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Social media, research ethics and your research

Social media platforms (like Facebook, LinkedIn and Twitter) represent incredible potential for researchers to conduct research and recruit survey participants. However the old rules still apply, along with some new rules too. This presentation looks at current and emerging issues in conducting research on social media and recruiting participants using social media channels. It also covers guidelines that apply to your activities, examples and some best practices.

Kim Gifkins, ECU Research Ethics Officer
Natacha Suttor, ECU Senior Online Marketing Coordinator
Fundamental shift

Please read carefully through the information letter below before you complete the questionnaire. The questionnaire will take approximately 10 minutes of your time.

I would appreciate it if you could forward this email and attached information letter to friends, family and other possible participants.

Follow this link to the questionnaire:

Information Letter to Participants - Australia.pdf

43K View Download

Fundamental shift

Participants will access and share your surveys in a different way(s).

This may happen with, or without, your awareness or consent.
So you wanna recruit?

Online Survey
www.

Information Letter

Compulsory: Ethics Approval

Step One: We need a happy face

Step Two: Who is your audience?

Step Three: Where is your audience? What are they likely to be doing?

Step Four: How can you communicate with your audience (directly or indirectly)?
Step Three: Where is your audience?

National and regional variation in:

- Platform uptake
  - Some not accessibly in certain countries
  - Some not (as) popular as a national/regional competitor
- Demographics
- Behaviours?

Much demographic and behaviour measurement is US-centric.

Step Four: How can you communicate with your audience (directly or indirectly)?

Directly: You can tell your connections (e.g. Facebook friends, LinkedIn connections, Twitter followers)

Indirectly:
- They can tell their connections
- They can post/share it on pages/groups
- They can tag or mention specific people

Things to consider?
- Demographic of users on platform?
- Demographic of connections?
- Demographics their connections?
- No guarantee they will see it
- Subjective and individual decision by your connections as to whether they ignore, interact with or share
Step Four: How can you communicate with your audience (directly or indirectly)?

Indirectly
- Posting on a group/page owned by someone else or
- Asking a page/group/profile owner seeing if that page owner would be willing to share your survey with their members/likebase

2 Degrees of Separation
- They can tell their connections
- They can post share it on pages/groups
- They can tag or mention specific people

Things to consider?
- Important to respect the owner of page/group/profile, ask permission first.
- Demographic of people connected?
- Subjective and individual decision by owners as to whether they share it or allow you to post, they may not see it as suitable/appropriate to promote to their audience
- May not fit their objectives/priorities for page, may not fit in with their content schedule
Why it is important to **respect** and be **mindful** of the owner of any social media presences you want to involve

Possible ramifications for you

- Shut down or locked out by stakeholders
- Shut out out of any conversations with stakeholder
- Shut off from any contact with your desired participants
- Your professional reputation
- Sustainable approach for your research?

Possible ramifications for ECU

You represent ECU. You are part of an ecosystem:

Actions stakeholders consider inappropriate could mean ramifications beyond the immediate (you), to:

- other students
- other researchers
- graduates...

This applies to each component within the ecosystem.

*Who looks bad if your participants “spam” pages?*
When good intentions go pearshaped

When people will share with/without your knowledge, things have the potential to go haywire.

Can be compounded if:

• You need to recruit one-on-one or face-to-face, and/or
• Your are researching a subject/area/instance that is sensitive, and/or
• You are recruiting from a very limited/select pool, and/or
• The survey needs to be “invite only”

It is important you set clear can do/can’t do boundaries from the start and in every transaction.

In a perfect world

You -> Recruiter / Recruitment Method

Desired survey participants

Everyone else
Tips on sharing on social media

- Write for your audience and your (desired) participants
- Establish a hierarchy of information
  1. Grab their attention with strong (and accurate) call to action: Why they might be interested
  2. Don’t waste their time, be upfront:
     A. Who might be eligible
     B. How long a commitment
  3. Who are you: field of research, level of research (not personal details)
- Write to the information hierarchy (fields are platform specific), in terms of what goes where e.g.
  - What is in the headline/first sentence?
  - What is in the body text?
  - What is in the social sharing metadata (editable)

Platform tips at the end, if we have time
National Statement

National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research, 2007

Values and principles of ethical conduct

• **Research Merit** and **Integrity**
• Justice
• Beneficence
• Respect

Research involving:

• particular groups of participants
• particular types of procedures

Is social media right for your research?

- Social media ≠ cheapest
- Social media ≠ more participants
- Social media ≠ least amount of effort
- Social media ≠ last ditch solve

Need to consider:
- How it addresses research aims and questions
- How it affects result of research
What will the ethics committee want to know?

- **Participants**
  - **Who** are they? Who are they identifying as online?
  - **How** will you ask them to take part?
  - Are you involving **particular groups of participants** (e.g. children, young people, Indigenous Australians, etc)

- **Procedures**
  - **What** are you asking participants to do?
  - **Where** will data collection take place?

- **Data/information/samples**
  - **Confidentiality**
  - **Data retention**
A person’s decision to participate in research is to be:

• voluntary

• based on sufficient information and adequate understanding of both the proposed research and the implications of participation in it
Information about the project

The information must be presented in ways suitable to each participant

• Plain language
• Purpose, methods, demands, risks and potential benefits
• Opportunity to think about information
• Ask any questions

Tools & Guides:
• How to Write in Plain English: www.plainenglish.co.uk/files/howto.pdf
• Gunning Fog Index calculator: gunning-fog-index.com/

Contact Info: www.ecu.edu.au/research/week
Consent

• Absolutely **voluntary**
• **No** coercion or pressure
• **Informed**
• **No penalty** for refusal
• **Right to discontinue** at any time
Informed consent is an ongoing negotiation

• **Process** of communicating information and seeking consent **not** just a **formal**, **“one-off”** requirement

• **Mutual** understanding between researchers and participants

• Based on **sufficient** information
Informed consent?

- **Read** this and **sign** here: information letters and consent forms
- **Who** is it for?
- How would “your mother” **understand** this?
- **You** want me to do **what**?
- Saying “**no**”
What to send with your application

All documents and other materials used in recruiting potential research participants, including:

- Advertisements
- Letters of invitation
- Information sheets
- Consent forms
Examples of research within online spaces

Examples

• Web page and/or e-conversation content analysis
• Online focus groups/interviews
• Chat rooms
• Discussion boards/blogs
• Facebook groups
• Via Facebook chats/messaging

Consider:

• Are you creating the platform and the space?
• Or are you creating a space on an existing platform?
• Or are you observing what occurs in existing spaces and/or platforms?
• Or something completely different?
Issues with research in online spaces

After Edward Snowden's revelations, why trust US cloud providers?
The NSA's activities are a massive blow for US computer businesses.

John Naughton
The Observer, Sunday 15 September 2013
Jump to comments (59)

Issues

- **Public vs private**
- **Linking** data
- **Monitoring** welfare and managing risks
- Location of **researcher** vs location of participants vs location of research platform

Facebook, Google Face Brazil Storage Mandate on Snowden Leak

By Arnaldo Galvao & Raymond Collitt - Sep 18, 2013 5:58 AM GMT+0800

Brazil's government is threatening to force Internet service companies such as Google Inc. (GOOG) and Facebook Inc. (FB) to set up local data storage centers following allegations the U.S. probed President Dilma Rousseff's e-mails.

Internet service companies would have to follow Brazilian privacy laws and the government may also decide to store sensitive data such as tax information within the country to protect it from foreign spies, Internet Policy Secretary Virgilio Almeida told reporters in Brasilia yesterday. He spoke after a meeting between industry representatives and Rousseff.
Consider: Your digital footprint and your security online (and that of your participants)

- Be careful what you put online, it’s permanent
- Be conservative about your digital footprint
- You may be releasing more information about yourself than you realise (metadata leaks)
- People can aggregate this data over time to build a picture of you
- Don’t share your home address, birthday, location, mobile phone/home phone
- Be restrictive about contact methods
Closing points

• **Water finds its own level**: build an awareness of how people are likely to act, share and interact into your research.

• **Set boundaries** and **be very clear** about how your research can/can’t be shared in every transaction.

• **Get all your ducks in a row**: e.g. information letter on the survey.

• Observe, be mindful of space and interact with respect.

• What people **identify as online**, is not necessarily what they are IRL.

• **Protect yourself** and **your participants**
  - Yourself: your privacy & security, your digital footprint, your reputation.
  - Your participants: their privacy & security, their digital footprint, their reputation.

Things go(ing) pear-shaped? **Contact** the Research Ethics Office: research.ethics@ecu.edu.au as first priority.
Who are we?

Kim Gifkins, Research Ethics Officer
Office of Research & Innovation (Research Operations), Edith Cowan University
Where you can find me:
Email: researchethics@ecu.edu.au
Telephone: +61 8 6304 2170

Natacha Suttor, Senior Online Marketing Coordinator
Marketing and Communications Services Centre (Online Marketing Team), Edith Cowan University
Where you can find me:
Twitter: www.twitter.com/natachasuttor
LinkedIn: www.linkedin.com/in/natachasuttor
Blog: www.ellipticalpointofview.com
Different platforms do things differently

**Twitter,** things to think about:

- Tweet = 140 characters
- But tweet with link = 117 characters
- Note: You don’t have 117 characters to play with if you want people to RT your tweet. You need to leave space for people to RT with comment (So 117 - ~20 characters = ~97 characters)
- Always use a link abbreviator (e.g. owl.ly, bit.ly, tinyurl)
- Different best practices for different outcomes:
  - If you want people to RT, use “Please ReTweet” or “Please RT” in your tweet
  - If you want people to click on your link, put the link 25% of the way through your tweet; use “please” “RT” “Via” or ”Check” in your tweet and tweet late in the day/on weekends
- Don’t place the link at the end, it will be the first thing truncated (and therefore broken link) if people RT with too many characters

Want to know more?
Start here: [ellipticalpointofview.com/category/channels/twitter-channels](http://ellipticalpointofview.com/category/channels/twitter-channels)
Different platforms do things differently

**Facebook**, things to think about:

- Status Update: 63,206 characters
- Truncates at ~400 characters
- Best practices for different outcomes:
  - If you want people to “share”, “comment” or “like”, use those words and/or include a photo
  - If you want people to share, write a long post (400-800 chars)
  - If you want people like, write a short post (0-100 chars)
- When sharing links:
  - Photos get more engagement
  - **Customise** the title and description text for links if required

Want to know more?
Different platforms do things differently

Facebook, things to think about:

Customising links
- Title field has a character limit (100 chars)
- Display of the title and description fields on Facebook is driven by the line count in each field with content in the title field taking precedence.
- There are 5 lines to play with:
  - The title will always be a minimum of one (1) line.
  - The description field will also always be a minimum of one (1) line.
- Image can reduce amount of text and lines

Consider this: You can customise this data when you share (and others share your post), but what happens when other share of their own initiative...?

Want to know more?
Different platforms do things differently

LinkedIn, things to think about:

• Activity Update: 600 characters
• Truncates at:
  – ~294 characters in the news feed
  – ~274 characters on your profile page
• When sharing links:
  – Photos get more engagement
  – **Customise** the title and description text for links if required

Want to know more?
Examples of ethics guidelines and resources

Ethical Decision-Making and Internet Research
aoir.org/reports/ethics2.pdf

Association of Internet Researchers wiki
ethics.aoir.org/

e-Ethics@Nottingham: Ethical Issues in Digitally Based Research
www.nottingham.ac.uk/sociology/pdfs/ethics-documents/e-ethics@nottingham-briefing-and-good-practice.pdf

A review of research ethics in internet-based research
194.81.189.19/ojs/index.php/prhe/article/viewFile/100/192

Ethical considerations for internet research
www.goodresearchpractice.stir.ac.uk/documents/Internet-basedresearchguidelines.pdf

Online survey tools: ethical and methodological concerns of human research ethics committees
www.sis.pitt.edu/~peterb/papers/JER0402_05.pdf