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Within each report, each case study is a snapshot of an actual research project currently being conducted in the YRC. Our researchers are sharing their experiences and offering their advice for conducting social research in an increasingly complex and diverse societal environment. The practices presented in this series of research reports reflect the innovative and contemporary research methodologies and methods undertaken by YRC staff and students. Some of the methods illustrated here are traditional but employed in new ways; while other methodologies and methods depart from conventional research practices to cover more innovative practices to investigate and understand the multidimensional ways of being young in the twenty-first century.

This report includes contributions from Josie Reade, Adam Seet, and Babak Dadvand, Rimi Khan and Johanna Wyn. Josie Reade is currently conducting a PhD which explores how young women experience their bodies and gender through engaging with fitness-related content on social media. Through outlining her methods of data collection (participant observation on Instagram and in-depth interviews), she brings attention to the particular ethical dilemmas she encountered during her research: navigating complex notions of privacy; interacting with participants on Instagram; and negotiating the impossibility of ‘leaving’ the field once the data collection was completed. Reade’s contribution offers a variety of important lessons within the burgeoning practice of digital research in the field of sociology of youth. Adam Seet is currently doing a PhD on the prevalence of internalised racism within racially minoritised young people and communities, in Australian society.

To explore the phenomenon of internalised racism with participants, Seet places the emphasis on the need for dialogue, trust and respect; which includes multiple interviews with the individuals involved in the research. Seet argues that conducting several rounds of interviews with participants enables the researcher to ‘engage in a deeper and more meaningful relationship’ with research subjects’ narratives. At the core of Seet’s argument is not just a better familiarisation of the data, particularly for novice researchers, but also greater respect for participants by engaging in recurrent dialogue (interviews) to provide accurate accounts of their everyday lives. Finally, Dadvand, Khan and Wyn situate their piece on the other side of the research spectrum: how do we store and share data in mixed method, social science research. Working with data from an Australian Research Council Linkage project about multicultural youth, they take readers step by step through some of the challenges that the research team faced about giving public access to research data. As Dadvand and colleagues argue, while sharing data is becoming increasingly common, including pressure by funding bodies to do so, there remains many questions around how to do it in a fair and ethical manner. Their chapter provides some important clues on how to achieve this.

Overall, these three chapters on researching young lives are a significant addition to the vibrant field of youth studies. They represent the Youth Research Centre’s continuous support, contribution and engagement with high quality research and practice for, with and by young people.
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ENTANGLED METHODS AND ETHICS: INVESTIGATING YOUNG WOMEN’S PRACTICES OF POSTING AND ENGAGING WITH FITNESS-RELATED CONTENT ON INSTAGRAM

Josie Reade

RESEARCH CONTEXT

My research explores how young women experience their bodies and gender through practices of posting and engaging with fitness-related content on the highly visual social media application Instagram. Emerging research in this field has predominantly involved content analyses of fitness imagery shared on social media (Tiggemann & Zaccardo, 2016; Reade, 2016) and experimental studies which measure the ‘effect’ of viewing such imagery on women’s ‘body image’ (Tiggemann & Zaccardo, 2015). While these research methods provide a useful background for ethnographic work, they are less suitable for research projects which seek to explore lived experiences and embodied practices. As such, my research employs principles of digital ethnography (Pink et al., 2016) to engage in regular observation of Instagram posts made by 21 Australian women aged 20-35, with the additional use of interviews to discuss their experiences and practices in-depth. Here, I take up a feminist materialist approach (Coole & Frost, 2010; Renold & Ringrose, 2016; Warfield, 2017) to bring sensitivity to the material, discursive and affective dimensions of young women’s engagements with fitness-related content on Instagram. Interrogating the complex and shifting relations young people have with social media is timely given the digital is increasingly part of the everyday; and necessary given the continued ranking of body image in the top three highest causes of personal concern for young Australians (Bullot, Cave, Fildes, Hall & Plummer, 2017). In this chapter, I discuss the entangled nature of data collection methods and ethical decision-making in my research.

ACCESSING PARTICIPANTS AND NAVIGATING COMPLEX AND UNPREDICTABLE NOTIONS OF PRIVACY

After receiving university ethics approval, I recruited participants through posting an advertisement for my research on my Instagram account. This advertisement introduced the study and invited women aged 18-35+ who post fitness-related content on Instagram to contact me via Instagram Direct if they would like to find out more about the study and/or participate. I asked my Instagram followers to share this advertisement with some of their followers (whom I did not know) and changed my account settings from ‘private’ to ‘public’ to ensure the post was visible to Instagram users beyond my existing followers. I also edited my Instagram ‘bio’ to include my research topic, university email address and link to my study’s website. Once in contact with potential participants, I provided them with a brief overview of the research and the link to my study website where they could read and download the plain language statement and if they were interested in participating, complete the consent form. Over a period of three-months, I successfully recruited 21 Instagram users aged 20-35 who identified as women to participate in my research.

When planning how to access and recruit participants on Instagram, I was faced with practical and methodological challenges surrounding the issue of privacy. Within the field of internet research, debates over what data is private or public, and how publicly accessible data should be treated are ongoing (see Tiidenberg, 2018a for a more detailed discussion of ethics in digital research). Increasingly, these debates have shifted from thinking about whether social media data is publicly accessible or not, to thinking about people’s expectations of privacy and the impetus to do no harm (Markham & Buchanan, 2015, p. 6). As explained in the Association of Internet Researchers recommendations for ethical decision-making, ‘people may operate in public spaces but maintain strong perceptions or expectations of privacy and publicity’ (Markham & Buchanan, 2012, p. 6).

Accordingly, I drew on Nissenbaum’s (2010) concept of ‘contextual integrity’ as a means of navigating this shifting terrain. This concept is based upon the notion that ‘what people care most about is not simply restricting the flow of information but ensuring that it flows appropriately’ (Nissenbaum, 2010, p. 2). Tiidenberg (2018a, p. 477) further explains, ‘just because something is technically accessible and collectable, doesn’t mean it should be accessed and collected.’ In my research, I therefore decided to seek informed consent from all participants, regardless of whether they had a ‘public’ or ‘private’ Instagram account. I was reassured that this was an appropriate ethical decision when a potential participant who had a public Instagram account with almost 100,000 followers declined to participate in my research because she wasn’t comfortable with me observing her profile for research purposes. In addition to receiving informed consent at the beginning of the research, I also messaged participants on Instagram Direct during the data collection phase (e.g., ‘I am now going to follow your Instagram profile, observe and like your posts, is that okay?’).

PARTICIPANT OBSERVATION AND INTERACTIONAL ETHICS

To better understand young women’s practices of posting fitness-related content on Instagram, I observed participants’ Instagram posts once a day, every day, over a three-month period. As the main data collection technique used by ethnographers, participant observation involves the researcher observing and recording the day-to-day activities of participants in the research setting (Angrosino, 2007). Unlike lurking – observing while remaining invisible – participant observation involves the ‘embodied emplacement’ of the researcher in the field as a social actor (Boellstrost, Nardi, Pearce, & Taylor, 2012, p. 65). In my research, I attempted to remain visible to participants through maintaining a public Instagram account which participants could view, follow and send messages to. Given it was not practical for me to notify participants each time I looked at their posts, I decided to ‘like’ participants’ posts to communicate my presence. ‘Liking’ as a method of visibility and an ethics of care was similarly used in Tiidenberg’s (2018b) study of how pregnant women present themselves on Instagram.

1 ‘Instagram Direct lets you exchange [private] threaded messages with one or more people, and share posts you see in Feed and Stories as a message’ (Instagram Help Centre, 2018).
2 All of my participants had publicly accessible Instagram accounts.
3 The start and end date of participant observation varied slightly due to the staggered nature of recruitment.
For Tiidenberg (2018b), ‘liking’ was a means of making herself noticeable and a practice of interactional ethics. At the beginning of the three-month period of participant observation I checked that it was okay to ‘like’ participants’ posts (e.g., ‘I am planning to like your posts to remind you that I am there and let you know that I have seen the post. Is this okay or would you prefer I don’t like your posts? You can tell me to stop at any point’). Although ‘likes’ are indeed a currency on Instagram and unsurprisingly no participants objected to me liking their posts, I thought it was important to demonstrate my presence through echoing the interactional logic of the platform. I did, however, decide not to comment on my participants’ posts for fear of being too intrusive.

While photos and videos posted to participants’ accounts are permanent – unless deleted by the user or reported to Instagram – Instagram Stories disappear after 24 hours. This required me to observe and collect data at relatively the same time every day. Instagram is also a multimodal application, with posts often containing photos, written captions, geotags, videos, sounds and hashtags all working simultaneously. As such, I not only took screenshots of participants’ static posts throughout participant observation, but also took screen recordings using a screen mirroring software (AirServer) and screen recording application (Record it!). Screenshots and screen recordings were automatically saved to my iPhone Camera Roll which cannot be accessed without a passcode and then transferred onto a password protected computer and USB. I chose not to store or transfer any content using cloud-based services, such as iCloud or Dropbox, to ensure the security of the data was not compromised. I initially planned to record all data posted within the three-month period of participant observation, however, I soon realised that the amount of social media data I was collecting was not manageable. As such, I have attempted to ‘like’ as naturally as possible. It has, however, been difficult to continue to read and watch sensitive data throughout participant observation as this would have meant closing off Instagram accounts immediately after the three-month period of participant observation. After which, I still observed and ‘liked’ participants’ posts daily but only recorded posts if they were largely different from what I had already collected.

**IN-DEPTH SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS**

Approximately one-month into the three-month period of participant observation on Instagram, I asked participants to take part in an in-depth semi-structured interview. In contrast to interview formats which ask a set of standardised questions or have no set questions at all, semi-structured interviews involve preparing an interview guide that contains a list of topics to be covered and/or a series of predetermined but open-ended questions (Ayres, 2008, p. 811). The topics and open-ended questions included in my interview guide were designed to attend to the embodied and affective dimensions of posting and engaging with fitness-related content on Instagram. The interviews were conversational in style and I often moved back and forth throughout the interview guide based on the participants’ responses and natural flow of dialogue. Participant generated photos, videos and stories posted to Instagram were also used as elicitation devices and discussion prompts during the interview (e.g., ‘Can you explain this post to me? What were you doing here?’). This ‘show and tell’ technique (Fredericks, 2012, p. 339) allowed participants to speak about their Instagram posts in their own words and allowed me to identify themes to pay attention to during the remainder of participant observation. As Boellstorff (2008, p. 76) explains, placing such methods in the context of participant observation can be highly effective given ‘members of a culture can sometimes be its most eloquent interpreters.’

In response to the different communication preferences that my participants had, the interviews were conducted in-person, over the phone, or via private messages on Instagram Direct. The latter options were most convenient for participants who did not live close to Melbourne or had extremely busy schedules. While in-person and phone interviews took place in a single sitting, Instagram Direct interviews involved several sittings depending on when the participant was active on Instagram and chose to respond to messages. Phones and the Instagram application were therefore entangled in the interview process in several ways. They were a vehicle for conducting interviews in the case of the Instagram Direct and became an integral part of interviews conducted in-person, with participants often grabbing their phones to open the Instagram application and show me fitness-related content posted by themselves or others.

**NEVER) LEAVING THE FIELD**

Throughout this research I had to negotiate my position as both a user and social media researcher on Instagram. Being an existing Instagram user meant that I was already in the field of research and will continue to be until such time that I decide to delete my Instagram account. While my research was only conducted for a relatively short duration, I am still ‘following’ my participants on Instagram and many of them are still ‘following’ me. I decided not to unfollow my participants’ Instagram accounts immediately after the three-month period of participant observation as this would have meant closing off a line of communication and potentially disrupting Instagram etiquette. Instead I decided to ask participants whether they would prefer I unfollow their account now that the period of data collection is over. This question was often met with responses like, ‘you are most welcome to keep following me and obviously I’d love to see the outcome of your research.’ After ‘liking’ participants’ posts for three-months, I also thought it could be considered disrespectful to stop ‘liking’ altogether. As such I have attempted to ‘like’ as naturally as possible. It has, however, been difficult to continue to read and watch sensitive self-disclosures about mental health and body image. These posts, and their cumulative affects over time, continue to envelop me in the everyday lives of my participants.

---

4 Instagram Stories are photos or videos that disappear after 24 hours. They can include several elements such as written text, hashtags, geotags and emojis.
Even if I lose touch with participants over time, it is not possible for me to leave my field of research because the digital spaces I am researching are part of my everyday life.

The ethical considerations of my research are ongoing and as discussed in this chapter, are inseparable from the enactment of my data collection methods. While receiving university ethics approval was an important first step, it did not prevent uncertainties from arising throughout the research process. I continue to face difficult ethical decisions in choosing how to write about my research and potentially share social media visuals generated by participants in publications and presentations. The ethical specificity of digital contexts thus requires an understanding of ethics as not simply a procedural checklist, but a deeply personal and situated practice of being constantly engaged in the research process.
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INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGICAL DESIGN

This chapter draws on a research project which examined the prevalence of internalised racism within racially minoritised individuals and communities in contemporary Australian society. As the primary researcher, I set out to examine how the phenomenon may manifest in the lived experiences of ‘1.5’ and 2nd generation Australians of East and Southeast Asian descent. Although the target group was limited to one racial group for the study (materialising simply as ‘Asian’ in contemporary Australian society, due to what the ‘Chinese-looking’ phenotype signifies), the implications could be generally and similarly applicable for other racially minoritised groups. Because of the nature of examining a race-based subject matter, I chose to apply Critical Race Theory (CRT). It is useful as a framework which enables a shift of focus towards analysing how issues of race, racism, and power may interrelate in society. As an overarching framework, CRT also influenced the methodological design of the project. It necessitated a qualitative approach to exploring the phenomenon of internalised racism via semi-structured interviews within a narrative-based inquiry due to its emphasis on the ‘Voice-of-Colour’ thesis (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012), a variation of feminist standpoint epistemologies. Three interviews were conducted with each participant, with each consecutive session being directly connected to the previous in terms of topic of exploration. This act, in part, as a method for triangulation of data for trustworthiness, and to enable a deeper exploration of participant narratives. To understand why both a dialogical method and the number of interviews were relevant to the research aims, it is important to gain further insight into the phenomenon itself, and more importantly, how it impacts the individual.

THE IMPORTANCE OF DIALOGUE: STUDYING INTERNALISED RACISM AND ITS RELEVANCE TO YOUTH

The internalisation of racist ideology has been a well-recognised phenomenon as early as the start of the 20th century, although it was not until much later that it became conceptualised under the terms utilised contemporarily. Multiple scholars have attempted to define the term since the 70s, and ways to understand the phenomenon itself have changed over time. Karen Pyke’s (2010) understanding of the phenomenon offers a definition situated within contemporary U.S. society. She highlights hegemonic whiteness as an important factor in understanding internalised racism, defining it as “the individual inculcation of the racist stereotypes, values, images, and ideologies perpetuated by the White dominant society about one’s racial group, leading to feelings of self-doubt, disgust and disrespect for one’s race and/ or oneself” (p. 553).

Australian society shares similar racial dynamics to the U.S. in terms of institutionalised racialisation of their respective societies, attributable most overtly to European colonisation (Stratton & Ang, 1994). Both therefore can be contemporarily categorised as culturally white-western dominated, primarily Anglophonic, settler-colonial nation-states. As such, Pyke’s definition is also useful for studying racially-minoritised Australians. Whilst the larger study has a subjective focus, the importance of studying such a phenomenon from a macro-structural perspective should not be overshadowed. This is because such a study is based upon the assumption that hegemonic dominance in any form, in this case racially, requires the consent of the dominated. That is, whether through conscious or subconscious means, the marginalised, minoritised or oppressed groups are seen as being coerced into adopting a constructed worldview that renders them complicit in maintaining existing (racialised) power structures (cf. Pyke, 2010; David, 2014). Thus, the dialogic method is strategically deployed in line with the research objectives to examine manifestations of internalised racism. It is through the generation of narratives, as opposed to a static survey questionnaire, that structures of the phenomenon can be brought to conscious awareness, studied, and hopefully dismantled.

Hipolito-Delgado (2010) theorised that lengthened exposure to racism, and/or acculturation to a racist society were potential causal factors for manifestations of internalised racism. These hypotheses have important implications for us, given the focus on youth. A recent nationwide report on Australian youth (people aged 15-19) found that of the total sample (N = 21,846), 30.8% reported personally experiencing “discrimination” based on “race/cultural background” (Mission Australia Youth, 2016, p. 3; p. 45). Further, 57.5% reported that that they had witnessed “unfair treatment” due to “race/cultural background”. With both the knowledge of systemic racialisation and racism embedded in contemporary Australian society (Hage, 1999), and the acknowledgment that racially minoritised youth in Australia perceive race-based “discrimination” at concerning rates, the issues raised here will be especially applicable to researchers who work in the overlap of the two areas, in attempting to uncover how racist ideologies may be maintained through the internalisation of racism amongst the nation’s youth. Additionally, we shall see that beyond the importance of the dialogic method, the other methodological tools utilised to conduct research in this area are also crucial to the efficacy of reaching the overarching research objectives.
**RESEARCHING RACE, RACISM, AND INTERNALISED RACISM IN AUSTRALIA**

**IN VIVO APPLICATION OF THE METHODOLOGICAL DESIGN**

For our purposes, it is important to understand that the interplay of the micro and macro, between the individual and structural levels, renders internalised racism a necessarily complex phenomenon to study. What may at first glance seem (or not seem) like a manifestation of internalised racism could, with more exploration, reveal its true nature. For instance, consider that in a first interview, an Asian Australian participant reports that she does not know why she tended to have primarily white friends in school. She says that these decisions are not necessarily race-based, further expressing her view of Australia as a ‘multicultural’, truly egalitarian, and meritocratic society. However, in the third session, the participant discloses, *inter alia*, that she remembers mocking the international Asian students in school alongside her white friends, to prove her ‘Australian-ness’. This disclosure changes the profile of the participant drastically. Rather than the genteel persona we received in the first interview, which purported a ‘colour-blind’ and post-racial worldview, we can now recognise much more nuanced aspects of her personality. Instead of unknowingly drifting towards a homogenous white group of friends, she is actually actively engaging in strategic ‘intra-ethnic othering’ to bargain for belonging/social status. Instead of adopting an unproblematic post-racial stance, she is in actual fact perpetuating and maintaining existing systems of racialised power through her internalisation of racist ideology (i.e. that whites are ‘better’ than Asians).

**CONDUCTING THREE INTERVIEWS.**

Drawing on the above and other similar experiences, I have found that allocating more than one interview per participant allowed time to establish a positive rapport with participants. The importance of attaining positive rapport may sound obvious, but within the context of studying race, it figures as particularly essential to the process. Kohli (2014) sees it as the crux of the researcher’s positionality towards the interviewee, in understanding the vulnerability of participants disclosing information of a highly personal nature. She explains that “while it is not the fault of the victim, internalized racism is often intertwined with guilt, shame or regret, and it takes trust and vulnerability to share something so personal” (p. 373). It is highly unlikely that navigating such “guilt, shame or regret” would even entirely be negated in three sessions, let alone one. Additionally, as early career researchers, we are often (understandably) inexperienced in conducting interviews and in deciding how to generate, and even what would constitute rich and useful data (cf. Charmaz, 2006, p. 114). Because interpretation of data is a subjective endeavour, albeit one guided by theory, some of us may require more practice in reflexive thought to think about the generated narratives and our own positioning to it. Thus, this is also an area that is impacted by conducting consecutive interviews with participants. Having more than one interview allows us to engage in a deeper and more meaningful relationship with our participants’ narratives. When we revisit, through the arduous nature of transcribing an audio recording, we are intimately familiarising ourselves with the data. By reading through the transcript at least once, the interviewer’s relationship to the narrative will be strengthened, along with her/his ability to facilitate the next interview more effectively.

**CONDUCTING INTERVIEWS AT ONE WEEK INTERVALS.**

Our application of theory, in relation to the interpretation of our data, is an area of research that I believe is equally important to consider. Hage (2016) emphasises the importance of recognising the difference between deploying theory “as a mark of sophistication and a form of cultural capital” and deploying theory “in terms of its analytical value” (p. 221). The latter, which he deems a much more useful method of one’s relation to theory, is also enabled by this research design. Having interviews spaced at least a week apart gave me the time to analyse the transcripts carefully and identify any threads that seemed, from the perspective of the overarching aims of the project, worthy of further exploration in the next interview. It also gave me time to refer to the extant literature to identify possible manifestations of internalised racism, along with time to reflect on the narratives. I asked myself questions such as: What did I make of the data, and why? Were my thoughts grounded in any particular theoretical perspective? What was my intent for asking some of the questions? How did they relate to my overall research objectives? This aspect of the research design also allowed for a preliminary analysis to identify possible themes. It gave me the option of deciding to pursue exploration of a possible theme to garner richer narratives on the subject matter, or else to seek alternative areas for examination to widen the theme-pool. Importantly, these preliminary analyses could be reflected against current theoretical frames, which allowed my utilisation of theory to be a more dynamic and analytical process. How does my current theoretical framework allow me to interpret the data? What else should I be looking for now, for the data to be theoretically verified? Should I incorporate additional theoretical perspectives to better explain the data? We can now see that the reflexive process allowed by the research design directly facilitates, as Hage (2016) advises, a relation to theory primarily as an analytical tool.
RESEARCHING RACE, RACISM, AND INTERNALISED RACISM IN AUSTRALIA

A (STAND)POINT OF DIFFICULTY.

Being the primary researcher and only interviewer, I noticed a difference in the way that male and female participants in my project responded to me. In general terms, female participants were more hesitant in disclosing personal information. This is not simply because “they are female, and I am male and therefore essential differences place us on irreconcilable wavelengths”. Rather, what I have experienced is that when we speak of ‘race-based issues’, we tend to ignore how other social aspects shape these issues for people. This makes sense when we realise that much like the individuals themselves, the problems they experience are often multi-dimensional too. The “Voice-of-Colour” or racialised standpoint may allow participants to speak about racial issues that we all tend to share as a racialised group, but not so when those racialised issues also have a gendered dimension, for instance. Some Asian female participants in my project were hesitant to share their racialised understandings of patriarchy, concerned that I would have an a priori self-interest, or that they could potentially cause me offence, being an Asian male. The “Voice-of-Colour” thesis is an essential cornerstone of the CRT framework which denotes the unique perspective that the racialised have over understanding racism from the position of one who is disadvantaged in a racialised social structure (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012). More critically however, I would argue that whilst racialised minorities certainly would be more likely to understand experiences of racialisation than members of the dominant racial group, we should not take this as a guaranteed presumption. Simply put, not all members of a racial group experience race or racism similarly, and some may claim to not experience it at all. Additionally, as a variation of feminist standpoint epistemologies, what the ‘standpoint’ denotes is more an individual-level than structural-level awareness of one’s social situatedness. Phenomenologically, one may recognise that one is being targeted racially, but may have no knowledge of the socio-historical or contemporary systemic factors that have led to one’s societal positioning. This is rendered even more complex when we realise that ‘race’ is but one social dimension of a social subject. In seeing every individual as multi-dimensional, we can understand a limitation in the “Voice-of-Colour” thesis. Therefore, as a cautionary measure, we should not ignore the intersectional aspects of sociological research, especially in conjunction with the researcher/interviewer’s positionality. I may be an ‘insider’ racially, but there will be many social dimensions upon which I would be considered an ‘outsider’.

CONCLUSION

This chapter demonstrates the benefits of allocating multiple interviews, directly connected to the better establishment of rapport with participants and to facilitate greater understanding and familiarisation with their narratives. Giving ourselves enough time between interviews is also important, as it can generate better relations to theory and inform how we utilise theory to analyse our generated narratives. It also helps counteract any issues attributed to researcher inexperience. This chapter also discusses, as a somewhat cautionary measure, the importance of accounting for a multi-dimensional perspective on researcher positionality, that does not statically fixate on a singular social dimension. What this chapter has hopefully shown are some of the useful research tools available for the exploration of highly personal and sensitive issues such as race, racism, and internalised racism.
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INTRODUCTION

This chapter addresses the topic of data storage and data sharing in mixed method, social science research. Drawing on the case study of an Australian Research Council (ARC) Linkage project called ‘Defining the Status of Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Young People’, we discuss some of the challenges that the research team encountered in decision-making about giving public access to qualitative and quantitative data collected for the project. Our discussions are organised in three sections. First, we review recent developments in the open sharing of research data in humanities and social sciences. We then provide a brief background to the research project, including our data storage and data sharing practices and protocols. In the third section, we discuss some of our concerns and considerations in making decisions about the public sharing of the data. The last section synthesizes our discussions and offers suggestions about data sharing that might be of interest to researchers thinking about their data management and data sharing plans.

DATA STORAGE AND DATA SHARING: PROMISES AND CHALLENGES

Over the past few years, data storage and the public sharing of research data through open-access repositories have grown in popularity among researchers in humanities and social sciences. Contributing to the current level of interest is the development of tools and technologies that can be used in data archiving, data mining and data analytics. These technologies have created an opportunity to store, retrieve and re-use research data in secondary analyses. Increasing popularity of data sharing is also driven in part by the growing attention given to transparency and rigor in research, including the importance of reproducible research protocols, processes and products (Lyon, 2016).

Two other drivers of the current push towards open-access and data sharing are policy mandates from funding bodies and the growing acceptance of secondary analyses in research (Bishop & Kuula-Luumi, 2017). Several funding agencies and publishers now require the development of data management and data sharing plans as part of their funding requirements. Researchers are encouraged, and in some instances obliged, to allow open access to the collected data, especially when public resources are used to fund projects; they are also asked to share their research findings in the form of open access reports and articles. This is coupled with growing recognition about the benefits of data sharing and the acceptance of secondary analyses among researchers and research communities.

While data sharing has been taken up more readily in quantitative research, there has been a reluctance towards the sharing and re-use of qualitative data. Some of the existing critiques relate to issues of rigor and ethics in the re-use of qualitative data (Ruggiano & Perry, 2017). Given the significance of social, cultural and political context to the conduct, analysis and interpretation of qualitative data, there are concerns about the loss of contextual particularities in the secondary analysis of qualitative data. The re-use of qualitative data also poses an epistemological question about research encounters and the role that researchers and participants play in the (co) construction of data and research knowledge.

Others have highlighted ethical concerns in relation to anonymity because of the limitations in de-identifying qualitative data (Morrow, Boddy, & Lamb, 2014). Large-scale quantitative data lends itself relatively easily to de-identification, a process that safeguards the identity or personal information of participants. However, qualitative data is much more difficult to de-identify, especially when it involves a small number of participants. In addition, the public sharing of qualitative data raises questions about informed consent. Consent is a complex and on-going process requiring constant negotiation between the researcher and the research subject. Public sharing of qualitative data, however, places the data in the public domain permanently with no or limited possibility for participants to withdraw their data.

Despite these concerns and caveats, qualitative data has been increasingly viewed as valuable for re-use (Mannheimer, Pienta, Kirilova, Elman & Wutich, 2018). With regards to ethics, there have been calls to broaden the parameters of ethical considerations in discussions about data storage and data sharing. Bishop (2009), for example, argues that debates about ethics in the archiving and re-use of data need to be broadened beyond a narrow focus on participants’ rights. In considering the benefits and risks of archiving, Bishop (2009) further contends, one needs to take into the account others who have traditionally been within the scope of research, namely the scholarly community and the public.

As debates continue on the potential benefits and perils of data sharing, there have been concrete steps towards creating repositories to store, curate and allow access to research data. An example of such a repository is the UK Data Archive that acquires, curates and provides access to the UK’s largest collection of social and economic data. In Australia, the push towards public sharing of data has come primarily from the Australian Research Council (ARC), one of the main Australian government agencies that allocates funding to researchers and universities. The current ARC Data Management Requirement encourages researchers to develop a data management plan and consider the ways in which they can best manage, store, disseminate and re-use all data (ARC, 2018).

ABOUT MULTICULTURAL YOUTH AUSTRALIA RESEARCH PROJECT

In the remainder of this section, we discuss some of our caveats, concerns and considerations in the public sharing of the research data from the Multicultural Youth Australia project. Multicultural Youth Australia is an ARC-funded Linkage project; it is a collaboration between the University of Melbourne and...
nine partner organisations including: Centre for Multicultural Youth (Victoria), Department of Premier and Cabinet (Victoria), Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (Victoria), Multicultural Youth Affairs Network (New South Wales), Access Community Services Limited (Queensland), Migrant Resource Centre (Southern Tasmania), Youth Coalition (Australian Capital Territory), Multicultural Youth (South Australia) and Youth Affairs Council (Western Australia).

The purpose of Multicultural Youth Australia is to examine how young people aged 15 to 25 who are from migrant or refugee backgrounds fare in cultural, economic and social spheres of life. Using a mixed method research design, the project collected data from 15 focus group discussions and a survey of 1,920 participants. The collected data tapped into a range of topics relating to the everyday experiences of young people, topics such as belonging, discrimination and racism, social networks, and socio-cultural participation. In order to store and share the data, we created an online repository called the Knowledge Hub. The Knowledge Hub was developed in collaboration with the eScholarship Research Centre, a social and cultural informatics research centre specialised in archival sciences at the University of Melbourne.

OUR CONCERNS AND CONSIDERATIONS IN DATA SHARING

The Knowledge Hub provided an opportunity to share our research data and its findings with the partner organisations and the wider public. However, in using the Knowledge Hub, we had to address some concerns and considerations. In this section, we discuss three concerns relating to: 1) possible misuse or misrepresentation of data, 2) user-friendliness of the platform, and 3) ways to facilitate participants’ access to the findings as an empowering measure. Rather than offering one-size-fits-all solutions to dealing with these or similar concerns, our discussions aim to provide insights into some of the issues that researchers need to be aware of in designing data management and data sharing plans.

POSSIBLE MISUSE OR MISREPRESENTATION OF DATA

Our research dealt with a relatively sensitive topic. Among other things, it tapped into issues of concern for multicultural youth, issues such as everyday experiences of discrimination and racism, a sense of belonging to the Australian society and difficulties in navigating education and work. Our decisions about unmediated public access to the data, therefore, raised questions about the possible misuse or misrepresentation of the research data and/or aspects of the findings. This was a particular concern given the current political context in which Australian youth from refugee and/or migrant backgrounds are portrayed as a threat to social cohesion by right-wing media and political commentary.

We had to address a tension in relation to our ethical duties towards the research participants, the research community and the wider public. On the one hand, we maintained a duty of care towards our participants and the communities that they represented. On the other hand, we were cognizant of the benefits that would accrue to the wider research community and the public from being able to access the research data. While we could articulate arguments both for and against public data sharing, we ultimately decided to allow ‘mediated’ access to the complete dataset to researchers and community organisations. Thus, we shared publicly only the findings of the project on the Knowledge Hub.

USER-FRIENDLINESS OF THE ONLINE REPOSITORY

Another issue that we had to address in decision-making about data sharing related to the user-friendliness of the Knowledge Hub. The Knowledge Hub was central to our data management and data sharing plans. As such, it needed to be easy to access and navigate by researchers, partner organisations, and the wider public and community sector. In developing the Knowledge Hub, we used the eScholarship Research Centre’s expertise in informatics and their already existing platform for archiving. A caveat of this platform, however, was that it was designed and developed primarily for archiving library data and resources. This posed a challenge to us with regards to storing, curating and sharing our research data, which were collected through surveys and focus groups and were thus of a different nature. The fixed architecture and IT structure underlying the Knowledge Hub allowed limited flexibility with the organisation and presentation of this content.

FACILITATING PARTICIPANTS’ ACCESS TO THE FINDINGS

A final consideration for us related to facilitating the participants’ access to the findings of the research. This was within our broader commitment to ‘give back’ to the participants and the community. As a research team, we were aware of the often-complex research reporting protocols which can make the outcome of research inaccessible to wider public audiences. For this reason, in conjunction with our other data sharing decisions, we actively sought ways to make the research findings easy to access for those who participated and the wider public who could benefit from the findings. Towards this end, we curated some of the research findings and used mediums such as vodcasts, infographic reports and graphic animations to communicate these findings to the participants through social media.
CONCLUSION

In this chapter, we discussed some of the potentials and challenges arising from data storage and data sharing in social science research. While the sharing of research data has been growing in popularity over the past few years, there still remains caveats and concerns about allowing unfettered public access to research data. This is despite the benefits in the public sharing of data including increased transparency and rigor in research, and the possibility of reusing data for secondary analyses without incurring additional time demands on participants. We also highlighted and discussed three considerations that we dealt with in storing and sharing the data collected as part of the Multicultural Youth Australia project. These pertained to potential misuse and/or misrepresentation of the data, the user-friendliness of the online repository hosting the data, and facilitating public and participant access to the findings. Rather than offering definite solutions to these issues, our discussions provide an overview of some of the challenges that might arise from data storage and data sharing practices, and which might be of interest to researchers in designing their data management and data sharing protocols.
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