

Trust but Verify

Qualitative Research Ethics and Open Science Standards

Joachim K. Rennstich (YMCA University of Applied Sciences, Kassel)

Criticism and Commitment in Social Work | University of Graz | 23 September 2021

Standards - and why they matter

Open Science

Standards

- data & research **access** (e.g., Wilkinson et al., 2016)
- data & research **availability**
- **replication** of research (e.g., Christensen et al., 2019; Rohlfing et al., 2020; Stockemer et al., 2018)
- **preregistration** (e.g., Nosek et al., 2018)

Why this matters

- critical engagement with **findings** > better **science** (e.g., Wuttke, 2019)
- critical engagement with **other research** > **interdisciplinarity**
- critical engagement with **society** > **funding, policy**
- critical engagement with **profession** > **professionalization**

Research Reality Bites

- **quantitative experiences** (e.g., Kuehn & Rohlfing, 2016; Mahoney & Goertz, 2006)
- **qualitative impossibilities?** (e.g., Parry & Mauthner, 2005; Ragin, 1987/2014; Tuval-Mashiach, 2017)
- **interdisciplinarity** (“Bezugswissenschaften”)
- **internationalization** (multiple standards, policies, etc.)
- **digitalization** (data sources, analysis, access, availability, metadata) (e.g., Heintz, 2021; Joye, 2005; Katerbow et al., 2020)

Extended Informed Consent

Legal

- local rules
- international rules
- impact on research (opportunities)

Ethics

- differing research traditions and their standards
- digital data (social media, sensor data, etc.)

Peers




- epistemological research communities
- local research communities
- international research communities

Institutional

- funding agencies (state, EU, international)
- universities
- private cooperation (schools of applied sciences + firms)

Open Social Work Science - Mission
Impossible?

Challenges & Opportunities

- [Computational Social Science \(CSS\)](#) as a future standard for quality scientific research and output
- opportunity for    researchers to (continue to) embrace and shape specific research traditions at global level, not simply applying – or ignoring – international ones
- new possibilities of participatory research and other (new) forms
- need for multi-lingual methodological training (data and digital literacies)
- danger of being ignored

References

- Christensen, G., Freese, J., & Miguel, E. (2019). *Transparent and reproducible social science research*. University of California Press.
<https://www.ucpress.edu/book/9780520296954/transparent-and-reproducible-social-science-research>
- Heintz, B. (2021). Kategorisieren, Vergleichen, Bewerten und Quantifizieren im Spiegel sozialer Beobachtungsformate. *KZfSS Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11577-021-00741-3>
- Joye, D. (2005). Qualitative or quantitative? Data archiving in documentation, research and teaching. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 6(2). <https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-6.2.462>
- Katerbow, M., Kümmel, C., Crispin, J., & Kerremans, D. D. (2020). *Digitaler Wandel in den Wissenschaften* (p. 16) [Impulspapier]. Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG).
- Kuehn, D., & Rohlfing, I. (2016). Are there really two cultures? A pilot study on the application of qualitative and quantitative methods in political science. *European Journal of Political Research*, 55(4), 885–905. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6765.12159>
- Mahoney, J., & Goertz, G. (2006). A tale of two cultures: Contrasting quantitative and qualitative research. *Political Analysis*, 14(3), 227–249. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pan/mpj017>
- Nosek, B. A., Ebersole, C. R., DeHaven, A. C., & Mellor, D. T. (2018). The preregistration revolution. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(11), 2600–2606. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1708274114>
- Parry, O., & Mauthner, N. (2005). Back to basics: Who re-uses qualitative data and why? *Sociology*, 39(2), 337–342. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038505050543>
- Ragin, C. C. (2014). *The comparative method: Moving beyond qualitative and quantitative strategies*. University of California Press. (Original work published 1987)
- Rohlfing, I., Königshofen, L., Krenzer, S., Schwalbach, J., & R, A. B. (2020). A reproduction analysis of 106 articles using qualitative comparative analysis, 2016–2018. *PS: Political Science & Politics, Advance Online Publication*, 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096520001717>
- Stockemer, D., Koehler, S., & Lenz, T. (2018). Data access, transparency, and replication: New insights from the political behavior literature. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096518000926>
- Tuval-Mashiach, R. (2017). Raising the curtain: The importance of transparency in qualitative research. *Qualitative Psychology*, 4(2), 126–138. <https://doi.org/10.1037/qup0000062>
- Wilkinson, M. D., Dumontier, M., Aalbersberg, I. J., Appleton, G., Axton, M., Baak, A., Blomberg, N., Boiten, J.-W., Santos, L. B. da S., Bourne, P. E., Bouwman, J., Brookes, A. J., Clark, T., Crosas, M., Dillo, I., Dumon, O., Edmunds, S., Evelo, C. T., Finkers, R., ... Mons, B. (2016). The FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship. *Scientific Data*, 3(1, 1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2016.18>
- Wuttke, A. (2019). Why too many political science findings cannot be trusted and what we can do about it: A review of meta-scientific research and a call for academic reform. *Politische Vierteljahresschrift*, 60(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11615-018-0131-7>