ETHICAL ISSUES THAT NEED TO BE ADDRESSED IN ORDER TO SHARE DATA.

Kristen Renwick Monroe, Chancellor's Professor, UC Irvine

I assume readers understand the background for DA-RT and hence go straight to the point. There are ethical concerns when dealing with certain types of data, especially qualitative data, that make it difficult for researchers to provide the full transparency that soon will be required by many journal editors in order to consider publishing work using these data. I note just three from my own experience in interviewing altruists, rescuers of Jews during the Holocaust, Nazis, genocide bystanders, people who survived wars, people speaking about their lives and how they made moral choices, both male and female university professors and administrators speaking about gender discrimination, and asylum seekers. All of these people trusted me with personal stories involving traumatic events, from murders and genocides to losing loved ones and enduring discrimination. Deserving this trust called for great sympathy, sensitivity and – above all – going the extra mile to protect the speaker's integrity and privacy.

       Modifying data. Certain kinds of interview data must be modified slightly to protect the speaker's privacy. My last book – *A Darkling Plain: Stories of Conflict and Humanity during War* – analyzes interviews with people who lived through wars to ask how they kept their humanity. One woman interviewed has family still living in Tehran. To not have modified her identity slightly could risk injury to other human beings. So with her permission, we gave her more children, altered her discipline, her job, etc. To release the original transcript to another scholar could do harm so we cannot do this. In this case, we showed the transcribed interview to the speaker and worked closely with her to make any changes, so these were all approved before any analysis even began. The speaker also was shown a manuscript copy of the book before it was published. The revised transcript can be made available to others, but not the original data.

       Destroying original data. Sometimes privacy dictates that data becdestroyed, even before they are fully analyzed. For a project on gender equality in academia, I conducted interviews with female faculty and university administrators. Many people were concerned their careers would be damaged if they spoke candidly so I promised to erase all the tapes from which interviews were transcribed. Each speaker was shown the final transcript before it was analyzed, and any requested changes, additions, deletions were made before the interview was analyzed. We also took the extra step of making a few changes ourselves, to protect subjects even when the speaker did not catch something. (For example, one woman told that she had to leave a baby alone in a NYC apartment to take her language exam, her last requirement for the PhD. Her husband had to work and the baby sitter did not show up. I thought the story was important to use since it captured the desperate choices women can face, but I suggested we drop it from the particular interview and just leave it as a free-floating comment. The speaker agreed, and was, I think, grateful for our vigilance.) But once we did all of these things, the original taped interviews were destroyed, with the knowledge and permission of the interviewees.

       Accessibility of data. Making data available for others to analyze also involves us in ethical issues. Should a young scholar, who has invested considerable time collecting data, be obliged to make these data available to others before she has fully analyzed them herself? Probably not. The time period for "releasing" data can be extensive, however, for perfectly honorable reasons. In my case, I first interviewed Tony in 1988. We spoke on and off about his work in the Resistance and rescuing Jews, and completed the interviews in the early 1990s, at which point I published several books in which Tony figured. He has now died, and his wife

would like to do a documentary on his life. She told me I am the only one who has the interviews, many of which are filmed. She has asked me to keep the films available for her to work on a possible documentary, and I believe this is her right. At some point, the filmed interviews will be made available. But in another instance, when someone wanted to make a documentary about one of my books and asked me to go through filmed interviews, I realized that the films of the interviews – like the initial tape-recorded interviews – contain material that was excised in the printed form. (We again did this in consultation with the speaker, so I have some idea as to what the speaker considered too personal.) To now go through and edit this material – filmed or tape-recorded – is very time extensive. I had not fully appreciated this difficulty before this summer, when I began going through the process of cleaning up the original interviews so they could be made available to others in a data archive. I spent all summer on this, and still have only scratched the surface of what will be required to edit the original interviews. I may never have the time to edit the original filmed interviews. I am not hiding information or hoarding data; I simply will not live long enough to through all of it carefully enough to address the ethical issues involved in sharing data.

My point is then: editors and scholars need flexibility. Transparency is important but it sometimes can work against trust, and thus ethical issues must be addressed. The current proposals do not do this fully so we need time to work on these important issues. I strongly urge delay in implementing the new rules, so these critical ethical issues can be addressed.