being like, you know, want people to be able to see the data worked with

And it is also the whole thing about whether it's open access in, anybody can access it or open access as in, you know, you have to ask it from me. Which I think both [are] happened right now, don't they? I'm not entirely sure, but I think both happened, and you know, it's also very different. I think it's very different situations.

If it works, if it works like that, I definitely [would] be more likely, I guess. I definitely [would] be more likely to make you open access, because I'd be like, you know, in the end I can control who accesses the data, and it gives you a certain control over thinking, like, you know, I don't, I want to make sure that I would feel more comfortable. That could make sure that every person that accesses it is somebody working in an educational institution, for instance, or something other. And not somebody related to always going on the field in a way that could harm respondents.

For instance, I am, I'm also thinking from experience, because I interview, I've been in certain sites that are so, they're so small it is very easy for someone living there to to identify someone. If they transcript, it's almost impossible. To release a full transcript, and anonymise it to the point that you could actually retain the data without people in the same context, being able to identify the person that did the interview that you can control when you're just picking out some quotes and the anonymize those quotes, but I think it's completely impossible, if you just have to release the whole transcript, so, yeah, that's, yes. if access could be more controlled, I think, could be, it'd be something to think about.

Besides the open access thing, I had no, the only thing was that I didn't want to use consent forms. I'm very strongly against the need for consent forms, so, and that meant I had to do some extra steps when getting my ethics review approved. But apart from that, no, I think it was quite straightforward. Yeah. Yeah,…

I guess the only point where I had to deal with, in a bit, was actually just yet the librarian suggesting, you know you might want to think about the data archiving thing.

Hmm. As in the epistemic standpoint, you hold

I would say, actually, I was. I would respond with the dilemma I was talking about before, which is obviously epistemic. Because, remember, we talked about, you know, I think it's good to have the data open access, but then because it's interpretive analysis, we're doing, you can always call back on the idea that, you know, you were the person that was there and and having access to all these contextual factors and and and, and socially embedded, meaning of what was being said and the gestures and the performativity of it all and you're the one being there. So epistemically, you're in a standpoint that has to be respected if you're aiming for interpretive analysis of that data. um, so yeah, I think, I think, I think qualitative open access puts you in a sort of weird spiral of legitimacy that you don't get when you're just putting out quantitative data, that you just have to run again and again and again, because that's not something you appeal against, whereas the interpretation of interpretation is always something you could appeal against. Yes, I think that. I think that's definitely an epistemic problem there and, and, I can imagine people being very adamant defending what they have found. I am, I think. It also, if you're asking an anthropologist, I don't know, if you talk to an anthropologist, I think they would also have the point, which is fair enough, which is that anthropologists often do come back ethnographies, where someone did an ethnography of this village and 30 years later somebody, not 30, just five perhaps, that somebody goes to the same village and asks exactly about the same topics, and tries to find exactly the same, at the same things and well. I guess if, if you could get to the same conclusions by just looking at the data instead of being there, it wouldn't be so, so, logical for ethnographers that there is a need, and, and a worthiness to doing the same research again in the same places again. And it reminds me of studies that, you know, contest very much what was found in previous studies, and I'm thinking, you know, partly what they can test is not because they have different perspective on the same data, but because you know, they went about different methods that managed to get the different perspective on the same research problem. Um, and obviously you can't get that different perspective, unless you create new data, you can't get that different perspective just by looking at the data that somebody perhaps generated in a faulty way, so to say.

Hmm. At present, it is very unlikely, for the reason we talked about. I think it's, I think it's very unlikely because of the topics. I asked the questions, I ask at all, the people I’m interviewing, because my experience tells me that it would be very complicated to convince [them] - and it would definitely affect recruitment rates and recruitment success and perhaps even the quality of the data. Well, definitely, not perhaps, definitely would have quality of data. And because it, particularly in my case, it pushes me back into the need to write up consent forms. And because I don't think you can just explain what data archiving is, and archive data without a consent form. And then obviously, you have to get different consents for different, you know. You know, do I want to just participate in the study? But I don't don't want the data archived. But on both things or whatever, I think it pushes you into [a] situation where if consent forms are necessary, so It'll be an added problem. Overall, those reasons. Yeah, I don't, I stick by my decision. In the Ethics Review process. Yeah. That doesn't mean another project are good,…

Like in this project, for instance, I see [a] wide of variety of reason it would be much easier for you than for me in my field, look, to convince the respondent to make the data open access, because you're interviewing people that is within the profession, and that understands and that empathise.

I think that is very interesting, I think I would definitely be interested in doing something on that. And I like that, you said complementary isn't, I don't, I don't think I would ever invest in massive energy and time to just analyse qualitative data generated by other people because it's, I don't think it's worth the effort, if you can produce data, that is perfectly suited to the, the data you need, and to the methods that are best to answering your questions. Also, because I can imagine, you know, alternative analyses being discarded by original authors, for the reasons we talked about before, but as a complement, I think, I think it could be wonderful as a complement definitely. Yeah, there's also thinking for instance, like, I interview ordinary people, and, but then I have work with this guy that does kind of studies, similar concepts to mine, but he focuses on elites. So I'm thinking, it might be interesting to be like, you know, his work is complimentary, but it it also be useful in a certain way to go one step further and you know, just be like, you know, like to see the data and and contrasted in detail to my data, you know, that be definitely, that'd be pretty, but yeah, as a compliment here, definitely think it'd be something interesting.

Within my university, what I had is, so this librarian I was talking to. She was very useful, she was really approachable, and she directed me to [a] series of, I think it was just, I think it was both from my university and resources from without, and she had written herself a series of blog posts on archiving, and whatever. That was very useful, and she had clearly, so I didn't know the resources but she made them available.

Researcher 1: Okay. Perfect. And what do you think would be useful, or is needed to have like for you or for researchers to make your own research data open access?

I can only, as I said before, I can only, sorry if I repeat myself, I think, I think it's important here to the idea that you know I can't imagine really enabling factors.

I can only imagine. Yeah, but the only enabling factor would be if you could control who accesses the data, because they ask you. And otherwise it can only see constraints that could force people to to do so. Do you know that workflow, that would take to make open qualitative research like from planning the project to the data repository this year, I hadn't thought of it. I don't think. I don't think it would fundamentally alter how you go about the data generation, and the data analysis. I mean, I guess, you're asking because it might do in some way, but I can't think. I mean, you have to be systematic about the transcription style, but beyond that, I don't. Yeah, I don't think it should be that much of a hassle. Yeah. Okay, might get complicated if you've got various people doing the transcriptions. Yeah.

I think. I think it would, because you have to map out like different coding strategies, right? Because it fundamentally alters the relation between some parts of the data and your research, question, for instance, and other parts of the data that are complementary to the research question, and on my feeling is that, it's just so much of a hassle. And it's other people's data. So I think, I can't imagine people going with a lot of trouble to actually dedicating the same attention to that data. Um, because nobody, so many, so much, so training in terms of time and resources, to go through the analysis of your own thing. Yeah, but on, I'm particularly, having [an] opinion on that.

I just wanted to kind to, because, um because I, it's something that was [at] the back of my mind, but I haven't really had the time to talk about it, to think about it. And, you know, I feel like I've got clear ideas now, and on something, it is important for the job. So yes, I think it's been something fantastically useful, thank you .