

Kalpana Shankar, Professor, School of Information and Communication Studies, University College
Dublin, Ireland, kalpana.shankar@ucd.ie

Book review:

The perspectives, roles, and knowledge transfer among stakeholders of research data sharing

Live Håndlykken Kvale (2022) Perspectives, roles, and knowledge transfer among stakeholders of research data sharing. Department of Archivistic, Library and Information Science Faculty of Social Sciences, Oslo Metropolitan (OsloMet) University, Oslo, Norway.

This review is a report on a doctoral dissertation, written by Live Håndlykken Kvale, for the Department of Archivistic, Library, and Information Science Faculty of Social Sciences at Oslo Metropolitan University in 2022. The thesis is a compilation of three published articles with an overarching summary (a 'kappe' in Norwegian). Each of the three articles addresses specific issues within the larger domain of open research and research data sharing. The first explores the multiplicity of data steward roles. The second analyses how data management plans could serve as an intermediary among different stakeholders in the data sharing process. The third focuses on the preservation of data/personal privacy of respondents through the life cycle. The kappe integrates the three articles by exploring the challenges these three papers have in common: how the different perspectives, roles, goals, and expertise of the stakeholders involved contributes to the goal of data sharing and naturally, how the differences can be managed.

Kvale begins her dissertation by exploring open research as a focus of science policy. She and others argue that many funding bodies, including in Norway universities, research integrity researchers, and research performing organizations are invested in the role of open science for addressing reproducibility/replication "crises", minimizing the costs of repetitive data collection, and promoting

new research and innovation avenues with increasingly sophisticated tools for secondary analysis (Burgelman et al., 2019; European Commission, 2016c; among others).

However, numerous challenges abound, and as Kvale notes, the majority of are likely to be institutional, social, and cultural. For one, data are fragile and technology dependent. As a result, data management require significant investment of sources (human and monetary) to curate data but the challenges are often overlooked. Kvale and others cite lack of knowledge on what is needed and how, insufficient institutional support, and reluctance on the part of researchers to make their data broadly available because of lack of incentives to do so. There are also disciplinary divides – in some research disciplines, data sharing is normalised, whereas in others, even the concept of “data” is fraught. In other words, the dream of seamless data sharing remains just that – a dream. The quotidian work of making data sharing happens is a complex act of coordination. The thesis explores these issues more deeply, especially the role of collaboration and learning among stakeholders vested in the goals of scholarly data sharing.

In Kvale’s words, the aim of the thesis is to learn more about how the perspectives and expertise of key-stakeholders involved in research data sharing affect their collaboration and knowledge transfer. Specifically, the thesis asks: How do the diverse stakeholder groups involved in data sharing and data curation understand their own role and the role of others involved in the process? What collaborative practices among stakeholders are at play? What kinds of “translations” are needed to make collaborations successful? To answer these questions, the thesis, drawing on theoretical work on data sharing infrastructure and “invisible experts” in data work, employs a multiphased Delphi interview and questionnaire study with 24 policymakers, infrastructure providers, research support staff, and researchers in Norway over a fourteen-month period in 2018 and 2019. The chosen study design is a Delphi study with a three-phase data collection using interviews and questionnaires with 24 participants. Data collection was conducted over 14 months in 2018-2019. Intermediate results from each phase were used to inform the next one. Specifically, in the exploration phase, Kvale conducted one-hour open interviews on themes related to data management plan and research data management. In the second, or evaluation, phase Kvale deployed a brief on themes of data stewardship, data management plans, ethics, and other tensions that were surfaced in the first phase. The concluding phase consisted of thirty-minute interviews which were used to check the validity of results from the first two phases. Outputs were coded for their relevant to understanding the daily work of making data shareable and creating institutional infrastructures for supporting data sharing over time.

In an article published in *College & Research Libraries* in 2021, Kvale focuses on the role and work of data stewards in libraries. The article asks: Who are the data stewards in the universities? What roles should data stewards play? What services should data stewards provide as part of these roles? What skills do data stewards need to carry out these services? Drawing on the data from the Delphi studies, the article dissects the different kinds of collaborative and coordinating labor that are involved in the work of data stewards (formal and informal). The article then presents a set of personas for research data management support. The use of personas was inspired by user experience methodology where personas are routinely used to make concrete the different use cases that a particular system or technology might support. In the article, the personas illustrate types of research data management support. The article identifies other challenges for providing data stewardship at universities.

The second article, published in the *International Journal of Digital Curation* (2022), Kvale and Pharo report on participants' view on the Data Management Plan, the core document in the data curation pipeline, and discusses whether and how the stakeholders' various perspectives influence the usefulness of the data management plan. What the authors conclude is that these perspectives can generate useful conversations among stakeholders but ultimately, if those differences are not respected and honored, the DMP cannot do the work of "translation" on its own. In other words, just handing a DMP to someone with a different role in the research pipeline and different understandings is not enough to make data sharing happen, seamlessly or otherwise.

The third article, written with Darch and in press in *Information Research*, focuses on the participants' views of respondent privacy in the curation of research data. Tensions between research subjects' right to privacy and advancing research through data sharing are surfaced and examined. They conclude that although the different stakeholders have their own perspectives on what constitutes personal privacy, the needs and wishes of the research participants should always be at the forefront.

Kvale's contributions to the literature on research data sharing are several fold. The thesis provides the professional and the scholarly community with a deep analysis of how data management and sharing are playing out in real time as national and university policies are evolving (Kvale goes into some detail about how the research landscape evolved in Norway at both the inception of her study and while she was conducting it and the import for her work). Secondly, rather than trying to "force" consensus on the multiple stakeholders in the research ecosystem through her narrative, Kvale's analyses of the competing visions, narratives, anxieties, and discomforts in conversation with each other point to ways in which difference can be used fruitfully and further, how documentary artifacts like the data management plan play into both building consensus and maintaining difference. Lastly, Kvale's approach to making her processes and choices transparent, along with some exploration of the roads she did not take, is a call to other scholars to be more transparent in their choices. In summary, Kvale's work has much to offer the professional who is called upon to implement and evaluate data management in their own institutions as well as the researcher of data sharing and affirms the challenges that all stakeholders face in this arena. I rely on Kvale's own words to make this point: "Research data are expected to cross disciplinary, institutional, and cultural boundaries according to the ideals of a global interdisciplinary research data flow...A close connection to domain expertise and a focus on research data sharing applying and developing interactional expertise are also needed."