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# Researcher 1 (R1) Interview Transcript

*Notes*

* *Timestamps in these transcripts have some gaps where multiple sections have been combined for readability. Microsoft Teams auto-transcription sometimes creates multiple timestamp ranges while one individual is talking.*
* *Where repositories have been deidentified and replaced by e.g.* [general repository 1]*, these deidentifications are not the same across interviews.*

0:0:00.000 --> 0:2:52.60  
Niamh Quigley  
[introduction] So we're going to talk about your research outputs and how you use third party repositories as well. I've had a look at what I could find out about your research outputs online, but if you just take me through what you create, what kind of different types and then we can talk about them. So do you want to tell me about your research at the moment?

0:3:13.470 --> 0:3:13.920  
R1  
[discussion of R1’s research area]

0:6:35.400 --> 0:6:46.600  
Niamh Quigley  
Yep, yeah, that was a great summary. So it kind of it sounds like you’re building that openness from the start rather than getting to the end and thinking where am I gonna put all these things? Is that, were you mentored in that process or is that something you've really come up with yourself?

0:8:32.210 --> 0:8:34.330  
R1  
[R1 provided examples of sharing their research openly]. And then over time I've sort of yeah, I've just continued that as my default approach. I guess I’ve planned for it from the start, but I am not actively thinking about that as I'm doing it, it's actually more for my own benefit that it makes my life easier. And then yeah [identifying], I like, you know, open science. It just makes sense that I'd open it up or find some minimum viable shared version of it that I can share at the end.

0:9:14.160 --> 0:9:14.640  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah.

0:9:15.100 --> 0:9:17.550  
R1  
So I didn't receive any like formal training. So it's mostly been like self-initiated just over time, but obviously as I've worked with people who are also more engaged in doing that and probably fosters it further than if it was just me doing it alone.

0:9:33.830 --> 0:9:34.500  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah. [identifying] Do you feel that it takes you more time to work in this way so openly.

0:10:7.20 --> 0:10:7.980  
R1  
I actually think the method itself probably and like using that methodology, it probably takes less time. Overall. I think you actually save a lot of time by using that approach. Of course, there are cases like particular collaboratively where there is some cost associated with getting things ready to be open and you know uploading and double checking everything [identifying].

0:11:36.510 --> 0:11:52.60  
Niamh Quigley  
So we'll talk about third party repositories now. And I have had a look, so I'm aware of some of the ones that you use, but we'll just go back to basics for the question. So we're talking about third-party repositories where we have general repositories like Zenodo, GitHub for code. And of course there's some paid ones as well, like Dryad as in addition to the free ones. Can you tell me which third party repositories you have used already?

0:12:24.440 --> 0:12:26.170  
R1

[identifying] And yeah, I don't use [general repository 1] I think I've only ever used [general repository 1] when I've been forced to by a publisher or something like that.

0:13:16.770 --> 0:13:26.960  
Niamh Quigley  
OK. We might talk about that one then [identifying] Is what happened that the publisher said to you we need a DOI, can you put it in [general repository 1] or how did that come about?

0:14:8.800 --> 0:14:25.210  
R1  
Yeah, the journal that I submitted to, [journal name] and in the submission process for that, it requires you to [provide a DOI for code] at the time of submission.

0:14:30.500 --> 0:14:30.900  
Niamh Quigley  
Alright.

0:14:33.140 --> 0:14:38.30  
R1  
As a sort of like supplementary material or something along those lines [identifying]. So I uploaded there for that purpose, but I typically wouldn't, like I wouldn't use [general repository 1] [identifying]. You know, say I have a data set that someone might want to reuse. I prefer they cite the manuscript itself rather than a repository associated with the data [identifying]. If I had like a really big data set like a big data collection I thought could have heaps of reuse I’d probably put up there, and then for software obviously I've had to do it in that case, but again, I'd probably try and get a paper or something.

0:16:0.40 --> 0:16:6.270  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah, did that journal specifically say [general repository 1] or is it more that it's nicely integrated [identifying]?

0:16:7.900 --> 0:16:21.470  
R1  
I think they strongly, I think it was. I think they didn't say you have to use [general repository 1] but they were like their whole system was set up so that if you did it, your life was like significantly easier.

0:16:22.530 --> 0:16:23.160  
Niamh Quigley  
Yes. OK. That makes sense [identifying] And the other one is [code on general repository 1].

0:16:36.220 --> 0:16:37.280  
R1  
Yeah, I think it was the same. I'm actually not totally sure why that one was on there. So [identifying] I only made quite minor contributions to that project. But it's a very inclusive authorship strategy made by that team. So even my, like extremely minor changes to the project, resulted in an authorship on that [code].

0:17:10.790 --> 0:17:11.220  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah.

0:17:11.230 --> 0:17:16.560  
R1  
Umm so I'm not totally sure on the reasoning for them. But I imagine that it's because [identifying] people will probably want to reference a specific version and have a citation for it.

0:17:31.10 --> 0:17:50.140  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah, yeah, that makes sense. Yeah. And that's actually one of my later questions that you've touched on when you're collaborating with others, how do you figure out what to do together because you, you're all going to be at various stages of open science? You know, do you feel you lead in those cases? And try and influence?

0:18:1.370 --> 0:18:4.40  
R1  
I'm thinking like the active projects I have right now. So typically if I'm the lead researcher on the project, we'll just be done my way and then others can kind of follow along. And most people I collaborate with to have technical expertise or that sort of already know that that would be the case [identifying]. Obviously there's different discussions towards the end in terms of how open we make it and that I would leave to the first authors generally [identifying] Uh, and in cases that of that calibre, I wouldn't. I don't really push for sort of open at the end or anything like, unless it's, I think particularly important to do so.

0:20:16.890 --> 0:20:17.380  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah.

0:20:17.660 --> 0:20:34.400  
R1  
[identifying] So that I wouldn't sort of like advocate too strongly, particularly if I'm not the senior person on the research project.

0:21:9.590 --> 0:21:15.160  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah. So you have to be quite adaptable it sounds like depending on the people on the project.

0:21:16.890 --> 0:21:17.630  
R1  
Yeah.

0:21:20.670 --> 0:21:42.560  
Niamh Quigley  
I did find some [research output] in [general repository 2] and that was one of your co-authored ones [identifying]. So was that something that you contributed to that decision to put that into [general repository 2], or was it co-author or another journal influence?

0:21:51.100 --> 0:21:56.470  
R1  
Yeah, I don't think it was me on the basis that I didn't even know I had something in [general repository 2]. I imagine it was the first author, and again it may have been something to do with, I think that paper might have been [year]

0:22:17.960 --> 0:22:21.580  
Niamh Quigley  
I didn't write down the year, but yeah, it could be right, yeah.

0:22:21.930 --> 0:22:25.740  
R1  
But I think that was the time before [discipline repository]

0:22:28.650 --> 0:22:29.440  
Niamh Quigley  
OK [identifying]

0:22:26.600 --> 0:22:33.290  
R1  
Was sort of large and then so I imagine whoever it was that uploaded just found the quickest easiest way to upload it with a sort of permanent record.

0:22:38.520 --> 0:22:39.20  
Niamh Quigley  
Yep that was published in [journal name]. [identifying] So do you have any reservations about using any of these repositories, whether you've wanted to use them or a publisher or co-author made that decision.

0:23:34.470 --> 0:23:40.460  
R1  
As in [unclear], each of them sort of what are my reservations about or what are some of my concerns, perhaps about using them?

0:23:40.710 --> 0:23:44.840  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah, yeah, about, you know, any of them in particular or in general?

0:23:49.750 --> 0:23:54.80  
R1  
I’ve probably got a few thoughts on this. So in terms of sort of third-party platforms like [general repository 2] and [general repository 1]. I think I prefer to avoid using particularly [general repository 2] like I find anything that approaches a commercialization level that doesn't sort of resonate with the purpose of it. And I think things like [general repository 2] and all of that I guess I think one of my concerns is overdoing digital object identification. So I think you know there needs to be, in some cases it may be very important to say have a DOI for every version of a piece of software, or whatever it is. But I think in many cases actually having one identifier and one clear original source is better. And obviously that also helps for things like citations and all of that. So you're not having this like weird distribution of your information [identifying].

And then similarly I guess with [discipline repository]. Preprints can and I'm going through at the moment it can actually interfere with blinded review processes and as much as you can provide anonymized links to your data and all of that, it's not that useful because all the people who actually do the review need to do is just copy and paste the name of the title into Google and then they'll see it's you. And I'm not too concerned about it. But obviously I need to be a bit more, like I've had to turn things off before.

I guess they’re my main reservations that are there, probably all quite, I guess relatively standard like you know, still like other people and you naturally you can be a little bit anxious about opening up everything. And also putting out all your data and all of that. I guess in a simple project it's fine, but the more complex a project is there's also increased risk that others will not necessarily understand the data, and I think that I don't necessarily endorse having data available on request for something simple, but for something complex, I can understand why someone might want to actually talk through the person and get them to know some of the works and all of that because otherwise you're spending hours and hours and hours documenting all this data for basically nobody.

0:28:3.290 --> 0:28:3.780  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah

0:28:20.650 --> 0:28:40.900  
R1  
[identifying] so I sort of adopt that strategy as well is like do the bare minimum that's required to be useful and then wait until someone needs help and then improve it because otherwise it's just not necessary at that time efficient.

0:28:47.190 --> 0:28:55.810  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah, I think that's a good strategy because you're making it findable, which is key. Yeah. So that makes sense. Umm, so you're using some other repositories, what would Curtin need to offer as extra so that you would feel that you would be able to use Curtin services rather than third party?

0:29:18.40 --> 0:29:20.150  
R1  
[identifying] Being honest, I’m probably unlikely to use a [Curtin service for code]. Partly because everything's on [code repository]. I've got it all integrated with my stuff. I know the flow and quickly invite people with that, but if I could link my [code repository] to a [Curtin service for code] and then have the code backed up or also stored on a Curtin service. And then I'd certainly yeah, totally consider that. I think that would be helpful.

0:30:49.700 --> 0:30:50.140  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah.

0:30:50.20 --> 0:30:52.710  
R1  
And it would feel a little bit more like robust. Just having those two versions of it. I'm not sure how that ties in with the sharing component, and that might start cropping up with what I was mentioning before with having too many versions of something there's like. I would probably want to avoid having like ohh like which one’s the real version of that and if you're having people file issues on both and all of that will start getting complex, but perhaps there's also, like particular projects that would make a lot of sense just to have on Curtin.

I could speak sort of more specifically, like for example with preprints, this might already exist, you know some things that I know that could be missing from Curtin’s preprint service is, you know, like whether you get assigned [a DOI]. I know it does get indexed in Google, but doesn't necessarily get assigned a DOI in the same way that you'll get through [discipline repository]. And there's bots that will index [discipline repository] and obviously people tend to go to that repository to find things, as like few researchers will go to an institution to find the paper. So I guess if it could be better linked, I guess having some awareness of or it being able to be very findable, we're probably, you know, if it is. I'm not saying it is or isn't, but that would probably help push me a bit towards using a local thing, but I guess the more general point and from being at university for how many years is I know that universities tend to like you know, it's like they'll implement a system. And the people who originally got really for it will be, you know, there for, say five years, six years, ideally longer. But you know there's a turnover and stuff and then what tends to happen is these services tend to die off a bit. And I see it all the time, and I'm finding papers that like, say, thesis and university websites that you get dead URL like requires login access or you know there's always issues and all that old system is no longer supported as it was. And then so there's no guarantee that when I upload it there it has like longevity as I feel while [discipline repository] has only been around a few years, but the general model that it follows is. Yeah, there's no. It seems mostly timeless so far, there hasn't been any major issues in that front. So that's certainly what will draw me like [discipline repository]. And so [discipline repository] and stuff is that I feel like you put it in an independent organization dedicated to archiving this kind of data and storing it and make it indexable as I would, you know, just being honest, have some trust issues that a university would in the long term be thinking about say 50 years down the track maintaining. Their institutional archives to the same degree of usability and index, indexability and all of that as perhaps these third-party ones might.

0:34:26.710 --> 0:34:27.120  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah.

0:34:26.660 --> 0:34:35.450  
R1  
And that was probably also why I don't necessarily trust commercialized ones like [general repository 2] because I feel like if their business model fails, it's unclear what will actually happen to your work as ones that are based on like [discipline repository], I just feel like someone else will, if it starts to die and there's a sufficient number of people on it, I guess they're just doing fundraising or, like, trying to look for donors or something to keep it alive, as it's harder to do that if you're a for profit company.

0:35:2.730 --> 0:35:5.960  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah, yeah [identifying]. They are all really interesting and great points. Have you considered putting your data with Curtin, with their data service?

0:35:36.660 --> 0:35:39.610  
R1  
And that's through via Elements?

0:35:40.700 --> 0:36:9.10  
Niamh Quigley  
Umm, it would be separate to Elements, so Elements you would use for other research outputs like your articles to get them into espace the repository. But Curtin also will take data sets from researchers, give them a DOI, store them locally at Curtin, and also get a record into Research Data Australia that points back to Curtin. So I was just wondering if you'd considered that service for your data.

0:36:10.870 --> 0:36:25.140  
R1  
I’ll be honest in saying I didn't know that, like I was vaguely aware they had that service, but I wouldn't know any details of it. I assumed it was something in Elements [identifying]. So I guess being honest, like I haven't considered it, but not because I think it's a bad idea because I just wasn't aware.

0:36:53.590 --> 0:36:59.560  
R1  
I think it that especially with like open data of Australia or

0:37:0.850 --> 0:37:3.40  
Niamh Quigley  
Yep, Research Data Australia, yeah.

0:37:2.820 --> 0:37:8.820  
R1  
Yeah, I think that sounds sensible. I’d definitely encourage PhD students to go through a service like that, particularly because their manuscript and all of that will be hosted via the thesis repository as well I guess and again this is probably me actually asking question now, but one of my I guess reservation is probably the wrong word, but yeah, mild reservation around that would be like one thing I like about [discipline repository] is that you have very immediate control, so it's like for example, I've had projects. I've put it all up, had everything there, and then it got knocked back from the journal, and then we, you know, go somewhere else and they have this blinded review process. So I'm going to [discipline repository] turn everything off or I can quickly update things and upload. And it's very like I don't have to think much about it like I've learned that system and it, but I feel if I had the situations where I'd definitely consider working more directly with Curtin, if I had a really, really big data set by, you know, over like 20 gigabyte, like 10 gigabytes or something. That certainly would be, yeah, OK, would be much more straightforward for me to do this through Curtin and say that a large data set in size or also in the scope where I think that the data set itself is a research output rather than it being associated with an output.

0:38:50.880 --> 0:38:51.370  
Niamh Quigley  
Yep.

0:38:51.160 --> 0:39:1.470  
R1  
Because I think it was associated, it's just kind of like, oh, just do whatever's in my workflow, the minimum viable easy thing that I know that's easily controllable and easily accessible, but I feel like if I had some, you know, massive data set or, you know [identifying] or something like that that I felt was important for reuse. So I'd certainly probably wanna put it to somewhere where the data set itself had [identifying]. I feel like most people who are interested in using or looking at that data will probably have only got there from the paper.

0:39:45.490 --> 0:39:45.940  
Niamh Quigley  
Yep.

0:39:46.300 --> 0:39:58.160  
R1  
If that makes sense, and so that's probably the majority of my use cases so far has been things that are like intimately tied to the research output, as if I had, yeah, data that was more separate like separately clearly useful independent product, or really really big than I’d certainly go, yeah, let's work with the uni.

0:40:9.690 --> 0:40:22.300  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah, well, I can send you more information at the end. I'll drop you an e-mail. Just so you know where information is for next time so you can consider it. OK, I'm getting to the end of our questions and you've answered most of my next questions really well. So with all of these repositories, how do they help you to share your research?

0:40:52.990 --> 0:41:2.920  
R1  
So I think the [discipline repository] it's sort of, you know it's a preprint and that comes with those benefits of getting research out earlier, getting a DOI on the materials and just providing more permanent hosting. So [identifying] it's also nice to have something a little bit more stable, that's successful, I think. And in terms of [discipline repository] or data I guess it helps in that it's now quite conventional by people to place a URL or information about how to access the material in their paper. So obviously in reading the paper it provides increased accessibility and that's something I often comment on in people's manuscripts in reviewer position is that you got, well, why is this hosted on Google Drive or you know whatever it is, like this needs to be on a stable platform.

0:42:11.90 --> 0:42:11.560  
Niamh Quigley  
Yep.

0:42:20.420 --> 0:42:21.170  
R1  
Yeah, I guess [code repository] is probably more like yeah, it probably helps share very specifically the code and the process but then also provides like the environment that people can use [identifying]. I guess when you combine all of these different tools as a strategy, it also increases just overall the points of contact to your work. Now you don't just have one paper in a journal. You've got a paper in a journal, you’ve got a preprint, you've your code and stuff on a repository, some of these things might have DOIs. So you've got like a larger body of, I think they’re all linked to each other, so you're more likely to be indexed as well.

0:43:15.700 --> 0:43:17.970  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah, that is true.

0:43:19.670 --> 0:43:20.980  
R1  
Not that that's the only reason.

0:43:22.70 --> 0:43:22.860  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah. Are there any other research outputs that you create, or ones that you're thinking about that you would like to share but you feel that there's just no place for them?

0:43:37.930 --> 0:43:42.860  
R1  
Yeah, there's definitely. This is a huge one. There's like reports [identifying] where it's quite academic but it's also not the same standard as a journal article [identifying]. It's not clear to me the best way to [share] and get a DOI [identifying]. I'd say certainly reports, as you can tell, are a very like weird problem that it's difficult to know what to do with them. And then it's difficult to know exactly when I should consider just uploading it to a Curtin system.

And probably the other one that fits in as well is like [educational materials]. [Identifying] like it's sort of a more complex from even knowing to give it away or not. It's sort of like what is it that people are actually citing and should I have a paper associated with are they citing the slides or citing going to the [educational event]. And if I upload [educational materials], do I do one for each time I run it and slightly adjust it and it would be nice to have sort of a permanent record of these things and be able to, you know, have it on your outputs [identifying].

0:46:54.210 --> 0:46:54.680  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah.

0:46:58.80 --> 0:47:5.150  
R1  
It can be unclear. Again, it's a complex problem because it's, it's not as simple as just going, I don't know how to give it a DOI, but it's like what am I actually giving the DOI for and what is it that I'm seeking recognition on and I think I haven't really thought that much about it, but that's certainly something that's another complex problem.

0:47:20.450 --> 0:47:23.480  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah, they were great answers. I might talk to you after the interview about some of these and give you some ideas. With the reports that you mentioned are they funded?

0:47:38.680 --> 0:47:39.700  
R1  
Uh, yeah.

0:47:40.390 --> 0:47:42.100  
Niamh Quigley  
And are they peer reviewed.

0:47:43.760 --> 0:47:44.440  
R1  
Ah, no.

0:47:45.100 --> 0:47:47.60  
Niamh Quigley  
OK. Yeah. Sounds like a typical you know, grey literature type report. OK. No, they were really great answers for other research outputs because they can help the library to look at gaps in what they're offering and see what people need and just think about that in their planning. That is the end of my questions. Did you want to add anything else about Curtin’s repositories, third party repositories.

0:48:19.360 --> 0:48:20.310  
R1  
No, I think that's about it.

# Researcher 2 (R2) Interview Transcript

0:0:0.0 --> 0:0:0.320  
[introduction]

0:1:17.860 --> 0:1:44.290  
Niamh Quigley  
So we're going to talk about your research outputs and how you use third party repositories to share as well. So I've had a look online at the kind of things that you share but if we just do it from your voice. So can you tell me about the kinds of research outputs you create so it can be current research, past projects, what kind of things would you create?

0:1:46.50 --> 0:1:47.130  
R2  
Uh, so my research mostly I’ve got articles, [identifying], a lot of code and data that I often share as well. And then there's presentations for conferences and posters for conferences. I think that's roughly about it, yeah.

0:2:18.120 --> 0:2:26.960  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah. So it's a really good range and I think I found [grey literature] as well.

0:2:24.660 --> 0:2:31.610  
R2  
Oh yeah, that's right. Yeah. [identifying]

0:2:31.870 --> 0:2:32.300  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah. OK. [identifying]

0:2:43.900 --> 0:2:44.350  
R2  
Yes.

0:2:44.580 --> 0:2:49.170  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah. So a really good range of things there. So third party repositories are kind of split into subject repositories where you'd have specialized types of outputs, and general repositories like big Figshare, Zenodo, that kind of thing. A lot of them are free some of them are paid like Dryad. So out of those or any different ones, are there any that you use?

0:3:18.970 --> 0:3:21.720  
R2  
So I do use [general repository 1] quite a lot. In the past I've also used [disciplinary repository 1] And then there was [disciplinary repository 2]. And of course, we also use [code repository] if you count that as a repository. Yeah.

0:3:39.720 --> 0:3:46.110  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah. OK. So let's talk about [general repository 1] first. Can you tell me the reasons why you've chosen to share those research outputs in [general repository 1]

0:3:54.460 --> 0:3:55.590  
R2  
Yep, well so [identifying]. And I also like using [general repository 1] because it's pretty easy to use in a sense that it caters for quite a lot of different types of things. I want to share for example, data presentations and articles, code. I think that's all selectable as a type of output on [general repository 1] so that makes it pretty easy. Uh, it's also easy to upload things. And of course, I don't think there's a cost involved so it's free to use. Uh. Just thinking what else? Yeah, and you can, there's a lot of flexibility in terms of what metadata you wanna input on [general repository 1], it's things like the copyright, the author details and almost, I think almost anything I think of, I can enter onto [general repository 1] as part of the metadata structure, which is quite useful.

0:5:14.20 --> 0:5:22.750  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah. And what about the fact that it mints a DOI for you. Is that important rather than just a URL?

0:5:23.40 --> 0:5:25.890  
R2  
They're definitely that. That I think is one of the main reasons at the beginning we chose [general repository 1] to use.

0:5:35.510 --> 0:5:39.530  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah, OK. They're great reasons and thinking about Curtin’s institutional repository espace. Would you ever consider using that for the things you currently put into [general repository 1]?

0:5:51.340 --> 0:5:52.50  
R2  
So I do put some stuff in espace. I think I’m meant to put everything in [general repository 1] that's also in in Curtin’s espace, but I just get because there's so many things to put into, I end up forgetting to put things in one place and other. Yeah it would be nice if there's, you know, things are really well connected and easy to transfer things in between. I do occasionally get emails from people that work in espace, asking me to update some stuff, yeah, and that that that would trigger me to remember would actually put things into espace when I haven't.

0:6:37.370 --> 0:6:50.560  
Niamh Quigley  
Yep, and I've heard similar from so many researchers that I’ve interviewed on different projects and it's yeah, it's that time and just getting around to it as well. It's difficult.

0:6:50.330 --> 0:6:50.720  
R2  
Yeah.

0:6:51.920 --> 0:6:54.600  
Niamh Quigley  
And do you have any reservations about using [general repository 1]? Any negatives?

0:7:2.360 --> 0:7:10.390  
R2  
Not really negatives I guess, but I'm thinking just in terms of comparing to things like [disciplinary repository 1]. Because I remember when we submitted things to [disciplinary repository 1] or deposit things into [disciplinary repository 1] there is a kind of like a process of checking your work before it's actually published, and then once it's actually published on [disciplinary repository 1] there's social media attached to it which I found really nice and useful. Of course, I don't think you get that with [generalist repository 1]. You would have to put onto social media yourself, I guess, yeah.

0:7:44.340 --> 0:7:56.410  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah. OK. So that was an extra feature that was really useful and made it easy to do that. OK. And was that sharing on social media or more Altmetric style reporting?

0:8:11.180 --> 0:8:13.400  
R2  
Umm, so I think on the [disciplinary repository 1] they do report some metrics of usage. And then there are tweets that associated with your publications, yeah.

Niamh Quigley  
Yeah, alright. Quite streamlined. So similar questions about [code repository]. So what's and you did mention for [general repository 1] that it was a team decision [identifying], so that's a logical place for your work as well as you liking it. So for [code repository], was that an individual decision to put code there or more of a team?

0:8:40.960 --> 0:8:50.970  
R2  
Similarly that was more of a team decision, I think, because we need to share data and code for [code repository] I think it's more code or software that we need to share and that we decided that was the easiest place to make it available.

0:9:1.100 --> 0:9:1.450  
Niamh Quigley  
Yep. And what features do you like about [code repository] for sharing code?

0:9:8.800 --> 0:9:9.270  
R2  
Well there's a lot of functions, but the one that I really like is that it keeps tracks of the changes that we made. So for example, I do share some code and software and data on [general repository 1] as well, but it doesn't really keep, if you want changes to be kept, you have to keep on submitting new versions, whereas [code repository] that's pretty much done automatically because it keeps all the changes that we made submitted and also keeps like a tag of who made the changes and when it was made. And you can always roll back the software or data to a previous version if you want to. So that's been pretty useful for us, especially when in a project we’re working on code and software with multiple people, and often we have to link or combine code that you have changed and things like that.

0:10:9.290 --> 0:10:17.380  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah. So very powerful for active development as well as sharing finished code.

0:10:17.630 --> 0:10:17.860  
R2  
Yep.

0:10:18.360 --> 0:10:29.270  
Niamh Quigley  
OK, great. And [disciplinary repository 2], was that ever your choice to use it or was it more team research outputs are in there.

0:10:29.830 --> 0:10:32.660  
R2  
That there was more my individual choice I think. There are other members in our project that have used it and I've seen that and I thought it was a good place to put some of our research into. Because I think it's because more of a subject repository, so it kind of reaches the audience that you want your output to get to. So yeah, that was the reason why I made the choice of submitting to something to, you know, to [disciplinary repository 2]

0:11:6.50 --> 0:11:11.320  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah. And do you still use [disciplinary repository 2], or do you feel you've switched more [general repository 1]?

0:11:12.740 --> 0:11:24.810  
R2  
I will probably continue to use it. I haven't used it a lot, but I think they are definitely some part of our work that would be nice to be shared on [disciplinary repository 2].

0:11:25.220 --> 0:11:29.240  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah. And what features do you like in [disciplinary repository 2]?

0:11:31.60 --> 0:11:35.840  
R2  
Well, the submission process is very simple as well and there's no cost involved.

0:11:40.760 --> 0:11:41.290  
Niamh Quigley  
OK and [disciplinary repository 2] also gives DOIs, doesn't it?

0:11:48.950 --> 0:11:50.740  
R2  
Yeah, I'm pretty sure it does. I just can't. Can't remember definitely, but it does definitely give an identifier.

0:12:2.500 --> 0:12:3.380  
Niamh Quigley  
Yes. Yeah. OK. And do you have any reservations about using [disciplinary repository 2]?

0:12:10.230 --> 0:12:11.190  
R2  
Ohh. So the only one thing that I've noticed when I was submitting my work is that [metadata ordering problem]

0:12:41.810 --> 0:12:50.290  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah, OK. It's got everything you need. OK, so we already had a little discussion about using espace.

0:12:50.740 --> 0:12:51.250  
R2  
Yep.

0:12:51.560 --> 0:13:4.340  
Niamh Quigley  
What would Curtin need to change for you to want to add your data to the Curtin Research Data Collection rather than using [general repository 1] or [code repository] in those cases where you have code with data.

0:13:11.850 --> 0:13:13.550  
R2  
Uh Umm? I guess the case with [code repository] is a little bit harder. Because of all the versioning and all that stuff, there might be a little bit difficult to compare with espace. But in terms of [general repository 1] I'm not actually sure. Does the Curtin repository also assign DOIs.

0:13:37.810 --> 0:14:6.280  
Niamh Quigley  
So yeah, the data doesn't end up in espace. It goes to a separate collection, and what the library team can do is you send them your data set, they'll give you a DOI, and they'll put it on a server at Curtin, which is maintained by DTS, and they'll also create a record on the website Research Data Australia, which is just a metadata record and points back to the Curtin server. But it does include some, you know it it's got some good metadata like temporal and spatial. And that means that anyone who's looking in Research Data Australia can find your data as well. So they do that for some data sets at Curtin, but this is the reason I wanted to talk to people like you who aren't using that option to try and figure out what's better about the other services. Is it that people just don't know that Curtin.

0:14:43.240 --> 0:14:45.540  
R2  
Yeah, could be, yeah. Because for example, I don't think I fully know what's the full functionalities that are available and how easy they are to use and things like that.

0:14:59.720 --> 0:15:0.170  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah.

0:15:0.670 --> 0:15:5.680  
R2  
Yeah, previous experience I had with espace, which is basically uploading an article. Yeah. So it might just be a case and obviously things might have changed and improved and like I don't know, but. Maybe it's more about awareness and if we. Yeah, I mean, there isn't really a barrier for me to actually use espace. I can easily use that. Yeah, it just has been easy that you know everything about all of our work from the project is on [general repository 1]. Also it's easy to keep everything in one place I guess.

0:15:39.720 --> 0:15:46.30  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah. Yeah, I can see how that's quite attractive to have the full set.

0:15:45.410 --> 0:15:52.580  
R2  
But what we do, I think in the project, we do occasionally remind each other to put stuff on espace and we have been doing that. Not regularly, but at a certain point in time or we have forgot to put stuff on, so we all go and put stuff on espace.

0:16:5.740 --> 0:16:6.380  
Niamh Quigley  
OK. And what about funded research? Do you have any specific places? Do you do anything different if it's funded research or you just have the same workflow?

0:16:17.490 --> 0:16:20.260  
R2  
I think for me there isn't a difference. [identifying] I think there isn't really a difference in terms of whether a project, whether the research is funded or not.

0:16:31.970 --> 0:16:32.380  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah. And are there any other websites or repositories that you use?

0:16:42.250 --> 0:16:44.560  
R2  
When you say use, do you mean access or do you mean…

0:16:44.30 --> 0:16:50.210  
Niamh Quigley  
Oh, sorry for sharing, for sharing research outputs. Yeah, apart from all of the ones that you've mentioned already.

0:16:50.420 --> 0:16:54.600  
R2  
So we mentioned [repositories]

0:16:55.40 --> 0:16:57.480  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah, I couldn't find anything of yours in [general repository 2]

0:16:58.70 --> 0:16:59.820  
R2  
No, I don't have anything on [general repository 2]

0:17:9.560 --> 0:17:10.10  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah.

0:17:4.300 --> 0:17:10.350  
R2  
No, I don't think there's anything else. Well, obviously on espace I did upload some stuff there and also previous places where I worked. I think other than that, there isn’t anything else. I’ve actually got a list down here.

0:17:20.180 --> 0:17:21.880  
Niamh Quigley  
Oh thank you. Yeah.

0:17:21.190 --> 0:17:24.520  
R2  
Of what I used and I think that's it.

0:17:24.850 --> 0:17:26.270  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah, that's great. And thinking about writing journal articles has a journal ever asked you to put supporting material in a specific place to go with the article? Have they ever told you that you have to put it somewhere?

0:17:47.700 --> 0:17:49.10  
R2  
I'm just trying to think back. There, there may have been a couple of cases, but it just turns out that those particular papers didn't really need supplementary material, but there were cases of journals saying you should submit your supplemental materials in this particular repository, yeah.

0:18:12.970 --> 0:18:15.540  
Niamh Quigley  
And which repositories were they?

0:18:15.950 --> 0:18:17.240  
R2  
I can't remember.

0:18:17.380 --> 0:18:17.880  
Niamh Quigley  
OK.

0:18:18.360 --> 0:18:19.830  
R2  
I guess it's a while back.

0:18:20.110 --> 0:18:20.520  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah. Did they kind of make you use that specific repository or suggest was it like you must put it in [specific general repository]? Or please put it somewhere where it will be preserved.

0:18:35.430 --> 0:18:38.470  
R2  
I think they were both of those cases. I think there were ones that asked if you have supplementary you have to put it into this one repository because that's the one that the journal uses, and there were other journals that said you could share them through several options.

0:18:53.920 --> 0:18:54.340  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah. Yeah, because I did find quite a lot on [general repository 1] of nice code and data packages, and that went with papers.

0:19:4.540 --> 0:19:5.530  
R2  
Yep, Yeah. I think for those ones, we didn't have specific requirements as to where to share them. And we just again chose [general repository 1] because everything else was there, it’s simple [identifying].

0:19:54.360 --> 0:19:56.210  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah, that's really handy. Umm. And do you find that you, do you ever change your practices around repositories depending on who you're collaborating with? [identifying] if you were collaborating with someone different or someone outside of Curtin how would you figure that out? Where to, where to put things?

0:20:24.570 --> 0:20:25.120  
R2  
I would. Yeah, I think things would have changed because. Previously, before I joined Curtin, uh, most of our researchers in [previous research area] and most of the papers that published in that area, well, with a group of people that I worked with then. The papers we published were in journals that are not open access and often had restrictions on how much you can share, which means we didn’t often have the option of putting things into repositories. Sometimes you could put preprints in institutional repositories, but the final published papers are often behind paywalls and we couldn't share that. [identifying] I think we try our best to share whatever we can, so that's very different from my previous work.

0:21:47.350 --> 0:21:50.660  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah. So it's about the culture of sharing, I guess in that field. OK, that makes sense. So thinking about espace only as an institutional repository, does it help you communicate your research and how?

0:22:8.470 --> 0:22:8.870  
R2  
Hmm. Well, I guess it communicates my research with the university itself, I guess. But I'm not actually too sure. Does it go further beyond that? Obviously, people can access research through the institutional repository but I would have no idea who's accessing those.

0:22:49.470 --> 0:22:51.600  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah, that's a really common answer for researchers because there is the perception that espace kind of just sits there and you would have to go into it to look for something to find it. But the good thing is that it's indexed so it ends up in Google Scholar.

0:23:11.910 --> 0:23:13.820  
R2  
It's searchable, yeah.

0:23:13.870 --> 0:23:20.10  
Niamh Quigley  
[identifying]

0:23:46.90 --> 0:23:59.610  
R2  
Yeah, it would be nice if it linked up to, you know, Curtin’s social media and, you know, whenever things are deposited, they get, you know, some kind of visibility on social media or other outlet.

0:24:0.270 --> 0:24:0.620  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah.

0:24:0.800 --> 0:24:2.230  
R2  
That would have been nice, yeah.

0:24:5.500 --> 0:24:10.850  
Niamh Quigley  
Thinking about third party repositories that we spoke about today. So including [general repository 1] and [code repository], how do they help you to communicate you research?

0:24:18.120 --> 0:24:21.450  
R2  
Ah, well, to both of them I think it's similar [unclear]? I kind of said you have to share the work yourself, so that's similar. I'm actually not sure. [identifying] Yes, but I guess with [code repository] it's more like a community thing again where you kind of communicate with this specific community and those communities use [code repository]. Umm, I'm not too sure about [general repository 1]. I think [general repository 1] doesn't have really a subject based thing, so it's anybody can use [general repository 1]. So I guess with that it's more of just if we deposit something into [general repository 1] we have to kind of make it visible to other people. Yep.

0:25:36.760 --> 0:25:43.980  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah, and push it out via social media. Yeah. And do that work that marketing, OK.

0:25:43.770 --> 0:25:44.80  
R2  
Yep.

0:25:44.790 --> 0:25:48.420  
Niamh Quigley  
And that community approach that you mentioned in [code repository]. Do you think that there's people who would follow [you in code repository] to keep up to date as well? Is that something you're aware of that people kind of keep an eye on your work. On that level.

0:26:6.960 --> 0:26:9.610  
R2  
I'm not 100% sure, but I think it's possible, yeah.

0:26:9.640 --> 0:26:9.990  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah. All right. Just a few questions left. So are there any other research outputs that you create? So it can be you know formal research or other things, educational materials, anything. Is there anything that you would like to share but you haven't?

0:26:36.650 --> 0:26:37.0  
R2  
I'm just trying to think. I think in terms of research yeah, there are probably places where I had presentations and things that hasn't been, conference presentations and things like that or similar presentations that haven’t really been shared. And in [educational materials] yeah there could possibly be [identifying] that might be useful to share. But yeah, with [educational materials] I'm not too sure about copyright and things like that how that can be managed. I'm not sure. I haven't, explored that yet.

0:27:47.460 --> 0:27:49.170  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah. OK. So what do you think the barrier is so? Is it time?

0:27:55.340 --> 0:27:58.790  
R2  
Yeah, I guess time is one issue. Well time to actually do it and also time to find out how it can be done might be the main reasons.

0:28:18.300 --> 0:28:19.870  
Niamh Quigley  
Yep, that's great [identifying]

0:28:40.600 --> 0:28:47.990  
R2  
Yeah, so previously when we did share, it's usually internal to the university and not visible outside. You know, I don't know how it works, how it would work if I have to share it beyond.

0:28:54.700 --> 0:29:9.70  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah, yeah, because I'm not even. There's a lot of universities doing really good things in open educational resources OERs, and they've set-up more repositories to scoop up all of those freebies the researchers are creating and the advantages are amazing because it means people all over the world can just pick them up. If the right license is on them, they can modify them, reuse them for teaching, and it makes them really open [identifying].

0:29:41.650 --> 0:29:51.980  
Niamh Quigley  
OK, they were great answers and that's all my questions. Is there anything else you wanted to add about repositories, third party repositories? Things that you find difficult to Curtin when you're using repositories or anything like that.

0:30:2.760 --> 0:30:14.340  
R2  
Yeah, I remember when I first joined Curtin, I did find it a little bit tricky to actually locate where I would submit the things and to use it. But once I've done it once [connection dropped]

0:30:39.540 --> 0:30:49.380  
Niamh Quigley  
… so you had just mentioned that when you joined Curtin, it was difficult. But then once you've done it once, it was OK.

0:30:49.780 --> 0:30:53.130  
R2  
Yeah, I guess it's a pretty similar story to where else I worked. It's a similar story for the first time. You don't know where to find it, and how to use it. And there isn't always necessarily a lot of information when you join to tell you that this is available and this is where you go to submit things often you kind of have to find out yourself or from other colleagues. Yeah. It's also different how different institutions work in terms of submitting work so one of the previous institutions where I worked I don't think you were allowed to submit work into the institutional repository yourself. They have dedicated admin staff within the school to actually do that. So you have kind of give your work to the admin staff and he or she will have to submit it to the repository for you.

0:32:4.370 --> 0:32:10.160  
Niamh Quigley  
Which model do you prefer, where you submit it yourself or where you have help?

0:32:11.380 --> 0:32:18.790  
R2  
Oh well definitely timewise I would prefer someone to help that would be nice but it also makes it, well the disadvantage is I guess because there's so many different variations and differences between different publications and things, it's very difficult for admin staff to actually pick all those things up. So if you do submit it yourself, you do have more of that flexibility of knowing what you actually want to submit and what you want to show. So there's advantages and disadvantages either way I guess. But timewise, definitely if someone has to submit for me that would be great.

0:33:6.880 --> 0:33:9.520  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah, yeah, it would be. That makes sense. Yes, that was all my questions. And if you think of anything else, you can just send me a follow up e-mail. Umm, so I'll be writing 2 reports, one internally for the library and one external report to share.

0:33:48.940 --> 0:33:50.270  
R2  
OK, right.

# Researcher 3 (R3) Interview Transcript

0:0:0.0 --> 0:0:12.830  
Niamh Quigley  
So I've had a look online so that I'm familiar with your research, but do you wanna start with a high level of what you're working on at the moment?

0:0:14.770 --> 0:0:28.20  
R3  
[description of research topic]

0:0:34.280 --> 0:0:49.540  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah, awesome. I did read one of your papers [identifying] So can you tell me about the kind of research outputs that you create? [identifying] What kind of other things do you consider as your research outputs?

0:1:8.70 --> 0:1:37.780  
R3  
Umm, I mean my main research output same as a lot of researchers would be just basically papers. [R3 describes how data is also a research output]. So that's quite significant. So we write a paper always kind of making those decisions like well we want to be as transparent as possible with our data and our methods. But what do we publish in there and how do we publish that on some repository that will well, first keep it available to people for a decent amount of time [identifying].

0:1:54.390 --> 0:2:5.380  
Niamh Quigley  
OK, so they're very important criteria in a repository. So keeping over a long period of time [identifying]. OK. And what about …?

0:2:8.790 --> 0:2:10.580  
R3  
I mean something that, sorry.

0:2:10.910 --> 0:2:11.800  
Niamh Quigley  
Oh no, you go ahead.

0:2:12.610 --> 0:2:13.630  
R3  
[unclear] So I don't know if you saw like [research output] I put on [disciplinary repository]. So I take some time to make an effort to push those [research outputs to disciplinary repository] obviously got other objectives behind that, but I know that very likely in 30 years’ time, they'll still be available for people to download.

0:2:44.470 --> 0:2:45.160  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah. [identifying about disciplinary repository]. So yeah, I was gonna ask about software. Do you ever release code with papers?

0:3:5.930 --> 0:3:22.840  
R3  
[identifying] that we've released with code and in that case we would usually tag like where it's like available and we use [code repository] but could be using, yeah, anything else and reference that [unclear]. Yeah, anytime we can especially be published [identifying] or try to make the code available. I haven't been going down the route, of I mean the code is quite specialised for what we do so haven't gone the route of like you know making dedicated papers for code and getting DOIs for like specific versions of the code haven't gone that way really. But just because our code is just very specialized.

0:4:6.110 --> 0:4:8.680  
Niamh Quigley  
OK, that's a great summary of code.

0:4:9.760 --> 0:4:12.610  
R3  
[unclear]

0:4:18.400 --> 0:4:25.730  
Niamh Quigley  
So I've had a look, I know that you've used [general repository 1] for [identifying] data sets for. And they're all maybe [number] of them are [research area] data set and the other one was with [identifying], it contains data for a paper that was submitted to [identifying], but I'm not sure if it's published yet. So is that your workflow that you like to put the data up first of all?

0:4:51.30 --> 0:5:17.100  
R3  
Yeah. Well, something we found cos with journals you’ve always got that option of getting supplementary material in. But what I found in past works is that supplementary material just doesn't stick around necessarily for very long. I was tracking down something. It was getting a bit old. It was like [number of years]. The guy who actually wrote it. So I tried to contact the editor and the editor said yeah, we don't have that. And then the main, the lead author [of the] paper didn't have it anymore or something. So I found that quite annoying so yeah, for our papers we've been trying to move away from just putting the supplementary material with the journal and yeah found out about [general repository 1], where it provides a kind of a fairly clear kind of, I guess, road map of what you want to do. And to me it looks like it's not going anywhere. It's probably here to stay. So I think for me, that was the main motivation for publishing data.

0:6:3.800 --> 0:6:14.170  
Niamh Quigley  
They're great reasons. I think the connection’s a little bit shaky, so if I'm quiet, it's just because I'm catching up on what you've said, OK.

0:6:15.530 --> 0:6:15.680  
R3  
Yep.

0:6:17.390 --> 0:6:29.120  
Niamh Quigley  
So you've mentioned some of the factors there that make [general repository 1] really attractive and your experience of missing data in the past as well. Umm, it's having a DOI important when you use [general repository 1]

[dropped connection in Teams]

0:7:9.820 --> 0:7:17.140  
R3  
Yeah, I can hear again. Sorry. Yeah, you were talking about the importance of DOIs and [general repository 1].

0:7:17.510 --> 0:7:19.460  
Niamh Quigley  
Yes. So that was my next question. [discussion of dropped connection] Yes, so is getting a DOI, is that an important thing to you for data?

0:8:4.350 --> 0:8:4.890  
R3  
Umm. I mean in, in the particular cases we’ve used it not really because data is like associated the paper and I mean ideally I want people to cite the paper and not the actual data set, like itself. Umm but yes, I could see like cases where that would be like quite useful. I know you could collect some data for some reason you don't get a paper out of that data but still want to publish it, make it available then yeah, having a DOI for that data set would be very useful in that case.

0:8:45.310 --> 0:8:49.660  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah. OK. And do you have any reservations about [general repository 1]?

0:8:52.680 --> 0:8:55.290  
R3  
So far, no, no, not really, no.

0:8:54.950 --> 0:8:55.830  
Niamh Quigley  
OK, that's great.

0:8:57.990 --> 0:9:10.100  
R3  
I guess the only the only thing with [general repository 1] is they do have some data size limits. I haven't run into the issue [unclear] so far, because with something like [file size] per data set like I think originally or like the base kind of limits? Umm, I guess like if we wanted to publish larger data that that, so not sure like where I would turn in that case.

0:9:33.590 --> 0:10:4.540  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah. Umm, I think with [identifying about general repository 1]. But I did want to mention that Curtin Library also have a data set service where you can send them your data set. They will mint a DOI, keep it on Curtin servers and add a record in Research Data Australia as well. So is that something that you're aware of?

0:10:6.270 --> 0:10:24.880  
R3  
Yeah, that's something I'm aware of. And yeah, I mean nothing against the library. You know, like people [at the] library do amazing work. But then, I know sometimes services or things at Curtin just get cut based on, you know, higher up, politics or cost saving measures. And the thing with the library where it's [unclear], to me there's not much visibility on how long that's going to be around for. So I know the people kind of running and promoting the services have the best intentions, but also know that Curtin has shown in the past that yeah, they can be quite quick at cutting services that you know at some point some manager will think oh it's not very useful. It's costing us money and just cut that. That's my kind of personal point of view on that and hence why I tried to [unclear] those services, look like they're here to stay. So yeah, my personal take on that doesn't necessarily reflect what, the rest of the team thinks. But yeah, that's the main reason that why I turned to [general repository 1] instead of Curtin Library personally.

0:11:21.540 --> 0:11:29.900  
Niamh Quigley  
Yep, Yep. OK, that's a really interesting answer [identifying discussion about R3 research area]. So this part of the project is to talk to researchers. Part is to talk to repository managers across Australia and the other part is to talk to the head librarians and find out what they're thinking about the future of repositories, which is kind of what you just mentioned, putting investment into them so that they're usable and trustworthy for researchers. I will be publishing all of the transcripts as open data from the researchers and I can send you a link to that if you're interested in having a look and I will send you the report in October as well. So you can get the summary.

0:12:59.970 --> 0:13:0.650  
R3  
Cool, alright.

0:13:0.30 --> 0:13:16.20  
Niamh Quigley  
So they were actually answered my next few questions, which is great. So thinking about data, what would you want Curtin to offer so that you would have that trust that it would be a long service?

0:13:18.780 --> 0:13:21.190  
R3  
Ohh, that's a that's a tough one. Yeah.

No.

0:13:29.960 --> 0:13:34.270  
Niamh Quigley  
Or is there anything they could come up with or you just happy with [general repository 1]

0:13:37.60 --> 0:13:40.830  
R3  
I mean, I'm personally very, very happy with [general repository 1]. Yeah again nothing against the library, but I know just the way sometimes things are done at Curtin. For example, we are currently working with DTS to migrate some of our R drive data which we don't really use as a primary repository [unclear] it's just the backup, but the cost savings that's put into some of those decisions doesn't make me very trustful of solutions provided by Curtin especially solutions that involve any sort of IT in the process. Let's put it this way.

0:14:28.240 --> 0:14:29.120  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah, yeah [identifying about R3 data]. OK, so I know you have a [identifying] funding sources. I've seen them acknowledged in your papers. Does that influence where you put your data or you're just happy with [general repository 1]?

0:14:58.690 --> 0:15:2.60  
R3  
I mean, yeah, yeah, pretty, pretty happy with [general repository 1]. Umm, something else kind of wondering is this kind of service provided by Curtin to upload data. Did that come from a requirement from some funding bodies to make the data available?

0:15:21.520 --> 0:15:26.390  
Niamh Quigley  
I think you're probably familiar with the funder requirements they have in their language is still a bit soft and no one has gone to the extent of, say, some of the European funders who say if we can't see your data, you're never getting money from us ever again. And I'm pretty sure there's not much monitoring and checking. So I think the Australian landscape is a lot softer than in Europe, but changes could be coming. And I think the reason behind the data service was more the visibility and to get it into Research Data Australia in the hope that people would look there for data sets as well for that reuse concept and to make it more findable as well. But that only works if people are using Research Data Australia. I mean, do you ever go on that website to look for data?

0:16:17.510 --> 0:16:29.460  
R3  
No, I don't. Ever. Yeah, or very rarely, I've looked at it before, but I don't give say ohh I need some data on something and therefore go on to that that particular service.

0:16:31.50 --> 0:16:32.110  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah, that makes sense.

0:16:35.180 --> 0:16:47.30  
R3  
But mostly because [unclear] I know what exists and what I guess what projects would have maybe collected it and then just doing some regular searches either through [disciplinary] repositories [identifying] or just web searches.

0:16:58.40 --> 0:17:14.880  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah. OK. So it's all discipline specific rather than generalist repositories for looking, OK. And when you're publishing articles, has a journal ever asked you to put your data in a specific place? Have they ever pushed on that.

0:17:19.820 --> 0:17:28.900  
R3  
No. Never. Like yeah, never had any journals asking for the data to be in specific places. Uh. No.

0:17:31.880 --> 0:17:34.40  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah. OK and would you say that it's part of your team culture now to use [general repository 1]?

0:17:41.990 --> 0:17:49.910  
R3  
Umm, [unclear] I push it normally in the team, but in our general kind of area of research, so more in the community as well, pushing gets people, maybe just leading by examples like trying to show that look I made my data available maybe on the next paper you should consider doing the same.

0:18:10.710 --> 0:18:10.990  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah.

0:18:10.580 --> 0:18:14.870  
R3  
Umm, I guess that's yeah, my point of view on that.

0:18:16.150 --> 0:18:25.550  
Niamh Quigley  
Yep, that's a great approach, and if you collaborating with researchers outside Curtin, do you have that discussion on where you're gonna store the data?

0:18:31.960 --> 0:18:40.950  
R3  
Yeah. So usually we start, yes, writing a paper, we’d have a discussion about what will end up published, what will end up being available at the end and then have a discussion where we gonna put it? And again, yeah. Last couple of cases where we've had that I've just been here pushing for [general repository 1] unless data was available already somewhere else.

0:18:56.620 --> 0:19:23.190  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah, OK. That's great. And I had a look in espace as well. So espace is Curtin’s institutional repository, but it's more for journal articles rather than data. So if you've ever used Elements to deposit, that's where your paper ends up in espace. So you've got [research outputs in espace]. Do you think that it helps you to communicate your research by having your work in there? Or is it more?

0:19:40.30 --> 0:19:42.740  
R3  
So just a quick clarification. So from a journal article point of view, is espace the idea that it can be used [identifying] where you can put the accepted version of your article freely available, not behind paywalls, is that correct?

0:19:58.310 --> 0:20:9.510  
Niamh Quigley  
Yes, exactly. So, yeah. So librarians call that green Open Access where there's an available copy that's still meets publisher copyright policies, but it might be a little bit as you said, the accepted version rather than the nicely laid out one from the journal. So yeah, that's exactly where they end up, yeah. Umm, so my question was do you feel that having papers in there helps you to communicate your research?

0:20:27.80 --> 0:20:33.750  
R3  
I feel like having papers uh on [disciplinary repository] in general definitely helps. Like at what stage we like in the publication process, we actually push something to [disciplinary repository] that kind of varies. [Identifying] we tend to use [identifying disciplinary repository].

0:21:3.980 --> 0:21:4.310  
Niamh Quigley  
Yep.

0:21:5.150 --> 0:21:20.700  
R3  
So I guess you have the time that we would spend kind of, yeah, formatting it and uploading these documents to [disciplinary repository]. I know that's not wasted and that's definitely still gonna be around in the next, yeah, foreseeable future basically.

0:21:21.170 --> 0:21:26.490  
Niamh Quigley  
[identifying about disciplinary repository] So thinking about third party repositories like [general repository 1] how do you think it helps you to communicate your research?

0:21:45.190 --> 0:21:49.120  
R3  
So that's for data, right?

0:21:47.600 --> 0:21:48.940  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah, for data, yeah.

0:21:50.860 --> 0:22:19.770  
R3  
To be honest, I'm not entirely sure how much, well, how much people use [general repository 1] for actually searching for data sets. From my point of view, using it is not necessarily for discoverability, because I think most people will discover these data sets, not by searching the web or searching [general repository 1], but will actually start from the papers and then maybe want to have a look at the data and go from there. So it's not necessary for the discoverability sort of thing it’s more just for the access to it and keeping it like available in in the long term.

0:22:28.60 --> 0:22:28.430  
Niamh Quigley  
Yep. OK, that's great. Do you ever make any other kinds of research outputs that you would like to share but you haven't? Maybe because you're not sure where they go, you're not sure if they'd be useful to anyone, so if you can't think of any I can tell you what the other researchers have told me.

0:22:53.570 --> 0:22:58.580  
R3  
I can't think of any like yeah, at the at the moment, no.

0:22:59.350 --> 0:23:4.520  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah. So two examples I got from researchers this week were educational materials say they're presenting a workshop on something, and it could be about methods or it could be about you know how they did something. And they weren't sure where that would go because they think it has good reuse value, but they weren't sure where to put it. Do you ever [have any educational materials] like that?

0:23:33.100 --> 0:23:47.80  
R3  
Yeah, I think that's actually a very good point. [R3’s research team created educational materials] it produced great content [identifying]. We’ve just been trying to move to content from website to website, but never considered like pushing that to a platform like [general repository 1] and that would make, yeah, that would make a lot of sense. I guess the other, never used it that way, but the other time I would probably use [general repository 1] is for data that won't make it into a paper, but will still be potentially interesting to publish and could be reusable. I haven't had a case like that so far. [identifying] More and more journals are offering like what they call like research notes typically which are non peer reviewed. So I think it's just an editor looks over to see if it's like relevant and does some copy editing on it. But it basically lets you publish your non peer reviewed work and makes available, gets a DOI and gets it out there. Which I find quite interesting, because then it makes it a lot easier to publish non results to get results out there and can potentially get cited for these things if other people find it useful. Did that answer your question?

0:25:31.550 --> 0:25:39.380  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah, that's a great answer and I hadn't thought about that one. Do you know if those journals that published those notes, are they open access? Like, would everyone be able to read them?

0:25:44.260 --> 0:25:44.790  
R3  
No, I'm not sure about all of them [identifying]

0:26:18.510 --> 0:26:18.870  
Niamh Quigley  
Yep.

0:26:20.600 --> 0:26:32.810  
R3  
Something that's that sound with a DOI and some visibility. So I'm not sure all of them are Open Access [identifying].

0:26:32.830 --> 0:26:41.140  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah, that's really interesting. And would you consider that the journal would keep it or would you think about putting it in another repository as a backup? Or you'd be confident in the journal.

0:26:46.180 --> 0:26:51.990  
R3  
Ohh in that particular case. Yeah, yeah, I've got good confidence the journal will keep it, yeah.

0:26:52.450 --> 0:26:55.380  
Niamh Quigley  
Yeah, that's great that that was a really interesting answer.

0:26:57.340 --> 0:27:3.210  
Niamh Quigley  
Is there anything else you wanted to add about repositories? How Curtin supports data? Anything like that.

0:27:8.900 --> 0:27:12.150  
R3  
No, nothing I can. Yeah. Nothing I can think of.
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