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Questions for today's presentation

**WHY?**
Why should we care about open science in the context of qualitative research?

**HOW?**
How do we implement open science principles in qualitative research?

**WHAT?**
What challenges did we face in implementing open science principles in our own study?
Background
What is Open Science?
Definitions

**IN PHILOSOPHY**

“science that is practiced with transparency and integrity, and with an emphasis on collaboration and inclusion” *(Field et al., 2021)*

Antidote to “replication crisis” in quantitative research *(Renkewitz & Heene, 2019)*

**IN PRACTICE**

Research practices such as data sharing, preregistration of research designs, open access publishing, preprint publication, and open peer review *(Vicente-Saez & Martinez-Fuentes, 2018)*
OS in Qualitative Research

**BENEFITS**

- transparency and accountability (Chauvette, Schick-Makaroff, & Molzahn, 2019)
- efficiency and economy (Corti & Fielding, 2016)
- “diversity in analysis and opinion” (Chauvette, Schick-Makaroff, & Molzahn, 2019)

**COMPLICATIONS**

- “...replication misses the point...” (Pratt, Kaplan, & Whittington, 2020)
- “cost-benefit balance” (Field et al., 2021)
- de-contextualization (Chauvette, Schick-Makaroff, & Molzahn, 2019)
- informed consent (Heaton, 2008)
Our project: NSF STEPP

STEM Training in Ethics of Publication Practices

RESEARCH AND GOALS

• 48 interviews: March - October 2020 (800 pages of transcripts)
• Extensive textual analysis: case studies, content analysis, and legal analysis
• Goal: understanding “predatory publishing” from diverse stakeholder perspectives
• Current status: analyzing data, writing and publishing results (one article published, one under review, book manuscript in progress)
Interview findings

Some highlights

OPEN SCIENCE AS ANTIDOTE TO "PREDATORY PUBLISHING"

- Traditional peer review occurs behind closed doors--how do we know it actually happens?
- Same is true for so much of the process in scholarly research--how can we truly assess quality without having access to the data?
- "Predatory publishing" and other suspect publishing practices thrive on this closed/black-box nature of traditional science
Examples from our study
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Challenges and Lessons Learned
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case ID</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06_P07</td>
<td>Transcript</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07_P08</td>
<td>Transcript</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08_P09</td>
<td>Transcript</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09_P10</td>
<td>Transcript</td>
<td>≈25</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10_P11</td>
<td>Transcript</td>
<td>≈18</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11_P12</td>
<td>Transcript</td>
<td>≈18</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12_P13</td>
<td>Transcript</td>
<td>≈19</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13_P14</td>
<td>Transcript</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14_P15</td>
<td>Transcript</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15_P16</td>
<td>Transcript</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16_P17</td>
<td>Transcript</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17_P18</td>
<td>Transcript</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18_P19</td>
<td>Transcript</td>
<td>≈30</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19_P20</td>
<td>Transcript</td>
<td>≈10</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20_P21</td>
<td>Transcript</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21_P22</td>
<td>Transcript</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22_P23</td>
<td>Transcript</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23_P24</td>
<td>Transcript</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24_P25</td>
<td>Transcript</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25_P26</td>
<td>Transcript</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26_P27</td>
<td>Transcript</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27_P28</td>
<td>Transcript</td>
<td>≈23</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For future consideration

**IMPACT**
- Dataset #1: 341 views, 23 downloads
- Dataset #2: 47 views, 0 downloads

**ADVICE**
- Consider other open science practices such as preregistration of study design and how these might apply in qualitative research
- If you intend to practice open data, keep that in mind from the beginning.


