Article:

Shesterinina, A., Pollack, M.A. and Arriola, L.R. (Submitted: 2019) Evidence from researcher interactions with human participants. SSRN. (Submitted)

Evidence from Researcher Interactions with Human Participants

Final Report of QTD Working Group II.2

December 2018

Working Group Members[*]

Anastasia Shesterinina, University of Sheffield

Mark A. Pollack, Temple University

Leonardo R. Arriola, University of California, Berkeley

[*] Anastasia Shesterinina <a.shesterinina@sheffield.ac.uk> is a Lecturer (Assistant Professor) in Politics/International Politics at the University of Sheffield. Mark A. Pollack <mark.pollack@temple.edu> is a Professor of Political Science and Law, Jean Monnet Chair, and Director of Global Studies at Temple University. Leonardo R. Arriola <larriola@berkeley.edu> is Associate Professor of Political Science and Director of the Center for African Studies at the University of California, Berkeley.

Introduction: Researcher Interaction with Human Participants

According to the American Political Science Association's (APSA) Guide to Professional Ethics in Political Science, "Researchers have an ethical obligation to facilitate the evaluation of their evidence-based knowledge claims through data access, production transparency and analytic transparency so that their work can be tested and replicated."[1] This disciplinary commitment to Data Access and Research Transparency (DA-RT) was first added to the APSA Ethics Guide in 2012[2] and then further reinforced by the signing of the Journal Editors Transparency Statement (JETS) in 2014,[3] which set the stage for the implementation of the data access and research transparency guidelines in the discipline.

The APSA Qualitative and Multi-Method Research (QMMR) Section initiated the Qualitative Transparency Deliberations (QTD) to engage the scholarly community in considering the meaning and the implications of transparency guidelines for scholars utilizing qualitative methods.[4] The QTD included a series of Working Groups (WGs) to consult and deliberate on these issues.[5]

This Community Transparency Statement presents a summary of, and recommendations based on, the deliberations of Working Group II.2: Evidence from Researcher Interactions with Human Participants.[6] Our consultations with scholars in the discipline, combined with insights drawn from contributions to the QTD online forum as well as published materials, reveal broad support for transparency in social science research. Yet, the meaning of transparency is debated across different traditions in the discipline and the principle should be understood in light of disciplinary diversity. This suggests the need to broaden the notion of transparency to research integrity writ large, including a discussion of transparency as reflexivity not covered by the focus on data access, production transparency, and analytic transparency in the DA-RT and JETS initiatives.

Our consultations and deliberations also reveal that transparency, as DA-RT and JETS articulate it, raises important concerns for human subjects research, where the imperative of transparency comes into tension with competing priorities, including, but not limited to, the ethical obligation to protect vulnerable human subjects, the epistemological diversity within the discipline, the workload imposed on scholars using qualitative data, and intellectual property concerns.[7] Above all, transparency should be understood in relation to the paramount principle of human subjects protection in the profession, especially in settings of authoritarian or repressive regimes, political violence, and marginalized populations where we should be particularly cautious with regard to transparency. This priority of human subjects protection has implications not only for making one's data available (data access), but also for explaining how it was collected and analyzed (production and analytic transparency).

---

[1] American Political Science Association 2012.
[2] For background on the DA-RT, see Lupia and Elman 2014. See also Golder and Golder 2016.
[3] Data Access & Research Transparency 2015.
[4] On the QTD, see Büthe and Jacobs 2015.
[5] Qualitative Transparency Deliberations: About.
[6] QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.2: Evidence from researcher interactions with human participants, https://www.qualtd.net/viewforum.php?f=18 .
[7] References to contributions from individual scholars in the QTD forum are hyperlinked in footnotes.

This report identifies a range of transparency practices that researchers, editors, and reviewers can apply on a case-by-case basis to mitigate these concerns. Some of these practices include:

- Providing extended interview excerpts

- Quoting interviews in a contextualized way

- Presenting interview protocols

- Writing a clear methodology section and/or appendix

- Explaining case, site, and respondent selection

- Being reflexive about how the research unfolded

- Including thick description, background knowledge, and meta-data

- Justifying why empirical material supports alternative arguments

- Reviewing the research of colleagues working in the same tradition and area

These tools, however, should only be requested by editors and reviewers and used by researchers when they are ethically, epistemologically, and practically appropriate given human subjects protection and disciplinary diversity concerns. In other words, these various tools will be suitable to some, but not other research traditions, subjects, and contexts. No one researcher can be expected to have the time and resources to engage in all transparency practices. This is a particularly significant recommendation for those editors whose journals have adopted or are in the process of adopting JETS, which intensifies the existing information asymmetry between researchers and editors who have to make judgements on transparency often without sufficient knowledge of the research context.

This report is organized in five parts. The first section summarizes deliberations regarding the meaning and conceptualization of data access and research transparency as applied to human subjects research. The second discusses the many benefits of transparency in human subjects research, while the third discusses the ethical and other concerns raised by data access and transparency with respect to data generated from human subjects. The fourth section identifies a number of recommendations coming out of the QTD consultation, including specific practices for consideration of journal editors, graduate instructors in the profession, and scholars seeking to advance transparency in ways that are consistent with epistemological foundations, practical realities, and ethical commitments of human subjects research. A brief fifth section concludes.

I. Meaning and Conceptualization of Transparency

This section presents comments regarding three aspects of transparency proposed in the DA-RT and JETS initiatives as applied to human subjects research. While data access, production transparency and analytic transparency constitute the notion of transparency in these initiatives, the deliberations show that transparency has multiple meanings depending on the researcher's epistemological position and research design. These differences suggest the need to be open about one's epistemological assumptions and research goals as part of transparency.

Data access

The 2012 APSA Ethics Guide (6.1) states that, "Researchers making evidence-based knowledge claims should reference the data they used to make those claims. If these are data they themselves generated or collected, researchers should provide access to those data or explain why they cannot." Drawing on this statement, conversations on transparency in qualitative research have often "equated 'full transparency' with the depositing of field notes or interview materials,"[8] such as transcripts. Some scholars, for example, advocate for a general norm of archiving qualitative data to facilitate evaluation, replication, and secondary data analysis.[9] Of the three inter-related principles of data access, production transparency, and analytic transparency, it is data access that raises the largest challenges for human subjects researchers, many of whom expressed concerns about the tensions between data access and competing ethical commitments, or reservations about the conception of replicability embedded in data access, as formulated by the APSA Ethics Guide, DA-RT, and JETS.

One concern reported by several scholars, and further discussed below, is that the transparency generated by full access to data must be weighed against other values, including, most notably, the protection of human subjects. In "ethnographic and interpretive methods, 'transparency'… isn't linked to sharing these materials (which would often break confidentiality agreements with interlocutors and thus be unethical). Rather, it's about 'giving a recipe' that lets the reader evaluate how one generated evidentiary material."[10] Many QTD participants, therefore, expressed serious concerns about the prospect of sharing field notes or interview transcripts based on confidential interviews, although a number expressed support for the sharing of data, such as extended quotations from an interview to support key inferences and interpretations.[11]

A second critique focuses on the criterion of replicability, positing the infeasibility of replicating fieldwork-based scholarship in the same way as quantitative research. As Aili Tripp notes, "No one is realistically going to replicate interviews that are done either with groups of people or specific individuals. Obtaining data often depends on serendipity (accidentally running into a terrific interviewee), or taking part in specific opportunities provided by events like conferences or observing happenings like a demonstration."[12]

---

[8] Sarah Parkinson, post "Re: Is there a tension between the principle of research openness and the willingness to pursue tough questions?," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.2: Human Subjects and Research Openness, December 2, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=14&t=169#p753.

[9] Elman, Colin, Diana Kapiszewski, and Lorena Vinuela. 2010. "Qualitative Data Archiving: Rewards and Challenges." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 43(1): 23-27.

[10] Sarah Parkinson, post "Re: Is there a tension between the principle of research openness and the willingness to pursue tough questions?," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.2: Human Subjects and Research Openness, April 18, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=14&t=169#p753.

[11] Guest, post "Re: Question 3: On innovation and examples," QTD Discussion Board, Forum IV.2: Settings of political violence, December 1, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=27&t=164#p752.

[12] Aili Tripp, post "Pursuing transparency in qualitative research," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.2: Evidence from researcher interactions with human participants, November 8, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=18&t=176#p635. See also the post by William J. Kelleher, who notes that participant observation research is not strictly speaking replicable – nor can it be made so by greater transparency. William J. Kelleher, post "An Example of Non-Replicable Good Science: Alice Goffman's On the Run," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.2: Evidence from researcher interactions with human participants, December 20, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=18&t=200#p846.

A third critique concerns replicability's exclusion of a range of ontological and epistemological traditions in the discipline that are premised on non-test-based knowledge production models. As Markus Kreuzer explains, "the discourse on transparency seems to imply a popular, albeit problematic, positivistic conception of objectively-similar knowers seeking truth."[13] As Kreuzer summarizes, "the three transparency dimensions… cover only the small, test-related stage of the broader knowledge production [to exclude] theorizing, philosophy of science, and sociology of knowledge."[14]

From the perspective of interpretive research, in particular, field notes and interview materials are not meant to facilitate replication. They do not "constitute a form of raw 'data' that can then be checked against any 'analysis' in the finished ethnography" or replicated without the background or contextual knowledge (or "metadata") that guided the original researcher's interpretations.[15] As Samantha Majic explains, "If someone else were to access these notes and use them as 'data,' I am not sure how much sense they would make to the person who did not conduct the ethnography/observation firsthand, as the secondary user was not *there*."[16] Aili Tripp concurs: "Providing selected interview transcripts is inadequate because the reviewer does not have the full context of the interview in relation to other interviews, survey data, and other sources based on living and experiencing the situation. The interview is still only partial evidence and cannot be taken on its own as evidence of something."[17]

Data access, therefore, extends to include not only (i) interview excerpts, (ii) observations, and (iii) partial or full transcripts or field notes, but also (iii) meta-data. These can only be requested and provided where ethically, practically, and epistemologically appropriate given human subjects protection concerns and disciplinary diversity.

---

[13] Marcus Kreuzer, post "SETTING THE STAGE," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.1: Ontological/Epistemological Priors, September 7, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=13&t=134#p449.

[14] Marcus Kreuzer, post "Topic 2: Placing DA-RT in the Broader Knowledge Production," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.1: Ontological/Epistemological Priors, October 3, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=13&t=156#p501.

[15] Timothy Pachirat, post "Re: Dishonesty in research raises concern," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.1: Ontological/Epistemological Priors, December 1, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=13&t=157#p751. See also Rachel Ellett and Mark Fathi Massoud, Post, "Re: How and when can and should we make available, in part or in full, evidence from research with human participants?," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.2: Ontological/Epistemological Priors, November 7, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=18&t=119&p=632&hilit=ellett#p632. Ellett and Massoud note that "even the most faithful transcriptions cannot capture the depth of silences, confusion, laughter, or hostility during an interview…. Collecting interview metadata may prove equally as important as collecting interviewees' reflections."

[16] Samantha Majic, post "Re: Limits to Transparency," QTD Discussion Board, Forum III.3: Ethnography and participant observation, October 20, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=22&t=132#p536.

[17] Aili Tripp, post "Pursuing transparency in qualitative research," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.2: Evidence from researcher interactions with human participants, November 8, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=18&t=176#p635. On reflexivity as an aspect of transparency, see also Alice Kang, post "Re: Let's Focus on Research Transparency," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.2: Evidence from researcher interactions with human participants, November 29, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=18&t=168&p=880&hilit=best+practices#p728: "Analytic transparency might/should include a discussion of how the researcher's position, funding, and training affect the questions that are being asked and how the answers are being interpreted, and so on."

Production transparency

WG contributors generally agree that accurately reporting the process by which evidentiary material is generated remains a core aspect of transparency across research traditions. The 2012 APSA Ethics Guide (6.2) states that, "Researchers providing access to data they themselves generated or collected, should offer a full account of the procedures used to collect or generate the data."

Many contributors to the WGs expressed support for this notion of production transparency, provided that it is interpreted broadly to include not only logistical details about the recruitment of human subjects and the methods used to solicit and record their views, but also the more general questions of research process and reflexivity that are common to scholars from multiple epistemological perspectives.

With respect to the narrower question of recruiting, interviewing and recording data from human subjects research, contributors noted potential dangers to human subjects if production transparency might (perhaps inadvertently) reveal the identities or personal details of human subjects. "I think that transparency should mean transparency with regard to *you the researcher,* not with regard to potentially vulnerable subjects," notes Amanda Fulmer. "We as researchers need to be clear as much as possible on what work we've done, and how, but we have no obligation to be transparent about the details of others' lives, if that might cause subjects harm or distress."[18]

This suggests that emphasis should be placed on the practical question of how researchers might be as transparent as possible in reporting aspects of data production such as the identification and recruitment of research participants, response rates, and potential non-response bias, while still protecting the confidentiality of human subjects who had been promised such confidentiality.[19] This is likely to be a delicate exercise, subject to broad guidelines but requiring case-by-case determinations by both researchers and editors in an effort to balance the professional duties of transparency and human subjects protection in practice.

Other contributors concur that production transparency should be interpreted broadly. Genuine production transparency, they argue, requires not simply a narrow reporting of methods, but reflexivity about the research process itself. "To be reflexive," Lee Ann Fujii specifies, "means to discuss explicitly what the original research plan was, how things actually unfolded, including the ethical dilemmas that arose and how the researcher responded to them."[20] Contributors suggest that research ethics, specifically "reporting of reflexive processes concerning the protection of human participants," should be part of production transparency.[21]

---

[18] Amanda Fulmer, "Re: What Do We Mean by Transparency in Human Subjects Research?," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.2: Evidence from researcher interactions with human participants, November 20 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=18&t=118#p685.

[19] Bleich and Pekkanen 2013.

[20] Lee Ann Fujii, post "Re: Human Subjects and Research Openness: Tensions and Dilemmas," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.2: Research Ethics: Human Subjects and Research Openness, October 21, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=14&t=116#p548.

[21] Elliot Posner, post "Human Subjects and Research Openness: Tensions and Dilemmas," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.2: Research Ethics: Human Subjects and Research Openness, September 5, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=14&t=116#p430.

Production transparency, therefore, expands beyond to include (i) reflexivity, (ii) transparency about changes to research plans, and (iii) transparency about responses to ethical dilemmas.

Analytic Transparency

According to the 2012 APSA Ethics Guide (6.3), "Researchers making evidence-based knowledge claims should provide a full account of how they draw their analytic conclusions from the data, i.e., clearly explicate the links connecting data to conclusions." At the heart of analytic transparency is whether "researchers [can] provide a mapping from the sort of evidence they might see (and seek) to the sorts of conclusions they might draw."[22] A number of contributors expressed general support for this conception of analytic transparency, suggesting that it further institutionalizes transparency practices that are widely implemented in the discipline.[23]

Other contributors, however, took issue with the DA-RT and JETS-based notion of transparency, which they argue fails to acknowledge the diversity in the approaches and subfield-specific practices to evaluating research. "Diverse epistemological assumptions inform research excellence and subfield-specific practices with profound effects on the construction of the objects of research."[24] Not only are evaluative criteria often specific to the epistemic communities generating certain types of research, but their respective strategies for documenting research processes also tend to evolve over time.[25]

Analytic transparency, therefore, includes not only (i) connection between data and conclusions, but also (ii) transparency about the back and forth between theory and evidence, which is linked to production transparency in fundamental ways in some research traditions in the discipline.

II. Assessment of Benefits

The notion of transparency is associated with a number of benefits by participants in WG discussions. This section identifies six benefits broadly identified by contributors. Many of these benefits are evident in the examples of transparency practices discussed below.

First, transparency could *help make research stronger* and, second, make *research from different traditions more understandable* by "making sure that others can fully evaluate your claims, that they can find your sources, that they could potentially replicate your work."[26] Working in the interpretive tradition, Kathy Cramer argues, "transparency in the sense of explaining in detail

---

[22] Macartan Humphreys, post "Re: What problem does access to evidence and transparency address?," QTD Discussion Board, Forum III.1: Comparative methods and process tracing, October 19, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=20&t=142#p532.

[23] Rudra Sil, post "Transparency and Common Sense in the Face of Diverse Models of Social Science," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.1: Ontological/Epistemological Priors, December 2, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=13&t=192#p756.

[24] Marcus Kreuzer, post "Topic 1: Competing Epistemological Assumptions," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.1: Ontological/Epistemological Priors, September 7, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=13&t=136#p451.

[25] Schwartz-Shea 2014.

[26] Sam Handlin, post "Re: Benefits and Costs of Increasing Transparency for Text and Non Text Based Sources," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.1: Text-based sources, October 17, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=17&t=140#p517.

my data collection and analysis procedures, as well as my epistemological approach, has been a professional necessity for me."[27]

     Third, and more specifically, transparency could *help better assess evidence and guard against bias* across a range of research approaches[28] and for both positive and negative (null) findings.[29] For some contributors, this benefit stems from data access. As John Gerring says, "the main problem facing us is surely not fabrication of data. It is the difficulty of interpreting that data. And in this respect, it seems to me that access to field notes might be helpful."[30] For others, the production and analytical aspects of transparency can "provide consumers of research with contextual information that can, in turn, help them evaluate evidence or consider sources of bias in the data used to buttress evidentiary claims."[31]

     Fourth and fifth, data access and transparency could *allow for replication*[32] in the instances where this is possible, and *provide access to data for future researchers*.[33] Although data access to human subjects research can raise ethical and practice issues (considered below), sharing such data where possible (including, perhaps, after an extended period of embargo) may constitute a valuable resource to future researchers that might otherwise be lost in a researcher's private files.

     A few contributors suggest that transparency could *help guard against dishonesty* in the discipline, though there is significant disagreement on the extent to which such "policing" is useful.[34] Although frequently raised in discussions of DA-RT, detecting and deterring dishonestly is only one of multiple potential benefits of transparency, and many of the others focus on how transparency can improve research in more positive ways. As Nancy Hirschmann notes, "insofar as data posting can help *stimulate discussion and debate* among scholars, that is productive."[35] Such expanded debate is a final way in which transparency can benefit the profession.

---

[27] Kathy Cramer, "Re: Limits to Transparency," QTD Discussion Board, Forum III.3: Ethnography and participant observation, October 20, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=22&t=132#p547.

[28] Ben Reed, post "The benefits of transparency in ethnography," QTD Discussion Board, Forum III.3: Ethnography and participant observation, December 30, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=22&t=204#p874.

[29] Hillel Soifer, post "Re: Presenting our evidence," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.1: Comparative methods and process tracing, September 24, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=20&t=124#p484.

[30] John Gerring, post "Re: Dishonesty in research raises concern," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.1: Ontological/Epistemological Priors, December 18, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=13&t=157#p833.

[31] Nikhar Gaikward, "Re: Benefits and Costs of Increasing Transparency for Text and Non Text Based Sources," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.1: Text-based sources, October 4, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=17&t=140#p502. Andrew Moravcsik (2010)'s proposals for the widespread adoption of active citation, although explicitly couched in the language of replicability, might also be interpreted as facilitating the careful assessment of empirical claims based on qualitative evidence, as well as the identification of possible bias.

[32] Guest, post "Re: Question 2: Transparency," QTD Discussion Board, Forum IV.3 Research with vulnerable and marginalized populations, October 20, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=28&t=123#p544.

[33] Guest, "Re: Power and the Institutionalization of Research Transparency/Openness/Explicitness," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.3: Power and Institutions, September 25, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=15&t=149#p486.

[34] Cf. Tom Pepinsky, Deborah Avant, Sandra Resodihardjo, and Jane Mansbridge's comments in the topic "Dishonesty in research raises concern," https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=13&t=157#p518.

[35] Nancy Hirschmann, post "Re: Dishonesty in research raises concern," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.1: Ontological Priors, November 4, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=13&t=157#p619.

III. Assessment of Costs, Risks, Appropriateness, and Constraints

Despite the frequently acknowledged benefits of transparency, the QTD deliberations revealed widespread concerns about the impact of DA-RT on human subjects research – concerns that many contributors felt had been ignored or underestimated in the initial DA-RT and JETS documents. This section discusses WG contributions focused on five major concerns associated with transparency: human subject protection, access to human subjects, effort and time, effects of power differentials, and epistemological diversity in the discipline.[36]

Human subjects (and researcher) protection

The primary concern related to data access and research transparency is human subjects protection, the foundation of research ethics in the discipline.[37] Standard training for scholars conducting qualitative fieldwork requires them to anticipate the various forms of harm that might affect their informants, especially when promised confidentiality,[38] and warns researchers that calls for transparency must be weighed against the potentially competing imperative of human subjects protection.[39] This is a perspective widely shared among WG contributors. "To force researchers to hand over notes that might endanger their sources… is a serious ethical concern," Cathy Schneider notes "[a]s a former member of our institution's IRB and as a long time ethnographer, who works in at risk communities."[40] This concern is of particular relevance to scholars who must protect the anonymity of sources in authoritarian and violent contexts.[41] It is a concern that extends to scholars working in elite settings in which "officials, ruling party members, etc. who may not be authorized to give interviews, or say things that deviate from the official line."[42]

---

[36] Guest, post "Transparency as it relates to power differentials," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.3: Power and Institutions, November 30, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=15&t=191#p734. See also Ben Read, post "The benefits of transparency in ethnography," QTD Discussion Board, Forum III.3: Ethnography and participant observation, December 30, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=22&t=204#p874 and Ingo Rohlfing, post "When do costs of transparency outweigh the benefits?," QTD Discussion Board, Forum III.1 Comparative methods and process tracing, November 5, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=20&t=170#p624.

[37] Guest, post "Transparency as it relates to power differentials," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.3: Power and Institutions, November 30, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=15&t=191#p734.

[38] Rubin & Rubin (1995, 96-97) instruct readers: "You should be prepared to destroy your notes rather than allow access to them by people who would hurt your conversational partners."

[39] Mosley 2013.

[40] Cathy Schneider, post "Re: Is there a tension between the principle of research openness and the willingness to pursue tough questions?," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.2: Research Ethics: Human Subjects and Research Openness, December 1, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=14&t=169#p740.

[41] Guest, post " Re: Privileging Quantitative Methods and Challenging Field Work conditions," QTD Discussion Board, Forum IV.1: Authoritarian/repressive political regimes, December 12, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=26&t=174#p808. See also Fujii 2012; Parkinson and Wood 2015.

[42] Guest, " Re: Risks and Practices to Avoid?," QTD Discussion Board, Forum IV.1: Authoritarian/repressive political regimes, November 15, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=26&t=148#p656. See also Alan Kuperman, post "Re: Question 2: On the specificity of political violence research," QTD Discussion Board, Forum IV.2: Settings of Political Violence, December 26, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=27&t=165#p863; Abbey Steele, post "Re: Question 2: On the specificity of political violence research," QTD Discussion Board, Forum IV.2: Settings of Political Violence, November 24, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=27&t=165#p698; Guest, post "Question 1: Marginalization and vulnerability," QTD Discussion Board, Forum IV.3: Research with vulnerable and marginalized populations, October 20, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=28&t=122#p545.

The 2012 APSA Ethics Guide (6.4) explicitly addresses the question of weighing data access and research transparency against ethical imperatives, such as human subjects protection, by stipulating that scholars may withhold data and a full account of research process when there are "well-founded privacy and confidentiality concerns." It further specifies that, "Decisions to withhold data and a full account of the procedures used to collect or generate them should be made in good faith and on reasonable grounds. Researchers must, however, exercise appropriate restraint in making claims as to the confidential nature of their sources, and resolve all reasonable doubts in favor of full disclosure."

This formulation, however, leaves open multiple questions, including what constitutes "good faith," "reasonable grounds," and "reasonable doubts." Deliberation within the QTD process focused in large part on the potential dangers to human subjects posed by DA-RT requirements, and to the importance of ensuring that DA-RT is implemented in practice in a way that respects researchers' commitments to their human subjects.

Perhaps the most frequently expressed concern is that the sharing of anonymized or partially redacted interview transcripts or field notes could result in the unintentional violation of confidentiality promised to human subjects.[43] Such "deductive disclosure" can result when descriptions of field sites and study participants make them identifiable in shared reports.[44] "No matter how sure I feel that I have disguised identifying markers in these documents, or that there's no substantial risk to participants, circumstances can change to completely transform the risk calculation," Lihi Ben Shirit stresses.[45] Another contributor agrees: "Simple redactions of crucial words or pages will often not be adequate to prevent a regime agent from re-tracing the steps of a researcher to identify a potential leaker or dissenter."[46] For this reason, another contributor notes,

---

[43] Cathy Schneider, post "Re: Is there a tension between the principle of research openness and the willingness to pursue tough questions?," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.2: Research Ethics: Human Subjects and Research Openness, December 1, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=14&t=169#p740; Guest, post "Re: Challenges to Transparency in Authoritarian/Repressive Settings," QTD Discussion Board, Forum IV.1 Authoritarina/repressive political regimes, November 25, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=26&t=146#p702; Sherrill Stroschein, post "Danger, harm and change," QTD Discussion Board, Forum IV.1: Authoritarian/repressive political regimes, November 30, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=26&t=187#p729; Joseph Brown, post "Re: Question 2: On the specificity of political violence research," QTD Discussion Board, Forum IV.2: Settings of political violence, January 2, 2017, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=27&t=165#p894.

[44] Kaiser 2012.

[45] Lihi Ben Shitrit, post "Re: Human Subjects and Research Openness: Tensions and Dilemmas," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.2: Research Ethics: Human Subjects and Research Openness, December 26, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=14&t=116#p864. See also Guest, post "Re: How and when can and should we make available, in part or in full, evidence from research with human participants?," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.2: Evidence from researcher interactions with human participants, October 18, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=18&t=120#p531: "there a risk of figuring out who is being interviewed if someone reads the full transcript (as not every person in the locations where I conduct interviews could speak for a full hour with specific knowledge on a topic…"

[46] Guest, post "Re: Privileging Quantitative Methods and Challenging Field Work conditions," QTD Discussion Board, Forum IV.1: Authoritarian/ repressive political regimes, December 12, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=26&t=174#p689. See also Dara Strolovitch, post "Re: Question 1: Marginalization and vulnerability," QTD Discussion Board, Forum IV.3: Research with vulnerable and marginalized populations, December 21, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=28&t=122#p849; Ricky Price, post: "Re: Question 2: Transparency,"QTD Discussion Board, Forum IV.3: Research with vulnerable and marginalized populations, December 29, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=28&t=123#p870; Eva Bellin, post "Re: Risks and Practices to Avoid?," QTD Discussion Board, Forum IV.1 Authoritarian/repressive political regimes,

"Keeping and making transparent a repository of research can make scholars and research participants vulnerable to heightened visibility and targeting."[47] These concerns are mostly expressed with respect to the publication of interview transcripts and field notes, but they apply also to efforts at production transparency because descriptions of sampling techniques or characterizations of the pool of interviewees could potentially provide clues as to the identities of subjects.[48]

Concerns about violating confidentiality arise most strikingly among scholars who engage in human subjects research among vulnerable populations, including dissidents, ethnic minorities, sexual minorities, and citizens of authoritarian regimes, all of whom face potential persecution or retaliation if identified from publicly released data.[49] Anastasia Shesterinina, summarizing one exchange among WG contributors, points out that human subjects in authoritarian and conflict settings are especially at risk of retaliation from government officials and other interested parties: "Even when the researcher works to de-identify transcripts and field notes to the best of her knowledge, this effort may leave description of the events that are particular to the location or set of actors she studies available to the reader with an in-depth understanding of the subject matter."[50] In the current political climate in the United States, one participant argued, "undocumented immigrants, Muslims, members of Black Lives Matter, LGBTQ, and perhaps even dissidents may face real danger."[51] Making materials available can also put in danger and under government scrutiny the researcher, especially if "increased openness [impacts] perceptions of researcher ties to US intelligence and other agencies."[52]

Ethical considerations may argue against complete transparency even when subjects explicitly grant consent to being identified. Alison Post asks, "Even if individuals give permission

---

November 1, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=26&t=148#p598; Matt Wood, post "Re: How and when can and should we make available, in part or in full, evidence from research with human participants?," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.2: Evidence from researcher interactions with human participants, September 28, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=18&t=119&p=494&hilit=matt+wood#p488.

[47] Guest, post "Re: Risks and Practices to Avoid?," QTD Discussion Board, Forum IV.1 Authoritarian/repressive political regimes, November 15, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=26&t=148#p656.

[48] Jesse Driscoll, for example, argues that "Thick description of life in places like Mogadishu or the North Caucasus, if complete with proper nouns, can be an intelligence asset." Jesse Driscoll, post "Re: Question 2: On the specificity of political violence research," QTD Discussion Board, Forum IV.2: Settings of political violence, November 30, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=27&t=165#p736.

[49] See the posts by Aili Tripp and Calvert Jones, in the topic "Pursuing transparency in qualitative research," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.2: Evidence from researcher interactions with human participants. The burden of protecting the confidentiality of human subjects, moreover, is not limited to vulnerable populations. Elite interview subjects, including those in established democracies, frequently participate in academic research only on condition of anonymity, fearing political retribution or damage to reputation.

[50] Anastasia Shesterinina, post "How and when can and should we make available, in part or in full, evidence from research with human participants?," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.2: Evidence from researcher interactions with human participants, September 5, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=18&t=120#p434.

[51] Cathy Schneider, post "Re: Is there a tension between the principle of research openness and the willingness to pursue tough questions?," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.2: Research Ethics: Human Subjects and Research Openness, December 1, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=14&t=169#p740.

[52] Elliot Posner, post "Openness and Perceptions of Researcher Ties to US Intelligence and Other Agencies," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.2: Research Ethics: Human Subjects and Research Openness, November 6, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=14&t=171#p626. See also Jesse Driscoll, post "Re: Question 2: On the specificity of political violence research," QTD Discussion Board, Forum IV.2: Settings of political violence, November 30, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=27&t=165#p736.

for us to tape or share transcriptions with reviewers or even the academic community, can they always foresee how domestic political conditions may change? Is it ethical to share open criticisms of politicians or other actors that may later trigger reprisals, even when subjects explicitly give us permission to publish their statements?"[53] As Aili Tripp notes, "Even if there are no security issues involved, there are privacy issues, issues of reputation, of pride, of not wanting to malign other people needlessly, and even of libel to consider."[54]

Access to human subjects

A number of WG contributors worry that excessive transparency might destroy the trust established with research participants, and endanger future access to human subject populations of all types.[55] "[A]ny weakening in confidentiality," Janice Bockmeyer points out, "will discourage vulnerable populations from participating in research."[56] This concern was expressed by a number of scholars with respect to data access, and particularly the specter of journals implementing DA-RT by requiring access to or publication of interview transcripts of field notes as a condition of publication. One commentator notes that securing access to hard-to-reach key actors, such as elites, could become "nearly impossible if there were a uniform requirement to obtain consent for sharing with any third-party interview transcripts or other such records of our conversations. Such elites, with public reputations to protect, would be highly unlikely to engage in unguarded conversations with researchers if they knew there were an automatic requirement for data sharing along these lines."[57]

---

[53] Alison Post, post "Re: How and when can and should we make available, in part or in full, evidence from research with human participants?," QTD Disussion Board, Forum II.2: Evidence from researcher interactions with human participants, November 18, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=18&t=120#p673.

[54] Aili Tripp, post "Pursuing transparency in qualitative research," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.2: Evidence from researcher interactions with human participants, November 8, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=18&t=176#p635.

[55] See the contributions by Jane Mansbridge, Carolyn Warner, and Stephen Brooke, on the topic "How and when can and should we make available, in part or in full, evidence from research with human participants?," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.2: Evidence from researcher interactions with human participants; Kristen Monroe, post "DA-RT and qualitative interview data," Discussion Board, Forum II.2: Evidence from researcher interactions with human participants, January 8, 2017, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=18&t=207#p906; Jacques Hymans, post "Re: Benefits and Costs of Increasing Transparency for Text and Non Text Based Sources," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.1 Text-based sources, December 13, 2016.

[56] Janice Bockmeyer, post "Challenges and Risks of Research Openess," QTD Discussion Board, Forum IV.3: Research with vulnerable and marginalized populations, November 20, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=28&t=182#p688. See also Lise Howard, post "Re: Question 2: On the specificity of political violence research, QTD Discussion Board, Forum IV.2: Setttings of political violence, January 5, 2017, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=27&t=165#p904; Lahra Smith, post "Re: Privileging Quantitative Methods and Challenging Field Work conditions," QTD Discussion Board, Forum IV.1: Authoritarian/repressive contexts, December 12, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=26&t=174#p808; Sandra Resodihardjo, post "Re: Power and the Institutionalization of Research Transparency/ Openness/Explicitness," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.3: Power and Institutions, November 17, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=15&t=149#p672. As a result, "Association for the Study of Nationalities released a statement that DA-RT poses a danger to our ability to conduct research." Sherrill Stroschein, post "Ethnic / religious tension settings," QTD Discussion Board, Forum IV.2: Settings of Political Violence, November 30, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=27&t=188#p730.

[57] Guest, post "Re: How and when can and should we make available, in part or in full, evidence from research with human participants?," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.2: Evidence from researcher interactions with human participants, October 18, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=18&t=120#p531.

Requiring the sharing of interview transcripts or field notes, as Dara Strolovitch explains, could unintentionally introduce bias into research by driving away potential participants. "Doing so will almost certainly make it more difficult to earn people's trust, to make them comfortable speaking with us, to get them to allow us to observe meetings and events, etc. But the corollary to *losing* those potential interviewees is that, in addition to making it more likely that people will 'parrot official positions,' those who *will be* willing to speak with us, who *will be* willing to allow us to observe their events, etc. are likely to be quite different from those who will refuse to allow our notes, the text of our conversations. etc. to be shared." Such rules, she notes, seem "very unlikely to produce better knowledge or insights about the political world."[58] For all of these reasons, an overwhelming number of contributors agree that journal editors should implement DA-RT standards, not with across-the-board rules mandating full transparency and data access, but consider on a case-by-case basis how authors can maximize transparency consistent with both human subjects protection and access considerations.

Effort, time, and resources

One concern among WG contributors is related to the effort, time, and resources necessary for providing access to data and detailed accounts of how they were generated and analyzed. A number of WG contributors pointed out that "transform[ing] the data… generate[d] through interviews, meeting observation, and other field interactions into transcripts,"[59] "render[ing one's] notes legible,"[60] "photograph[ing], sort[ing], and process[ing] all of the images,"[61] or writing methodological appendices[62] place large and potentially overwhelming burdens on researchers.[63] As Sam Handlin points out, "[g]iven that it often only takes one reviewer to sink a paper, it is not

---

[58] Dara Strolovitch, post "Re: Pursuing transparency in qualitative research," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.2: Evidence from researcher interactions with human participants, December 21, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=18&t=176#p847.

[59] Robin Turner, post "Re: Power and the Institutionalization of Research Transparency/Openness/Explicitness, QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.3: Power and Institutions, December 30, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=15&t=149#p871.

[60] Ken Eaton, post "Re: When do costs of transparency outweigh the benefits?," QTD Discussion Board, Forum III.1: Comparative methods and process tracing, January 1, 2017, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=20&t=170#p888.

[61] Guest, post "Re: Documenting use of text-based or non-text-based sources," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.1: Text-based sources, November 15, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=17&t=128#p657. See also Guest, post "Re: Benefits and Costs of Increasing Transparency for Text and Non Text Based Sources," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.1: Text-based sources, November 7, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=17&t=140#p627.

[62] Anastasia Shesterinina, post "Re: Human Subjects and Research Openness: Tensions and Dilemmas," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.2: Research Ethics: Human Subjects and Research Openness, December 17, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=14&t=116#p831; Sam Handlin, post "Re: Benefits and Costs of Increasing Transparency for Text and Non Text Based Sources," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.1: Text-based sources, October 17, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=17&t=140#p517; Amy Poteete, post "Re: Benefits and Costs of Increasing Transparency for Text and Non Text Based Sources," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.1: Text-based sources, January 1, 2017, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=17&t=140#p887.

[63] Guest, post "Re; How and when can and should we make available, in part or in full, evidence from research with human participants?," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.2: Evidence from researcher interactions with human participants, December 10, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=18&t=120#p799, noting that full transcription of interviews is often unnecessary for the purposes of research, and that transcription of dozens or hundreds of interviews could be extraordinarily time-consuming.

completely obvious to me that offering up an additional 30-40 pages of extended quotations from textual sources and commentary on my interpretation and use of them is actually going to increase the likelihood of getting a paper accepted. Writing a thorough and careful [transparency appendix] involves a lot of work for relatively uncertain rewards, [p]articularly for junior faculty."[64] One question that emerged in this context is "whose responsibility it is to provide a digital repository of materials, particularly if the materials come from an unorganized archive."[65]

Exacerbating power differentials in the discipline

The questions of effort, time, and resources raised concerns of power differentials among scholars in the discipline. The burdens imposed by new transparency rules "affect different members of the discipline in different ways."[66] Labor-intensive transparency requirements are likely to fall particularly heavily on less established scholars as well as those at less well funded universities or independent scholars.[67] "The less well-resourced the institution the scholar works in, the more that scholar is underfunded," Jane Mansbridge points out. "Having to incur costs to convert field notes or interviews into the appropriate forms for deposit… might well prove impossible for such researchers."[68] Many thus conclude that, "for under-resourced scholars, DA-RT only sharpens their inability to compete… when it comes to publishing their work in top journals."[69]

A closely related concern has to do with the scholar's intellectual property and right of first use. Even if a researcher were able to overcome ethical issues and fully share her field notes and/or interview transcripts, the common requirement that the underlying data be publicly shared within

---

[64] Sam Handlin, post "Re: Benefits and Costs of Increasing Transparency for Text and Non Text Based Sources," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.1: Text-based sources, October 17, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=17&t=140#p517. For example, Diana Fu "spent several weeks writing up an extensive appendix that discusses ethnography and its advantages as well as limitations in the context of [her] study." Diana Fu, post "Reporting Ethnographic Data in Journals," QTD Discussion Board, Forum III.3: Ethnography and participant observation, November 14, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=22&t=178#p646.
[65] Guest, post :Re: Documenting use of text-based or non-text-based sources," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.1 Text-based sources, December 9, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=17&t=128#p786; Vicky Murillo, post "Re: Power and the Institutionalization of Research Transparency/Openness/Explicitness," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.3 Power and Institutions, December 16, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=15&t=149#p826; Maria Victoria Murillo, post "Re: Topic 2: Placing DA-RT in the Broader Knowledge Production," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.1: Ontological/Epistemological Priors, December 17, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=13&t=156#p832 .
[66] Shamira Gelbman, post "Re: Documenting use of text-based or non-text-based sources," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.1: Text-based sources, December 1, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=17&t=128#p741.
[67] Hall 2016.
[68] Jane Mansbridge, post "Re: Power and the Institutionalization of Research Transparency/Openness/Explicitness," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.3: Power and Institutions, October 26, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=15&t=149#p571.
[69] Guest, post "Transparency as it relates to power differentials," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.3: Power and Institutions, November 30, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=15&t=191#p734. See also Guest, post "Non-tenured faculty research," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.3: Power and Institutions, December 9, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=15&t=194#p785; Mneesha Gellman, post "Re: Power and the Institutionalization of Research Transparency/Openness/Explicitness," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.3: Power and Institutions, November 28, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=15&t=149#p716.

one year may be insufficient to allow scholars to make full use of data – which may take years of fieldwork to collect – before releasing it for use by others.[70]

Transparency standards and diversity in the discipline

A broader concern arising from this discussion is that an editorial insistence on transparency will limit diversity in the discipline by holding qualitative researchers to a different standard, by marginalizing researchers working in epistemological and ontological traditions incompatible with the notion of transparency as formulated by DA-RT and JETS, and by exerting a chilling effect on scholars who might be directed away from sensitive areas of qualitative research towards "safer" topics for which DA-RT compliance may be more straightforward. Mark Beissinger summarizes the first point as "requirements to publish research notes place a burden on qualitative researchers that is way beyond what anyone else in the profession is being asked to fulfill."[71] Zoe Marks further notes "the perceived double standard of quantitative researchers not justifying every coding interpretation made in constructing a dataset."[72]

Second, uniform transparency rules – particularly those requiring extensive data access – may impose limits on the conduct and publication of specific forms of qualitative research, such as those that "use field interviews,"[73] "multi-source, multi-method data,"[74] or extensive background materials that are "simply not feasible to list;"[75] research where note-taking may disrupt observations that are most critical to the findings;[76] and "developing country research [which] usually necessitates another layer of disorganization and complexity in organizing historic

---

[70] Kristen Monroe, post "DA-RT and qualitative interview data," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.2: Evidence from researcher interactions with human participants, January 8, 2017, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=18&t=207#p906.

[71] Mark Beissinger, post "Re: Dishonesty in research raises concern," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.1: Ontological/ Epistemological Priors, November 18, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=13&t=157#p676. See also Marcus Kreuzer, post "Dishonesty in research raises concern," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.1: Ontological/Epistemological Priors, October 24, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=13&t=157#p553; Nikhar Gaikward, post "Re: Benefits and Costs of Increasing Transparency for Text and Non Text Based Sources," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.1: Text-based sources, October 4, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=17&t=140#p502.

[72] Zoe Marks, post, "Re: Topic 3: Elaborating Multiple/alternative Journal Criteria," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.1: Ontological/Epistemological Priors, December 27, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=13&t=137#p867.

[73] Catherine Boone, post "Dishonesty in research raises concern," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.1: Ontological/Epistemological Priors, October 17, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=13&t=157#p518.

[74] Zoe Marks, post, "Re: Topic 3: Elaborating Multiple/alternative Journal Criteria," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.1: Ontological/Epistemological Priors, December 27, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=13&t=137#p867. See also William J. Kelleher, post "How the Rule of Transparency Can Become Self-Destructive for Political Science," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.1: Ontological/Epistemological Priors December 23, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=13&t=201#p858.

[75] Tasha Fairfield, post "Re: Presenting our evidence," QTD Discussion Board, Forum III.1: Comparative methods and process tracing, October 3, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=20&t=124#p496. See also Maya Tudor, post "Re: When do costs of transparency outweigh the benefits?," QTD Discussion Board, Forum III.1: Comparative methods and process tracing, December 12, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=20&t=170#p805

[76] Sherrill Stroschein, post "Practical problems in the field," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.2: Research Ethics: Human Subjects and Research Openness, November 30, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=14&t=189#p731;

or relevant info."[77] From the perspective of some scholars, the very notion of knowledge is challenged by the current debate on transparency. As Rudra Sil argues, "adding new layers of procedures and regulations requires uniform understandings of what constitutes 'knowledge' or 'truth'… [A]n effort to create and impose uniform procedures across journals that have historically showcased diverse approaches and arguments for diverse audiences will create unevenness in submissions, acceptance rates, and costs in terms of time and resources."[78]

Third, DA-RT standards may have a diverting effect on important research for which codified transparency may be more difficult to meet. The concern is that "we are going to collectively sacrifice interesting questions and deep knowledge in order to valorize 'openness'."[79] If a project does not abide by the new transparency rules, should it be pursued?[80] Here, we find a concern that "the proposed transparency rules will remove the context sensitivity that many of us develop in favor of blanket rules."[81] These rules may, furthermore, prevent researchers from engaging with certain questions and areas where they cannot be followed, such as in "non-democratic and war torn settings."[82] Steven Brooke elaborates, noting that, "rather than struggle upstream against both American policy and disciplinary norms, many scholars – particularly early in their careers – will simply decide to direct their academic energies elsewhere. The result will, I fear, be a further constriction of the questions we ask, and a general reduction in our willingness and ability to use the tools of social science to answer questions about the world."[83]

---

[77] Veronica Herrera, post" Re: Documenting use of text-based or non-text-based sources," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.1: Text-based sources, November 28, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=17&t=128#p718. See also Abbey Steele, post "Re: Documenting use of text-based or non-text-based sources," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.1: Text-based sources, November 24, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=17&t=128#p696.

[78] Rudra Sil, post "Transparency and Common Sense in the Face of Diverse Models of Social Science," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.1: Ontological/Epistemological Priors, December 2, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=13&t=192#p756.

[79] Guest, post "Re: Human Subjects and Research Openness: Tensions and Dilemmas," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.2: Research Ethics: Human Subjects and Research Openness, November 1, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=14&t=116#p594.

[80] Mneesha Gellman, post "Re: Is there a tension between the principle of research openness and the willingness to pursue tough questions?," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.2: Research Ethics: Human Subjects and Research Openness, November 27, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=14&t=169#p711.

[81] Scott Straus, post "Re: Question 2: On the specificity of political violence research," QTD Discussion Board, Forum IV.2: Settings of political violence, January 3, 2017, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=27&t=165#p901.

[82] Aili Tripp, post "Re: Privileging Quantitative Methods and Challenging Field Work conditions," QTD Discussion Board, Forum IV.1: Authoritarian/repressive political regimes, November 12, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=26&t=174#p640.

[83] Steven Brooke, post "Re: How and when can and should we make available, in part or in full, evidence from research with human participants?," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.2: Evidence from researcher interactions with human participants, December 15, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=18&t=120#p823. See also Alison Post in the same topic: "I worry that if journals and other publishers were to require transcripts or recordings as a precondition for evaluating manuscripts, that we would unwittingly encourage qualitative scholars to focus on topics and regions where it is less risky for individuals to express their opinions openly." Alison Porter, post "Re: How and when can and should we make available, in part or in full, evidence from research with human participants?," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.2: Evidence from researcher interactions with human participants, November 18, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=18&t=120#p673.

Other concerns

Among other concerns raised in WG discussions are journal word limits that do not accommodate detailed accounts of research processes,[84] copyright issues as "[m]any archives have strict limits on the number of documents that any one scholar can photocopy or reproduce,"[85] and potential misuse of disseminated data.[86]

IV. Transparency Practices and Ways Forward

WG contributors identified a number of practices for journal editors, for the profession, and for researchers to consider as a way forward in achieving and managing transparency in the discipline.

A number of WG contributors emphasized the key role already being played by journal editors who are in an authoritative position to make calls about what constitutes transparency with respect to any given study.[87] Indeed, much of the important work of promoting transparency in published scholarship, and balancing transparency against other legitimate professional and ethical values, will fall in practice to journal editors working together with authors. Proposals for journal editors include: inviting authors to "explain why they cannot reveal certain attributes of their informants and/or research sites;"[88] "promot[ing] *adaptive* transparency policies that prioritize: (1) intellectual clarity… and (2) ethical rigour;"[89] demonstrating flexibility with respect to the

---

[84] Jessica Teets, post "Re: Human Subjects and Research Openness: Tensions and Dilemmas; Guest, Refining Norms/Practices in Publishing," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.2: Research Ethics: Human Subjects and Research Openness, December 23, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=14&t=116#p855.

[85] Nikhar Gaikward, post "Re: Benefits and Costs of Increasing Transparency for Text and Non Text Based Sources," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.1: Text-based sources, October 18, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=17&t=140#p526. See also Ecaterina Locoman, post "Re: Power and the Institutionalization of Research Transparency/Openness/Explicitness," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.3: Power and Institutions, November 30, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=15&t=149#p733; Shamira Gelbman, post "Re: Documenting use of text-based or non-text-based sources," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.1: Text-based sources, December 1, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=17&t=128#p741; Guest, post "Re: Documenting use of text-based or non-text-based sources," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.1: Text-based sources, September 9, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=17&t=128#p463.

[86] Mala Htun, post "Re: Human Subjects and Research Openness: Tensions and Dilemmas," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.2: Research Ethics: Human Subjects and Research Openness, December 9, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=14&t=116#p789; Sherrill Stroschein, post "Reviewer gets files, disappears," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.3: Power and Institutions, November 30, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=15&t=190#p732; Alison Post, post "Cybersecurity and work with human subjects," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.2: Evidence from researcher interactions with human subjects, November 18, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=18&t=181&sid=21b7b5f38ef7f0ac37ca9f9697314334#p675.

[87] Yashar 2016.

[88] Ana Arjona, post "Re: Question 2: On the specificity of political violence research," QTD Discussion Board, Forum IV.2: Settings of political violence, December 1, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=27&t=165#p749.

[89] Zoe Marks, post "Re: Topic 3: Elaborating Multiple/alternative Journal Criteria," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.1: Ontological/Epistemological Priors, December 27, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=13&t=137#p867.

word limits of articles and online appendices;[90] and "mak[ing] space for online storage of appendices or data-sets."[91]

The lively debate that has taken place within the QTD forum indicates the need for the profession to incorporate training for future generations of scholars, not simply about the generic transparency provisions of the APSA Ethics Guidelines, but also about the diverse ways in which scholars can address data access and transparency concerns in practice, consistent with other concurrent, and sometimes competing, practical and ethical considerations. Contributors pointed out that professional standards exist "to incentivize scholars to lay bare the basis for their knowledge claims and to lay bare the principles informing different aspects of an argument,"[92] in other words, to "document their material"[93] and explain how they arrived at and assessed their claims,[94] while not sharing materials where it is problematic.[95] This is standard advice in the texts used to train social scientists in field methods, one that could only be strengthened and further systematized in the future, and included in methods training at the graduate level in the discipline.[96]

WG contributors offered a range of transparency suggestions for researchers that include:

- Writing a "clear research/methodology section;"[97]

- Explaining "the process by which cases were identified and included in the analysis;"[98]

- Being explicit about decisions involved in selecting field sites and how much time to spend at each site or with each interlocutor;[99]

---

[90] Alison Post, post "Re: How and when can and should we make available, in part or in full, evidence from research with human participants?," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.2: Evidence from researcher interactions with human participants, November 18, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=18&t=120#p673.

[91] Rudra Sil, post "Transparency and Common Sense in the Face of Diverse Models of Social Science," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.1: Ontological/Epistemological Priors, December 2, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=13&t=192#p756.

[92] Rudra Sil, post "Transparency and Common Sense in the Face of Diverse Models of Social Science," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.1: Ontological/Epistemological Priors, December 2, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=13&t=192#p756.

[93] Mark Beissinger, post "Dishonesty in research raises concern," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.1: Ontological/Epistemological Priors, November 18, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=13&t=157#p676.

[94] Samantha Majic, post "Re: Practicalities of Transparency," QTD Discussion Board, Forum III.3: Ethnography and participant observation, October 20, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=22&t=133#p535.

[95] Sarah Parkinson, post "Re: Limits to Transparency," QTD Discussion Board, Forum III.3: Ethnography and participant observation, December 2, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=22&t=132#p757 .

[96] See Kapiszewski, MacLean, and Read 2014; Dewalt and Dewalt 2011.

[97] Sandra Resodihardjo, post "Re: Power and the Institutionalization of Research Transparency/Openness/Explicitness," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.3: Power and Institutions, November 17, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=15&t=149#p672.. See Aaron Schneider, post "Re: Presenting our evidence on the Bayesian updating process," QTD Discussion Board, Forum III.1: Comparative methods and process tracing, December 19, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=20&t=124#p838 for example.

[98] Tasha Fairfield, post "Re: Transparency in case selection," QTD Discussion Board, Forum III.1: Comparative methods and process tracing, October 3, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=20&t=115#p497.. For a useful list of transparency practices in case selection, see Andy Bennett, post "Re: Transparency in case selection," QTD Discussion Board, Forum III.1: Comparative methods and process tracing, October 14, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=20&t=115#p511.

[99] Ben Reed, post "The benefits of transparency in ethnography," QTD Discussion Board, Forum III.3: Ethnography and participant observation, December 30, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=22&t=204#p874.

- Presenting interview protocols;[100]

- Being "reflexive about how the research actually unfolded as opposed to what the research design called for;"[101]

- Including background knowledge/meta-data;[102]

Providing thick description of research where it does not expose research participants;[103]

- Giving "more attention to weighing alternative arguments;"[104]

- "[J]ustifying why a given piece of empirical material means what we believe it means;"[105]

- Quoting interviews in a contextualized way;[106] and

- Reviewing the research of colleagues working in the same area.[107]

The following sections outline a number of these practices with examples from published articles presenting the results of human-subjects research. The transparency tools include in-article discussions contrasting one's approach against other more familiar approaches,[108] appendices

---

[100] Lise Howard, post "Re: Question 2: On the specificity of political violence research," QTD Discussion Board, Forum IV.2: Settings of political violence, January 5, 2017, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=27&t=165#p904.

[101] Lee Ann Fujii, post "Re: Question 2: Transparency," QTD Discussion Board, Forum IV.3: Research with vulnerable and marginalized populations, November 19, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=28&t=123#p679. See also Paul Staniland, post "Re: Question 3: On innovation and examples," QTD Discussion Board, Forum IV.2: Settings of political violence, December 20, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=27&t=164#p844.

[102] On background knowledge, "any highly relevant background knowledge that informs our analytical judgements, along with key pieces of evidence on which we base our analysis, should be highlighted in the text of an article. Additional material could be placed in an appendix." Tasha Fairfield, post "Re: Documenting use of text-based or non-text-based sources," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.1: Text-based sources, November 19, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=17&t=128#p683.

[103] Guest, post "Re: Question 2: Transparency," QTD Discussion Board, Forum IV.3: Research with vulnerable and marginalized populations, October 20, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=28&t=123#p544. Some contributors suggested confirming with research participants what can and cannot be included in publication (Lama Mourad, post "Re: Human Subjects and Research Openness: Tensions and Dilemmas," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.2: Research Ethics: Human Subjects and Research Openness, December 11, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=14&t=116#p802).

[104] Jessica Teets, post "Re: Dishonesty in research raises concern," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.1: Ontological/Epistemological Priors, December 23, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=13&t=157#p854.

[105] Derek Beach, post "Re: Presenting our evidence," QTD Discussion Board, Forum III.1: Comparative methods and process tracing, December 19, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=20&t=124#p840.

[106] Guest, post "Re: Question 3: On innovation and examples," QTD Discussion Board, Forum IV.2: Settings of political violence, December 1, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=27&t=164#p752: "developing a standard that scholars report the question asked as well as the answer provided by the respondent when quoting from an interview. Or, similarly, that scholars provide a longer, de-identified excerpt from the interview for each quote used."

[107] Sherrill Stroschein, post "Practical problems in the field" QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.2: Research Ethics, Human Subjects and Research Openness, November 30, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=14&t=189#p731.

[108] Kathy Cramer, post "Re: Limits to Transparency," QTD Discussion Board, Forum III.3: Ethnography and participant observation, October 20, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=22&t=132#p547. See also Erica

detailing aspects of the research process[109] or systematizing interview data[110] while protecting research participants,[111] footnotes,[112] self-reflexivity in writing,[113] and pilot projects on active citation and data collections.[114]

Contributors like Jillian Schwedler warn against "the idea of 'best practices,' not because there aren't better and worse practices, but because 'interpretive methods' are very diverse and I am concerned about a one-size-fits-all set of standards against which diverse approaches will be

---

Simmons, post "Re: Best practices in interpretive Social Science?," QTD Discussion Board, Forum III.2: Interpretive methods, October 17, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=21&t=155#p521.

[109] Tasha Fairfield, post "Re: Transparency in case selection," QTD Discussion Board, Forum III.1: Comparative methods and process tracing, October 3, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=20&t=115#p497; Diana Fu, post "Reporting Ethnographic Data in Journals," QTD Discussion Board, Forum III.3: Ethnography and participant observation, November 14, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=22&t=178#p646; Sam Handlin, post "Re: Benefits and Costs of Increasing Transparency for Text and Non Text Based Sources," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.1: Text-based sources, October 17, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=17&t=140#p517; Anastasia Shesterinina, post "Re: Human Subjects and Research Openness: Tensions and Dilemmas," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.2: Research Ethics: Human Subjects and Research Openness, December 17, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=14&t=116#p831; Taylor Boas posting as Guest, post "Re: Documenting use of text-based or non-text-based sources," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.1: Text-based sources, December 22, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=17&t=128#p851.

[110] Guest, post "Re: Presenting our evidence," QTD Discussion Board, Forum III.1: Comparative methods and process tracing, October 3, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=20&t=124#p498.

[111] Sarah Parkinson, "Re: Limits to Transparency," QTD Discussion Board, Forum III.3: Ethnography and participant observation, December 2, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=22&t=132#p757; Guest, post "Re: Human Subjects and Research Openness: Tensions and Dilemmas, QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.2: Research Ethics: Human Subjects and Research Openness, October 25, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=14&t=116#p594; Amrita Basu, post "Re: Question 1: Marginalization and vulnerability," QTD Discussion Board, Forum IV.3: Research with vulnerable and marginalized populations November 17, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=28&t=122#p708; Crystal Jackson, post "Re: Question 1: Marginalization and vulnerability," QTD Discussion Board, Forum IV.3: Research with vulnerable and marginalized populations, October 31, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=28&t=122#p589; Lisa Vanhala, post "Re: Question 1: Marginalization and vulnerability," QTD Discussion Board, Forum IV.3: Research with vulnerable and marginalized populations, December 28, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=28&t=122#p868; Guest, post "Re: Question 1: Marginalization and vulnerability," QTD Discussion Board, IV.3: Research with vulnerable and marginalized populations, December 9, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=28&t=122#p782.

[112] Marcus Kreuzer, post "Re: Documenting use of text-based or non-text-based sources," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.1: Text-based sources, November 4, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=17&t=128#p621.

[113] Lee Ann Fujii, post "Re: Human Subjects and Research Openness: Tensions and Dilemmas," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.2: Research Ethics: Human Subjects and Research Openness, October 21, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=14&t=116#p548; Crystal Jackson, post "Re: Question 2: Transparency," QTD Discussion Board, Forum IV.3: Research with vulnerable and marginalized populations, October 31, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=28&t=123#p590. See also John Gerring, post" Re: Dishonesty in research raises concern," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.1: Ontological/Epistemological Priors, December 18, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=13&t=157#p833. On Alice Goffman's study, On the Run, see Timothy Pachirat, post "Re: Dishonesty in research raises concern," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.1: Ontoligical/Epistemological Priors, December 1, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=13&t=157#p751; William J. Kelleher, post "How the Rule of Transparency Can Become Self-Destructive for Political Science," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.1: Ontological/Epistemological Priors, December 23, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=13&t=201#p858.

[114] Andy Bennett, post "Re: Exemplars of process tracing and historical analysis," QTD Discussion Board, Forum III.1: Comparative methods and process tracing, October 15, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=20&t=114#p512.

assessed."[115] Others note limits to the applicability of some practices across traditions in the discipline.[116] Hence, these examples are provided with the caveat that transparency practices for one research tradition might not be suitable to another and that different transparency tools might be used for different components of the research.[117]

In-article Transparency Discussion

The most obvious way in which authors can be transparent about their research is by taking the time in an article "to explain how and why we did what we did [to] make our work more accessible."[118] Katherine Cramer Walsh's (2012) article in the *American Political Science Review* (APSR), "Putting Inequality in Its Place: Rural Consciousness and the Power of Perspective," is an example.

A scholar of public opinion, Cramer studies how people understand politics, which involves observation and interpretation of how people talk with others about politics. As this approach is unusual in her field, Cramer emphasizes that "transparency in the sense of explaining in detail my data collection and analysis procedures, as well as my epistemological approach, has been a professional necessity for me."[119] This includes clarity about Cramer's focus on the process rather than causality and how it contrasts with the more familiar positivist approaches.

In her article, Cramer makes it clear on the first pages that "this is a constitutive analysis (an examination of what this thing, rural consciousness, consists of and how it works) versus a causal analysis (e.g., an examination of whether living in a rural place predicts rural consciousness)."[120] As a result, the reader is better equipped to understand the value of this research.

Transparency Appendices

Methodological appendices provide the space to expand on the data collection and analysis procedures. As Taylor Boas puts it, "online appendices… have become almost de rigueur in quantitative research given the vast number of alternative specifications… that scholars are expected to present, but which don't fit in the main body. The same could… be done for… qualitative sources."[121] Anastasia Shesterinina's (2016) *APSR* article "Collective Threat Framing and Mobilization in Civil War" offers an example.

---

[115] Jillian Schwedler, post "Re:Best practices in interpretive Social Science?," QTD Discussion Board, Forum III.2: Interpretive methods, October 3, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=21&t=155#p499.

[116] Tasha Fairfield, post "Re: Let's Focus on Research Transparency," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.2: Evidence from researcher interactions with human participants, December 31, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=18&t=168&p=880&hilit=best+practices#p880.

[117] Filiz Kahraman, post "Re: Question 2: Transparency," QTD Discussion Board, Forum IV.3: Research with vulnerable and marginalized populations, November 3, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=28&t=123#p617.

[118] Erica Simmons, post "Re: Best practices in interpretive Social Science?," QTD Discussion Board, Forum III.2: Interpretive methods, October 17, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=21&t=155#p521.

[119] Kathy Cramer, post "Re: Limits to Transparency," QTD Discussion Board, Forum III.3: Ethnography and participant observation, October 20, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=22&t=132#p547.

[120] Walsh 2012, 518. In an online appendix Cramer provides additional information, including the details of observed groups and question protocol.

[121] Taylor Boas posting as Guest, post "Re: Documenting use of text-based or non-text-based sources," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.1: Text-based sources, December 22, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=17&t=128#p851.

A scholar of mobilization, Shesterinina examines how people come to perceive threat and arrive at a range of decisions from fleeing to fighting in civil war. This study is based on in-depth interviews supplemented with observations and additional primary and secondary data. Because these materials were collected in a highly politicized setting on a war that took place over two decades ago, Shesterinina had to explain how she collected and analyzed them. This included clarity about how she selected her research sites and participants, addressed the issues of memory and potential bias in first-person narratives through interview strategies and triangulation, and weighed her findings against alternative explanations.[122]

In addition to the methodological discussion and presentation of extended, paragraph-length interview excerpts in the text of her article, Shesterinina's online appendices discuss in detail her fieldwork logistics, interview protocols, participant observation sites, and coding and process tracing procedures, which could not be included in the text of the article.[123] Focusing on her choices in and out of the field, rather than personal details of participants, the appendices clarify the research process needed to evaluate the findings while maintaining commitment to human subjects protection.

In her *World Development* article "Going Where the Money Is: Strategies for Taxing Economic Elites in Unequal Democracies," Tasha Fairfield (2013) further demonstrates the usefulness of appendices by linking particular interview materials to process-tracing tests that underpin the study.[124] Fairfield lists observations supported by interview excerpts for each of her hypotheses, making clear how she arrived at her conclusions and giving confidence in the method's rigor.

Finally, systematizing interview data in ways that demonstrate the transition from all interviews to a selection presented in the article has been another critical use of appendices for achieving transparency in human subjects research.[125] Where appropriate, for example, interview tables might include "the type, character, and extensiveness of the limited set of interviews… [and] the scholar's approach to using interviews as part of a well-planned research strategy."[126]

Footnotes

While transparency appendices can be useful in increasing the clarity of the research process in some projects, WG contributors point out that appendices can "be less accessible than foot-

---

[122] Anastasia Shesterinina, post "Re: Human Subjects and Research Openness: Tensions and Dilemmas," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.2: Research Ethics, Human Subjects and Research Openness, December 17, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=14&t=116#p831.
[123]   Shesterinina   2016.   Supplementary   Materials   available   at https://static.cambridge.org/resource/id/urn:cambridge.org:id:binary:20170412070549178-0276:S0003055416000277:S0003055416000277sup001.pdf
[124] Fairfield 2013.
[125] Guest, Presenting our evidence.
[126] Bleich and Pekkanan 2013, 104. See 99-101 for an example of the interview methods table.

notes"[127] or more fundamentally "artificially divorce the method from the analysis."[128] Footnotes can be used to include necessary information on the method in the article. Sarah Parkinson's (2013) *APSR* article "Organizing Rebellion: Rethinking High-Risk Mobilization and Social Networks in War" is an example.

A scholar of militant organizations, Parkinson studies organizational adaptation through ethnography "in both 'organizational spaces' and 'private spaces' across generations" and advocates "a more integrated, less linear evidence-gathering/analysis process… [that is] loyal to how ethnography often works."[129] Along with the methodological discussion in the text of the article, Parkinson uses footnotes to elaborate on her research site selection and confidentiality procedures.[130] She uses footnotes to support her claims by pointing to multiple interviews that conveyed similar information, to indicate how she triangulated her interviews with those of other researchers, and to explain her participants' background in the organization.[131] This approach lends credibility to the argument.

Discussion of Reflexivity

Transparency about the integrated data collection/analysis process is evident in researchers' discussions of reflexivity. "My movement from one position at the slaughterhouse to another," Timothy Pachirat illustrates in his ethnography, "structured not only what I saw but also how I it and how I gave meaning to it"[132] Lee Ann Fujii's (2010) *Journal of Peace Research* article, "Shades of Truth and Lies: Interpreting Testimonies of War and Violence," is another example. A scholar of genocide, Fujii calls attention to contextual knowledge in human subjects research and finds that "[t]o be reflexive means to discuss explicitly what the original research plan was, how things actually unfolded, including the ethical dilemmas that arose and how the researcher responded to them."[133] Fujii's article supplements the discussion in her book, *Killing Neighbors: Webs of Violence in Rwanda*, by expanding on the ways in which her background and position affected how she was seen in the field, what information she was able to access, and what she learned as a result.[134] The article is clear about how Fujii incorporated people's perception of her

---

[127] Taylor Boas posting as Guest, post "Re: Documenting use of text-based or non-text-based sources," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.1: Text-based sources, December 22, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=17&t=128#p851. Marcus Kreuzer suggests that footnotes "assure data access by pointing the reader to the precise location of evidence…, production transparency by discussing the broader context from which the piece of evidence was taken…, [and] analytical transparency by clarifying how the tangible piece of evidence supports an inference to a broader, and usually not readily observable claim" (Marcus Kreuzer, post "Re: Documenting use of text-based or non-text-based sources," QTD Discussion Board, Forum II.1: Text-based sources, September 13, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=17&t=128#p465.)

[128] Sarah Parkinson, post "Re: Practicalities of Transparency," QTD Discussion Board, Forum III.3: Ethnography and participant observation, December 2, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=22&t=133%20-%20p448#p760.

[129] Sarah Parkinson, post "Re: Practicalities of Transparency," QTD Discussion Board, Forum III.3: Ethnography and participant observation, December 2, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=22&t=133%20-%20p448#p760.

[130] Parkinson 2013, fn. 3-4, pp. 422, respectively.

[131] Parkinson 2013, fn. 17, 7, 6, pp. 424, 422, respectively.

[132] Pachirat 2011, 16.

[133] Lee Ann Fujii, post "Re: Human Subjects and Research Openness: Tensions and Dilemmas," QTD Discussion Board, Forum I.2: Research Ethics: Human Subjects and Research Openness, October 21, 2016, https://www.qualtd.net/viewtopic.php?f=14&t=116#p548.

[134] Fujii 2009, 34-35.

in the collection and analysis of materials, including by giving access to some of the most difficult topics, such as ethnicity.

Active Citation and Data Collections

Pilot active citation and data collection projects are an important addition to the transparency practices discussed above. Available on the Qualitative Data Repository, these projects show how qualitative data can be shared with attention to human subjects and copyright concerns.[135] Rachel Ellett's active citation compilation for a chapter in her 2013 book, *Pathways to Judicial Power in Transitional States: Perspectives from African Courts*, is an example. In support of the claims in the chapter, Ellett provides anonymized information on interviewees and location of the interview, annotations explaining why the citation is important or presented in this particular context, and specific location of the supporting materials, such as documents and news sources.[136]

Other pilot projects have included active citations with longer excerpts as they were recorded at the time of the interview[137] and data collections in support of the analysis that involves human subjects, for example, videos.[138] These innovative transparency tools help clarify what data was used and how to arrive at the findings and gives access to its source, where appropriate.

These examples point the way towards a series of scholarly, editorial and professional practices in which the aim of transparency is pursued with care and with attention to competing ethical concerns and to the nature of the research in question. With each of these practices, drawn from different traditions in the discipline, the scholar was able to effectively use strategies for making aspects of the data collection, analytical approach, and positionality clear within the broader research process. These practices have helped journal editors, reviewers, and readers to understand the value of the research, evaluate the findings based on a close reading of how the data were collected and analysed, and gain appropriate access to the data itself, including through the use of extended excerpts.

V. Advancing Research Integrity

This Community Transparency Statement has sought to contextualize the benefits and concerns associated with transparency in human subjects research. The report has drawn on insights shared by an intellectually diverse set of scholars—through in-person discussions, posts to the QTD online forum, and numerous publications—who support transparency in broad terms. The scholars we consulted were nearly unanimous in emphasizing the importance of openness and explicitness—e.g., specifying how information from interview subjects is collected and analyzed or interpreted—for the integrity of the research enterprise. Simply put, research involving human subjects is perceived to be more reliable when scholars make the design and analytical procedures of their studies more understandable to their readers.

In reflecting on the importance of transparency to research, this report has also summarized key concerns identified by scholars representing distinct analytical traditions. The critiques advanced by both positivist and interpretivist scholars suggest that generic requirements for data access and replicability should be avoided. Standardized rules imposed on all submissions to any

---

[135] See https://qdr.syr.edu/discover/pilots.
[136] Ellett 2015.
[137] Rich 2015.
[138] Boas 2015.

given journal are unlikely to adequately accommodate the array of ethical and practical dilemmas that researchers must confront when turning information from human subjects into publishable knowledge. Moreover, it remains in doubt whether the imposition of standardized rules for data access, especially to prevent deception or fraud, would appreciably increase the reliability of human subjects research.

This report has sought to meaningfully advance transparency discussions in human subjects research by describing specific practices that scholars can employ as appropriate for their particular research to overcome transparency concerns, all while ensuring ethical and professional obligations. The variety of practices discussed, ranging from the design to the write-up phases, can be readily implemented by most scholars to make their findings easier to evaluate in peer review. Greater recognition by journals of these practices as being consistent with transparency guidelines would facilitate the case-by-case determinations that editors and reviewers inevitably need to make when assessing the reliability of scholarship.

DA-RT has been adopted by the professional association and JETS by many of the leading journals in political science, yet the QTD consultation reveals a number of practical and ethical issues that arise when applying the criteria of data access and research transparency to human subjects research. Furthermore, the consultation suggests that transparency practices that are suitable to one research tradition in the discipline may not be appropriate for others. In light of these concerns, it is incumbent upon editors, graduate instructors, and scholars to implement DA-RT and JETS in cautious and flexible ways that acknowledge and accommodate the specific practical and ethical demands of human subjects research and diversity in the discipline. We hope that this report represents a step in that direction.

Works Cited

American Political Science Association. 2012. *A Guide to Professional Ethics in Political Science*, Second Edition. Washington DC: American Political Science Association. http://www.apsanet.org/Portals/54/APSA%20Files/publications/ethicsguideweb.pdf.

Bleich, Erik and Robert Pekkanan. 2013. "How to Report Interview Data." In *Interview Research in Political Science*, ed. Layna Mosley. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Boas, Taylor. 2015. "Presidential Campaign Advertising in Chile, Brazil, and Peru." Data Collection, QDR:10053. Syracuse, NY: Qualitative Data Repository [distributor]. http://doi.org/10.5064/F62Z13FQ.

Büthe, Tim and Alan M. Jacobs, eds. 2015. "Transparency in Qualitative and Multi-Method Research: A Symposium." *Qualitative and Multi-method Research* 13(1): 2-64.

Data Access & Research Transparency. 2015. "The Journal Editors' Transparency Statement (JETS)." http://www.dartstatement.org/2014-journal-editors-statement-jets.

Dewalt, Kathleen and Billie R. Dewalt. 2011. *Participant Observation: A Guide for Fieldworkers*. Second Edition. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Ellett, Rachel. 2015 Data for: "Democratic and Judicial Stagnation" (155-200), *Pathways to Judicial Power in Transitional States: Perspectives from African Courts*. 2013. Abingdon, UK: Routledge. Active Citation Compilation, QDR:10064. Syracuse, NY: Qualitative Data Repository [distributor]. http://doi.org/10.5064/F6PN93H4.

Elman, Colin, Diana Kapiszewski, and Lorena Vinuela. 2010. "Qualitative Data Archiving: Rewards and Challenges." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 43(1): 23-27.

Erik Bleich and Robert Pekkanen. 2013. "How to Report Interview Data." In *Interview Research in Political Science*, ed. Layna Mosley. Ithaca: Cornell University Press: 84-103.

Fairfield, Tasha. 2013. "Going Where the Money Is: Strategies for Taxing Economic Elites in Unequal Democracies," *World Development* 47: 42-57.

Fujii, Lee Ann. 2012. "Research Ethics 101: Dilemmas and Responsibilities." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 45(4): 717-723.

_____. 2009. *Killing Neighbors: Webs of Violence in Rwanda*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press

Golder, Matt and Sona N. Golder. 2016. "Symposium: Data Access and Research Transparency (DA-RT)." *Comparative Politics Newsletter* 26(1): 1-64.

Hall, Peter A. 2016. "Transparency, Research Integrity and Multiple Methods." *Comparative Politics Newsletter* 26(1): 28-31.

Kaiser, Karen. 2012. "Protecting Confidentiality." In *The SAGE Handbook of Interview Research: The Complexity of the Craft*, eds. Jaber F. Gubrium, James A. Holstein, Amir B. Marvasti, and Karyn D. McKinney. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications: 457-464.

Kapiszewski, Diana, Lauren M. MacLean, and Benjamin L. Read. 2014. *Field Research in Political Science: Practices and Principles*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lupia, Arthur and Colin Elman. 2014. "Openness in Political Science: Data Access and Research Transparency." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 47(1): 19-42.

Moravcsik, Andrew. 2010. "Active Citation: A Precondition for Replicable Qualitative Research," *Perspectives on Politics* 43(1): 29-35.

Mosley, Layna. 2013. "'Just Talk to People'? Interviews in Contemporary Political Science." In *Interview Research in Political Science*, ed. Layna Mosley. Ithaca: Cornell University Press: 16.

Pachirat, Timothy. 2011. *Every Twelve Seconds: Industrialized Slaughter and the Politics of Sight*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press,

Parkinson, Sarah Elizabeth and Elisabeth Jean Wood. 2015. "Transparency in Intensive Research on Violence: Ethical Dilemmas and Unforeseen Consequences." *Qualitative & Multi-Method Research* 13(1):22–27.

Parkinson, Sarah Elizabeth. 2013. "Organizing Rebellion: Rethinking High-Risk Mobilization and Social Networks in War." *American Political Science Review* 107 (3): 418-432.

Rich, Jessica. 2015. Data for: "Grassroots Bureaucracy: Intergovernmental Relations and Popular Mobilization in Brazil's AIDS Policy Sector." 2013. *Latin American Politics and Society*, 55 (2): 1-25. Active Citation Compilation, QDR:10066. Syracuse, NY: Qualitative Data Repository [distributor]. http://doi.org/10.5064/F6SF2T3N.

Rubin, Herbert J. and Irene S. Rubin. 1995. *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine. 2014. "Judging Quality: Evaluative Criteria and Epistemic Communities." In Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, eds. 2014. *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn* Second Edition, eds. Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea. New York: ME Sharpe: 120-146.

Shesterinina, Anastasia. 2016. "Collective Threat Framing and Mobilization in Civil War," *American Political Science Review* 110(3): 411-427.

Walsh, Katherine Cramer. 2012. "Putting Inequality in Its Place: Rural Consciousness and the Power of Perspective," *American Political Science Review* 106(3): 517-532.

Yashar, Deborah. 2016. "Editorial Trust, Gatekeeping, and Unintended Consequences," *Comparative Politics Newsletter* 26(1): 57-65.