Navigating Complexity: Reflexivity, Acceptance of Digital Means, and Ethical Imperatives in Contemporary Qualitative Research

Prof. Dr. Muhammad Saleem[1]

Introduction

The evolution of qualitative research is not just about adopting new tools or methodologies; it has about how we, as researchers, make sense of the complexities of a rapidly changing world. Every day, we come across challenging questions about social justice, the digital transformation of our lives, and our ethical responsibilities to the communities we research. This editorial reflects my own journey, grappling with these complexities and exploring how our foundational principles of reflexivity and ethics are being reshaped by the digital age. What does this all mean for us, as a community, trying to create research that truly matters?

Reflexivity in the Digital Age

Reflexivity has always been at the heart of qualitative research. It is about taking a step back and thinking deeply about how our own presence influences the research process. These days, though, I often find myself reflecting on what it means to be a researcher in digital spaces, spaces where the rules are a little different and the dynamics between our participants and us are mediated through screens. I think about Zoom, Twitter, or Instagram and the ways they shape how we connect with participants. I often find myself wondering: What does it actually mean to "be present" in a virtual space?

Let me share an example. A few months ago, I conducted some interviews over Zoom. It was really quite different from being face-to-face. There is something about trying to pick up subtle cues through a screen that makes you realize just how much of our connection is non-verbal. It is all those small things, a smile, a nod, shared eye contact. I remember one particular interview where I had to be extra mindful of my tone and expression to ensure the participant felt heard. It took deliberate effort to build that trust, unlike the more natural flow that comes with in-person interactions (Salmon et al., 2021). Reflexivity, in this context, meant not just thinking about my biases but also reflecting on how this digital medium was influencing everything, the flow of conversation, the sense of connection, and even what my participant felt comfortable sharing. Digital ethnography brings its own set of challenges. Social platforms are far from

[1] Prof. Dr. Muhammad Saleem, Editor In-Chief, Pakistan Journal of Applied Psychology

neutral; they have algorithms that decide what we see, what we do not, and even how conversations unfold. These platforms are built with specific agendas and incentives, and as researchers, we have to be mindful of how these factors subtly shape the stories we hear. Reflexivity, then, is not just about examining our own biases; it about critically understands the platforms we are using and how they may be affecting our insights (Varis, 2016).

Digital and Hybrid Methods: Expanding Boundaries

There is no denying that digital tools bring many exciting possibilities to our work, whether it is using AI to analyze large datasets or tapping into social media for new forms of qualitative data. However, I also approach these tools with a bit of caution. I often ask myself: How do we make sure we are not losing the depth and richness that qualitative research is all about? There is something incredibly powerful about sitting with the data, spending time with it, and understanding the stories behind the numbers. I recall a recent project where I studied online activism around environmental justice. I used a combination of AI-assisted analysis and traditional coding, and I have to say, the AI was helpful in clustering conversations and spotting emerging themes. Then came the human part, where I had to go beyond those clusters, take a step back, and really listen. It was in those moments of careful listening that I understood the emotions in those tweets, the solidarity, the anger, the hope. The technology helped, sure, but it was my own engagement with the data that really brought the findings to life (Aguayo & Eames, 2022).

Ethical Imperatives in Digital Qualitative Research

With the shift to digital research, our ethical considerations have also evolved. The line between public and private is becoming increasingly blurred, especially in online spaces. For instance, when we study social media, there is always the question: Is a public tweet fair game for research? Sure, it is out there for anyone to see, but ethically, it feels a bit more complicated. There is a person behind each post, a person who might not have expected that their words could end up in an academic study (Markham & Buchanan, 2021). One approach that has been helpful for me is thinking about consent as something ongoing, especially in digital research. Instead of viewing it as a one-off event, I try to keep checking in with participants - making sure they still feel comfortable with how their stories are being represented. In one particular study, I remember a participant who reached out to me after an interview, concerned about how some of their comments might be interpreted. We had a follow-up conversation, and I adjusted my analysis accordingly. It was a reminder that ethical research is about respecting participants not just during the data collection phase, but also throughout the entire process (Thompson & Cupples, 2021).

Conclusion

We are at a transformative moment as qualitative researchers. The core principles of reflexivity and ethics are as relevant as ever, but they need to evolve as we step into these digital environments. I truly believe that, as a community, we have the creativity and resilience to use these new tools in ways that enhance our work - without losing the essence of what makes qualitative research meaningful. Let us embrace the opportunities these digital tools offer, but let us also keep our eyes on what really matters, our empathy, our commitment to depth, and our passion for human stories. Let us keep questioning, keep reflecting, and use these tools to deepen our understanding of the complexities of the lives we study, not just as data points, but also as real, lived experiences.

References

Aguayo, C., & Eames, C. (2022). Artificial Intelligence and Big Data in Qualitative Research: Opportunities and Challenges. *Journal of Qualitative Inquiry, 28*(1), 43-57. DOI: 10.1177/10778004211056719

Archibald, M. M., Ambagtsheer, R. C., Casey, M. G., & Lawless, M. (2019). Using Zoom Videoconferencing for Qualitative Data Collection: Perceptions and Experiences of Researchers and Participants. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 18*, 1-8. DOI: 10.1177/1609406919874596

Berson, I. R., Berson, M. J., & Ferron, J. M. (2022). Ethical Dimensions of Using Artificial Intelligence in Qualitative Inquiry: The Case of Machine-Assisted Interview Transcription. *Qualitative Research, 23*(2), 145-162. DOI: 10.1177/14687941211034730

Markham, A. N., & Buchanan, E. A. (2021). Ethical Considerations in Internet Research: Recommendations from the AoIR Ethics Working Committee. *Ethics in Internet Research, 25*(3), 1-18. DOI: 10.1177/2056305120913900

Salmon, D., Cox, K., & Barlow, J. (2021). Qualitative Interviewing in the Digital Era: Challenges and Opportunities. *Qualitative Health Research, 31*(8), 1431-1442. DOI: 10.1177/1049732321993500

Thompson, L., & Cupples, J. (2021). Rethinking Consent and Ethics in Digital Ethnography: Participatory Approaches in Online Research. *Social Media and Society, 7*(3), 1-12. DOI: 10.1177/20563051211012315

Varis, P. (2016). *Digital Ethnography. In The Routledge Handbook of Language and Digital Communication* (pp. 55-68). Routledge. DOI: 10.4324/9781315694344