Overview of Existing Debate on Data Access and Research Transparency Across Disciplines

Anna Calasanti

August 25, 2015

Table of Contents

Sociology:

The American Sociological Association (ASA) has a clear policy regarding data sharing, as reported in the Code of Ethics via the Policies and Procedures of the ASA Committee on Professional Ethics, as seen in the excerpt, below:

(a) Sociologists share data and pertinent documentation as a regular practice. Sociologists make their data available after completion of the project or its major publications, except where proprietary agreements with employers, contractors, or clients preclude such accessibility or when it is impossible to share data and protect the confidentiality of the data or the anonymity of research participants (e.g., raw field notes or detailed information from ethnographic interviews).
(b) Sociologists anticipate data sharing as an integral part of a research plan whenever data sharing is feasible.
(c) Sociologists share data in a form that is consonant with research participants' interests and protect the confidentiality of the information they have been given. They maintain the confidentiality of data, whether legally required or not; remove personal identifiers before data are shared; and, if necessary, use other disclosure avoidance techniques.
(d) Sociologists who do not otherwise place data in public archives keep data available and retain documentation relating to the research for a reasonable period of time after publication or dissemination of results.
(e) Sociologists may ask persons who request their data for further analysis to bear the associated incremental costs, if necessary.
(f) Sociologists who use data from others for further analyses explicitly acknowledge the contribution of the initial researchers.

The full document can be found here:
http://www.asanet.org/images/asa/docs/pdf/CodeofEthics.pdf

Within ASA, there is the Committee on Professional Ethics (COPE), established "to promote ethical conduct by sociologists at the highest professional level through development and sponsorship of educational activities for ASA members and other sociologists, investigation of complaints concerning the ethical conduct of members of the ASA, and imposition of sanctions when a violation of the Code has occurred."

COPE has the authority to, among other things, recommend changes in the Code of Ethics, adopt rules and procedures, provide confidential advice on ethical obligations, and investigate and seek to resolve allegations of unethical conduct. A full statement on COPE's policies and procedures can be found here:
http://www.asanet.org/about/ethics/COPE.cfm#juri

The American Sociological Review (ASR) has a clear policy regarding publication ethics, which is informed directly from ASA's statement on data-sharing (as reported above):

"**Ethics:** Submission of a manuscript to another professional journal while it is under review by the *ASR* is regarded by the ASA as unethical. Significant findings or contributions that have already appeared (or will appear) elsewhere must be clearly identified. All persons who publish in ASA journals are required to abide by ASA guidelines and ethics codes regarding plagiarism and other ethical issues. This requirement includes adhering to ASA's stated policy on data-sharing: "Sociologists make their data available after completion of the project or its major publications, except where proprietary agreements with employers, contractors, or clients preclude such accessibility or when it is impossible to share data and protect the confidentiality of the data or the anonymity of research participants (e.g., raw field notes or detailed information from ethnographic interviews)" (ASA Code of Ethics, 1997)."

ASR's full submission guidelines can be found here; https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/american-sociological-review/journal201969#submission-guidelines

My understanding is that the policy at ASR has been in place for quite some time, see e.g. Hauser and Baron, below, but that it is not heavily policed. The prevailing norm is that if someone wants to look at your data, you should give it to them if you can; there appears to be far less emphasis on placing data in a shared repository. It is assumed that most quantitative data can be shared easily, and without ethical concerns, but even there, the attitude appears very laid-back — some volunteer it at the time of publishing, some don't, but the expectation is that you will share if asked. However, this does not include field notes and transcripts explicitly, as the assumption is that they cannot be shared for ethical reasons.

There has been a debate in Sociology over the last decade or so which has largely dealt with ethics/best practices in the context of specific methods, as well as a debate about the validity of one method over another, particularly ethnography versus interviewing as a valid form of research.

There has been a parallel conversation with Anthropology and History discussing the friction between IRB requirements and research ethics/best practice, with ethnographers taking the lead in that conversation. As an example, Jack Katz's 2006 piece, "Ethical escape routes for underground ethnographers" discusses the disconnect between official rules and the ethnographer's ability to comply with these expectations, given the conditions of the field site and the method. Katz argues for the development of a "culture of legality in campus ethics administration," which he conceptualizes as a reinterpretation of regulatory framework that will, by being both more realistic and embracing the true spirit of the regulatory intent, allow for ethnographers to operate more openly. A large portion of his argument rests on the idea that exemptions for interview and ethnographic data need to be reframed to meet the original intent of protecting this research at each step of the way (with the implication that IRB administrators have overstepped along these lines).

Michele Lamont and Ann Swidler have a 2014 article that tries to bring together all sides of the debate: "Methodological Pluralism and the Possibilities and Limits of Interviewing," in which they argue that the discipline should look towards methodological pragmatism (i.e. pluralism) rather than allowing "tribalism" to take over. They urge both interviewers and ethnographers to "seek ways of analyzing the broader cultural codes as well as the origins and logics of the structural circumstances," (166). This piece touches on the general tone of the debate, which Lamont and Swidler discuss as the limitations of different methodologies— e.g.the difficulty of contextualizing interviews within institutional structures— and leads them to the conclusion that powerful questions require multiple, complementary methods.

This background frames the current Alice Goffman controversy—within the discipline, the debate is focused on the trade-offs between data transparency and the privacy of the subject, the credibility of one researcher's experiences, and the ethical guidelines of field research (more detailed notes on this are at the end of this section).

Judith Taylor and Matthew Patterson's 2010 "Autonomy and Compliance: How Qualitative Sociologists Respond to Institutional Ethical Oversight" is also interesting, but may not be as relevant here. They interview sociologists across departments and find three different "ethics orientations" that shape how the faculty approach and respond to oversight from IRB/REBs.These categories are opposers (see ethics as a power struggle, tend to be senior men at elite institutions), accommodators (see ethics as a necessary evil, and go through the motions when "on stage," tend to be mid-career faculty), and active engagers (are extremely concerned that Sociology has ability to exploit vulnerable populations, believe in accountability structures, tend to be the authors of the ethics policies, tend to be young women).

The Data Archive for the Social Sciences' (GESIS) Wolfgang Zenk-Moltgen and Greta Lepthien's 2014 article, "Data sharing in Sociology journals," examines the data-sharing policies of 140 Sociology journals, and then compares the results with similar studies of economic and political science journals.
For the Sociology journals, they find that: "Although only a few Sociology journals have explicit data policies, most journals make reference to a common policy supplied by their association of publishers. Among the journals selected, relatively few articles provide data citations and even fewer make data available – this is true both for journals with and without a data policy. But authors writing for journals with higher impact factors and with data policies are more likely to cite data and to make it really accessible."

They compare this with Ghergina and Katsanidou's 2013 study of political science journals, which they cite as finding 15% (of 120) journals have adopted data availability policies and 5.8% plan to adopt them (Zenk-Moltgen and Lepthien, 711); and Vlaeminck and Siegert's 2012 study on economic journals, which they cite as finding 20% (of 141) journals have data policies which require authors to send data to the editors, who can then

pass the data on to interested parties (Zenk-Moltgen and Lepthien, 712). Zenk-Moltgen and Lepthien also cite Vlaeminck and Siegert's study as having found that journals "which have a data availability policy have a higher impact factor than journals without such a policy," that 82.8% of the policies were mandatory, with almost 90% including a submission to the editors (Ibid.).

Zenk-Moltgen and Lepthien found that the following 5 Sociology journals have an explicit data policy: ASR, Sociological Methodology, Sociological Theory, Sociology of Education, Social Science Quarterly (SSQ), Contemporary Sociology, and Teaching Sociology. All of these are produced by ASA, with the exception of SSQ. Of the two highest-impact sociological journals, ASR and the American Journal of Sociology (AJS), only one (ASR) has a data policy. When Zenk-Moltgen and Lepthien investigated the availability of the data of papers, they were able to access a cumulative 15.8% of data across the journals (Ibid., 716). [my contacts at SAGE all said that data would be made available upon request, and it isn't clear to me that these authors explicitly asked]

Ghergina and Katsanidou's study finds that "Five journals, British Journal of Political Science (BJPS), EUP, JCR, JPR, and Journal of Politics (JOP), clearly indicate in their policy that they require data availability only when quantitative analyses are conducted," (342) while the Journal of Peace Research encourages qualitative scholars to: "make use of the replication page to disclose additional documentation that cannot be included in the article itself, such as interview guides, interview transcripts, oral histories, documents that are difficult to obtain or that have recently been declassified, etc." (342-3). They also conduct an analysis on the journals that have adopted mandatory data policies, and conclude that they are more likely to be older journals that are published in English. These journals tend to be the "pace setters" of the discipline, with the greatest impact factor, and this creates a "bidirectional relationship" that will encourage other journals to follow suit in the pursuit of higher relevance in the discipline (345).

I did also find a little blip of a debate from the 1980s, e.g. Robert Hauser's editorial "Sharing Data: It's Time For ASA Journals to Follow the Folkways of a Scientific Sociology" in ASR, and James Baron's guest editorial response, also in ASR, "Data Sharing as a Public Good." Hauser's argument is (in addition to increasing the font size of print publications) that ASA should look into "electronic publishing" as a mechanism to preserve data that authors may wish to share with future generations of scholars. He recounts a story in which he threw away a large stack of "computer output" that had been cluttering his office for a decade, only to receive a request for said output the following day. He discusses the fact that ASA's Code of Ethics mandates data sharing, and laments that this is essentially meaningless, as there are no organizational mechanisms to support this mandate.

Baron's response to this is basically that while data sharing sounds great in theory, there are practical concerns that make this difficult, such as a lack of formalized standards and procedures for data collection and index construction, as well as a lack of documentation cohesion. The problems that he discusses are largely those of logistics and incentives. He addresses the fact that there is a difference between qualitative and quantitative data (and he asks where that line is drawn) and also highlights the fact that individual researchers sink a lot of personal cost into the collection of data— his suggestion is that if there is to be data sharing, that this should be financed to compensate the researcher for his or her sunk costs, thus incentivizing them to share more willingly. Finally, he discusses the problems of a journal's editorial staff taking on the responsibility of monitoring data sharing (including the possibility of researchers choosing to publish in journals that do not require rigid data sharing as a reaction) and suggests that COPE or a similar body should instead assist individuals who would like to access others' data, but are having a difficult time finding it.

Anthropology:

The most recent version of the American Anthropological Association's (AAA) statement on ethics was established 2012 by the Committee on Ethics subsection and from what I can tell at this point, it seems that this forms the core of "best practice" within the discipline. It is very much focused on ethical considerations at each phase of the research process, with a repeated catch phrase of "do no harm." Releasing results is discussed in the context of how it will impact the subject—including the manner in which the results are presented, how much information is released, etc. There is no mention within the statement of releasing field notes, raw interview data, etc— the only mention of "transparency" comes in the discussion of being "open and honest about your work" as you proceed, which I read as being as much about being honest with research subjects as it is with the academic community. Research here is described as an ongoing process, and the statement suggests that the researcher should make "principled decisions prior to beginning the research and encouraging participation, engagement, and open debate throughout its course."

There does appear to be some discussion about changing this code, but it mostly deals with bridging the gap between practitioners and academics. Some of this debate is spearheaded by the Committee on Ethics, but it seems more is being discussed via the National Association of the Practice of Anthropology (NAPA), which is also a section of the AAA. Concerns here include how to protect research conducted in the non-academic sphere where there is no IRB process in place, intellectual property rights within academia versus the private sector, and suggestions that there is too much emphasis on "do no harm" and not enough emphasis on "do some good."

There has also been an ongoing conversation about the influence of the IRB and ethics, focused largely on teaching the IRB how to think about participant observation and ethnography, responses to proposed changes in the Common Rule, and concerns about IRB overreach (similar to the concerns in History). Rena Lederman has written extensively about this topic, across several platforms. Her blog posts are easily accessible and provide a good overview of her arguments:
http://savageminds.org/author/rena-lederman/

The following articles discussed are from a special issue of *American Ethnologist,* which discuss ethics and the IRB, edited by Rena Lederman. Many of the authors are anthropologists, and there are a few points from this special issue worth highlighting.

Stuart Plattner, in "Comment on IRB regulation of ethnographic research," shares some his observations as an ethnographer, but more specifically, as the human-subjects-research officer for the NSF. Among other things, he argues that since "academic research is valuable in principle, it should not be impeded without specific reasons…the level of bureaucratic oversight of research should be directly related to the level of risk," (526).

Although he is discussing the oversight of the IRB, there is a certain parallel here with the idea of research transparency regulations that may be useful. It's also important to note that the rest of his article is largely cautionary: his emphasis above all is to protect the research subject.

Another important quote; in her rejoinder, "The ethical is political," Rena Lederman argues that "…the existing U.S. system is ineffective when it comes to meaningful support of specifically ethnographic "best practices." Not only do IRBs, as presently constituted, not help to cultivate an "ethical climate of research" for ethnography but they also actively undermine such a climate by fostering cynicism, dis- honesty, and confusion. Frequently frustrating, occasionally outrageous bureaucratic tangles associated with IRBs focus attention on models of research design and consent documentation that are construed by many nonethnographers as epistemologically neutral but that can be shown to reflect particular, mutually inconsistent ways of understanding the world (each with its own "best practice"): a politics of knowledge production. These tangles drain energies better spent designing ethics education relevant to field research or alternative structures for reviewing field projects," (546).

Didier Fassin raises another issue in, "The end of ethnography as collateral damage of ethical regulation?" He argues: "The intrusion of formal ethical regulation in ethnographic work puts into question the very meaning of fieldwork…participant-observation—which has become more and more often in my own practice observant participation, given that I am often engaged as an actor in the domains I study—is characterized by its informality. It blurs the boundaries between research and life. Fieldwork is everywhere. In my investigation of racial issues in France, I sometimes learn more in informal situations than I do when I conduct formal interviews with civil servants on official policies concerning equality or with young people confronted by discrimination in their everyday experience: for instance, when I participate as a speaker at events like the first Convention of Black Populations; when, as parents' representative, I attend a school meeting at which teachers discuss cases of children from immigrant families; or when I have dinner with friends of African origin who are members of the municipal authorities where I live. Obviously, all these heuristic moments should not be excluded as sources of information in a scientific investigation."

History:

While I have found prepared statements on a range of topics via the American Historical Association (AHA), none deal directly with the idea of sharing data, and it seems like an issue that is not relevant. There is an official statement in support of embargoing dissertations for 6 years, which is fueled by a fear that providing dissertations online will place junior scholars in a position where it is difficult to publish because their work is already readily available in the dissertation format. There is also some discussion of the importance of open access to data, this is in reference to original archives, etc., not a data set collected by a scholar for a particular publication. The assumption appears to be that, for the most part, historians already have access to the primary data, so for an individual to place his or her collected data into a repository is redundant. There are also guidelines regarding the peer review process, but they are largely focused on the importance of providing unbiased and constructive critique. All formal statements can be found here:
http://www.historians.org/jobs-and-professional-development/statements-and-standards-of-the-profession

There is also the following informal statement regarding ethics/best practices in research, which under the heading, "Maintain transparency in research," states: "It should always be possible for other researchers to have access to the materials on which you based your work. Where your research results in the production of new sources (such as oral histories, in audio or transcript form) donate the materials to an appropriate archive or library to facilitate their examination and use by others."
https://www.historians.org/publications-and-directories/perspectives-on-history/january-2010/ethics-for-historians-the-perspective-of-one-undergraduate-class

I did find some discussion of data hubs and collaboration (see de Moor and van Zanden, 2008, "*Do ut des* (I Give So That You Give Back): Collaboratories as a New Method for Scholarly Communication and Cooperation for Global History"), in which the idea of requiring the sharing of data in order to publish is floated, as part of a larger project. The authors' aim in the piece is to encourage a community of collaboration, particularly across borders, in order to increase the knowledge available to all researchers through the construction of "big data" archives.

One issue that is the subject of debate is the role of the IRB in historical research, and the AHA goes as far as to state that all IRBs should follow national standards and declare oral histories to be outside their scope. Zachary Schrag has written a good bit about the History and influence of the IRB, and has a particular focus on reining in what he believes to be an overbearing institution. In addition to a book (entitled "Ethical Imperialism") and a series of journal articles on the topic, he currently runs an IRB news blog that is continuously updated, and can be found here:
http://www.institutionalreviewblog.com/

This interview with Schrag may also be useful:

http://www.historians.org/publications-and-directories/perspectives-on-history/april-2011/ethical-imperialism-a-conversation-with-zachary-schrag

Economics:

I haven't found much in the way of a spirited debate here— sharing data and relevant processes is given a high priority overall, although some exceptions are made for proprietary data. I haven't seen anything that really discusses ethics, just detailed protocols, and explanations of why transparency is good.

The American Economic Review has a clear policy in place regarding data access.

Essentially, once a paper is accepted, the author is expected to send data and all other relevant materials for replication to the AER office. There are some exceptions: for econometric and simulation papers, as well as experimental papers—for the former, there is a minimum requirement of data submission, and authors must cooperate fully with replication requests from investigators. It is possible to request an exemption in instances where data is proprietary, but authors must provide instructions for how others can obtain the data, and provide copies of any programs used to achieve results. For experimental papers, there is a very detailed policy— authors must submit clear instructions, information about subject selection, all programs or scripts used to run the experiment, as well as all raw data, which must be summarized in a way that others can understand.

The full policy can be accessed here:
https://www.aeaweb.org/aer/data.php

At the most recent American Economic Association meeting, in January of 2015, there was a panel entitled "Promoting New Norms for Transparency and Integrity in Economic Research"

The two most relevant papers from this:

Nosek's paper focuses on the importance of reproducibility over positive results as part of the scientific process— i.e. that there are "incentives that inflate the rate of false effects in published science," and in the interests of science, more results should be challenged, and infrastructure and incentives should be set up in a way that encourages this.

Ball and Medeiros describe a protocol they have instituted with their students that trains them to document all statistical work and data throughout the research process, which they argue teaches responsible practices that increase standards of replicability and transparency.

http://openeconomics.net/2012/10/03/the-benefits-of-open-data-evidence-from-economic-research/

Psychology:

In May of 2015, the Subcommittee on Replicability in Science Advisory Committee to the National Science Foundation Directorate for Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences, which is co-chaired by a Psychologist and a Sociologist (the other committee members are psychologists) released a report entitled "Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences Perspectives on Robust and Reliable Science."

Overall, the report emphasizes the importance of replicability and transparency in reporting methods and results, and discusses a move toward a "more open science." This includes a number of suggestions that are aimed at increasing transparency, including sharing data. Within the report, there is a full section that deals directly with data-sharing, which stems from a panel on institutional policies and procedures sponsored by representatives from the Association for Psychological Science (APS) and the American Psychological Association (APA).

This section highlights the benefits of data sharing, points to the popularity of the APS special issue on replicability and good research practices, mentions the APA Task Force on Replication in the Psychological Literature's ongoing work in creaking guidelines for a "good" replication study, and the APA's establishment of the *Archives of Scientific Psychology* as an open access journal with an emphasis on data-sharing and collaboration.

This section also identifies a number of issues that need to be explored further, specifically: "the protection of human subjects in the context of data sharing and data repositories;" "supporting the evolution of the scientific publishing enterprise through development and deployment of infrastructure, including the development of easy-to-use tools for researchers, and services designed to improve replication and data sharing;" and "re-examining an incentive structure that encourages investigators to create new and innovative instruments that results in the collection of data that are difficult to harmonize."

Also worth a brief mention: much of the conversation in psychology does appear to be prompted by a series of incidents of research fraud in the discipline over the last few years, the most notable of which is the Stapel case, below:

http://www.nytimes.com/2011/11/03/health/research/noted-dutch-psychologist-stapel-accused-of-research-fraud.html

Also interesting, in 2012, Stroebe et al, in response to the Stapel case, published "Scientific Misconduct and the Myth of Self-Correction in Science," in which they analyze 40 cases of discovered research fraud between 1974 and 2012. In their conclusion, they discuss several strategies for reducing the risk of scientific fraud, including the effectiveness of data transparency and replication. They do state that data transparency might make it possible to detect mistakes in a falsified data set, and that repeated replication failures can be a warning sign (they stipulate many iterations, as there are many reasonable factors that can cause failed

replications). However, they maintain that the most effective tool in combatting fraud are whistleblowers— as colleagues and graduate students who are close to the project are far more likely to see issues than outsiders.

In January 2014, *Social Psychology* published a special issue devoted to 27 replication attempts of previous important findings in the discipline, many of which failed either partially or completely. The table of contents of that special issue can be found here:

http://econtent.hogrefe.com/toc/zsp/45/3

Following the release of the special issue, there was a good amount of pushback, particularly from Simone Schnall, who was extremely upset that, although she was cooperative and shared all relevant material with the team attempting to replicate her study, she was not allowed to review or respond to their results, which leads to the so-called #repligate controversy, see e.g.:

http://www.psychol.cam.ac.uk/cece/blog
http://www.sciencemagazinedigital.org/sciencemagazine/23_may_2014?pg=17#pg17
http://www.spspblog.org/simone-schnall-on-her-experience-with-a-registered-replication-project/comment-page-1/#comment-17137
https://davidjjohnson.wordpress.com/2014/05/25/rejoinder-to-schnall-2014/

The Times recently reported on the team run by one of the two editors for the SP special issue, Brian Nosek, also known as the Replicability Project:
http://www.nytimes.com/2015/08/28/science/many-social-science-findings-not-as-strong-as-claimed-study-says.html?_r=1

Finally, another overview of the replicability argument from the APA Science Student Council, with a series of links to blogs, relevant twitter accounts, special issues, etc:

http://www.apa.org/science/about/psa/2015/01/replicability.aspx

Appendix: Notes from DA-RT MPSA Podcast

Lupia—

motivation— to increase "credibility and legitimacy" of work in political science

if we produce knowledge claims that others can't replicate or if we can't really explain how we got them, others can ask questions about whether they should trust what is we say

change the status quo from "please can i have your data, on your knees begging for months and months" to the expectation that data will be shared "although understanding that there may be lots of good reasons why it can't be"

4 commitments (from the dart statement)—
—if you have data that you can share (is citable), you put it in trusted digital repository
—clear definition of analytic procedures upon which published claims rely
—data citation policy
—journal style guidelines

incentives—
will increase citation counts
publication following guidelines

also makes a point about how the dart guidelines do not contain the words "political science" anywhere— suggests that this may be something that other disciplines will want to adopt

Elman—

trusted digital repository— durability, curation support—allows data to be useable, discoverable, meaningful, citable, securable

when must data be made available? catalytic event— publication? review?
obligation is to explain the data that we used to arrive at the published claim— the heuristic data not the equivalent of the study data set
we're fans of sharing the study data set if you can, but that's not the obligation under dart

epistemic foundation— theory of knowledge reason why transparency is important
social inquiry is more than process dependent (cites KKV!) "content is the method"
if you can't see how the result was arrived at, you don't get to see the full result
if can't see the data AND the analysis then the outcome has less meaning than it could— a "degraded product"
requirement for research transparency is driven by an epistemic imperative—show your work

individual research communities allowed under dart umbrella—
universal principle— any evidence-based social inquiry has to show data access and research transparency
but this is not homogenous
common typology but specific content would be different

(from the Q&A)
        —people have a hard time understanding what qualitative research transparency looks like, so need to create good template/guidelines, but also a good examples from exemplary texts, shows an example from the qualitative data repository

Ishiyama—

APSR embraced idea of adopting new data access/research transparency policy after:
—work of the dart group
—critical events (e.g. Stapel case)
—problems associated with current best practices, discovered after they took over editorship 2012

AJPS, Political Analysis, others, have been "doing this" for a long time

we would not proceed just along with quantitative research— wanted to include qualitative and normative work as well

not only for the purposes of replication— stresses that will not expect replication of qualitative work— key is transparency, in production and in analytical processes

APSR is committed to the following:
—data access (where applicable)
—production transparency (how did you get the data you have)
—analytical transparency (how did you come to conclusions)

implementation—
working with variety of scholars to help fashion wording of guidelines to build a consensus and in support of those principles

what we will not do—
will not ask people to make public their field notes
do not presume that field research/ researcher's unique experiences can be replicated
will not impose standards from above— expect that standards will emerge organically

what we will do—
committed to implementing these principles

words have meaning— and use of terms like replication and transparency may be controversial
working with scholars from variety of traditions to create consensus, guidelines

Jacoby—

AJPS is an enthusiastic participant in dart

tried to implement a data replication policy at JOP

implementation
—AJPS has always encouraged authors to make replication materials available
—previous editor Rick Wilson established new policy by requiring upload of replication
materials to Harvard Dataverse
—some problems
    —not enough guidelines led to enormous variance in what people uploaded
    —Jacoby's attempts to get data from authors of previously published work has been met
    with flat refusals and concerns about research being stolen, etc (all quantitative work in
    his examples)
    —caveat— very little qualitative work represented in AJPS, but this is "not a policy" so if
    you intend to submit qualitative work to AJPS, contact Jacoby to figure out how to
    proceed ("we will be flexible")
    —must provide analysis dataset, detailed code, info on source, any instructions for
    extracting and producing the analysis data set from the original data source, a "read me"
    file that tells people what they will be looking at in the dataverse

—objective is to provide a general standard for the information that must be made available to
the research community

—submitted replication materials will be verified to guarantee that they do reproduce results
before the work will appear in AJPS (sent to UNC Odum Institute)

—no projects had been successfully replicated at time of podcast recording (policy had been in
place for a month, and 9 acceptances had been sent to the Odum institute)

Kapiszweski—

—much weaker tradition of sharing data among qualitative scholars
—remains unclear how this translates into a concrete set of guidelines for qualitative scholars
her thoughts on/suggestions for what guidelines can be implemented that will make dart less of a
punitive step for qualitative researchers and more of an opportunity to showcase the integrity and
rigor of their work—

—mentions her work with colin on qualitative data repository, refers to it as a process in which they are building specialized knowledge on how to address some of the difficulty inherent in sharing qual data

> —which data need to be shared? which processes need to be described and in what detail?
> —scholars don't need to share all of the data they took in when interacting with the social world
> —this is not a purely epistemic question— may be ethical and legal concerns— dart creates a space for this, but there aren't clear and explicit guidelines
> —content and form— at each of the steps of the data collection process, choices are made about what aspects of the social world to interact with, what questions were and were not asked— this is something that should be included, and something that scholars should be documenting along the way in a "lab book" or similar

—ultimately leaves a lot of open questions, especially in terms of operationalization