Social media research: ethics issues & guidance v1

Key terms

Social media: Twitter, Facebook, YouTube, Instagram, LinkedIn, Pinterest, Snapchat, Reddit, TikTok, forums, chat rooms, blogs etc.

Data:

- From *created* content, e.g. (micro)blogs, comments, images videos.
- From engagement, e.g. likes, shares, retweets, followers, friends.
- From tracking participants, e.g. location.

Guidance documents consulted¹

- British Psychological Society (BPS). *Ethics guidelines for internet-mediated research*. 2021.
- Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC). Internet-mediated research. n.d.
- franzke, aline shakti, Anja Bechmann, Michael Zimmer, Charles Ess and the Association of Internet Researchers (AoIR). *Internet Research: Ethical Guidelines* 3.0. 2019.
- National Committee for Research Ethics in the Social Sciences and the Humanities (NESH). A Guide to Internet Research Ethics. 2019.
- Townsend, Leanne and Claire Wallace. Social Media Research: A Guide to Ethics. 2016.
- The University of Sheffield. Research Ethics Policy Note no. 14, Research Involving Social Media Data. n.d.

General philosophical issues

- Social media users = human participants (Sheffield).
- Key: user perceptions, (reasonable) expectations, attitudes (Sheffield; BPS; NESH).
- Internet communication covers private (home) and public (forum) locations simultaneously (BPS); 'not all info openly available online is public' (NESH).
- Public nature 'should always be critically examined' and identity protected where appropriate (ESRC); plus consider digital fingerprints / tracking (NESH).
- Key factors: accessibility, sensitivity, vulnerability, interaction (NESH).

IPSOS MORI, 2015 UK study (URL)

- 38% are aware that social media data is shared for research.
- 60% think such sharing should not happen.
- 74% prefer to be anonymous in research.
- 54% agree on right to anonymity.

¹ Ethical codes listed on the page 'Internet and social media research in BMS': <u>link</u>

Context and culture

Cultural differences include contextualising frameworks (AoIR):

- European (Scandinavian, e.g. NESH): deontological, 'dignity, freedom, autonomy, solidarity, equality, democracy and trust'.
- US / UK (e.g. BPS): utilitarian, 'greater good for the collective and society in general'.

Values in tension

- Individual autonomy vs relational selfhood; vulnerability of individuals and communities.
- Virtue ethics, feminist ethics (of care): beyond ethical obligation / compliance, e.g. community benefits.

Privacy settings

- Terms and conditions, inc. 'third party use', but does that means it is 'public'?
- Online content is not static, e.g. T&C changes, pages archived (BPS)².
- What about informed consent? N.b. Legislation ≠ ethics.
- Consider different ways people use the internet, and the full range of impacts, e.g. roles of anonymity, play, choice³; issue of filter bubbles⁴; risks of public shaming, bullying, cancelling⁵; potential impacts, e.g. trolling⁶ and doxing⁷.

Some key (ethical) questions and principles to consider:

- Is there a reasonable expectation of privacy?
- Does deletion of a post = withdrawal of consent?
- Can you fully anonymise data searchable online?
- Is there a risk of harm (embarrassment, reputational damage, prosecution)?
- Is a participant willing and of sound mind (inc. when they posted)?
- Can you be sure you've understood (accuracy), e.g. between: serious vs. irony/humour; ranting vs. sincere beliefs?
- Can you be sure they are who they say they are?
- Flexible principles for various contexts, platforms, populations, topics, methodology, data; responsibility remains with researcher & ethics committee (assuming latter are well informed & not misled) (Townsend and Wallace, 2016).
- Key is reflective, dialogical processes; ethical judgments with reasons (AoIR).

² Cf. https://europa.eu/youreurope/business/dealing-with-customers/consumer-contracts-guarantees/consumer-contracts/index_en.htm

³ Burkitt, I. (2008) Social Selves: Theories of self and society. London: Sage.

⁴ Pariser, E. (2011). *The filter bubble: What the Internet is hiding from you.* London: Penguin.

⁵ Ronson, J. (2016). So you've been publicly shamed. NY: Riverhead Books.

⁶ Phillips, W. (2015). This is why we can't have nice things: Mapping the relationship between online trolling and mainstream culture. Mass.: Mit Press.

⁷ Eckert, S., & Metzger-Riftkin, J. (2020). Doxxing. *The international encyclopedia of gender, media, and communication*, 1-5.