

Research Openness in Canadian Political Science: Toward an Inclusive and Differentiated Discussion

Genevieve Fuji Johnson, Mark Pickup, Eline A. de Rooij, and Rémi Léger*

This article has been accepted for publication and appears in a revised form, subsequent to peer review and/or editorial input by Cambridge University Press, in *Canadian Journal of Political Science/Revue canadienne de science politique* 50 (March 2017) published by Cambridge University Press. The copyright holder is the Canadian Political Science Association.

Abstract

In this paper, we initiate a discussion within the Canadian political science community about research openness and its implications for our discipline. This discussion is important because the Tri-Agency has recently released guidelines on data management and because a number of political science journals, from several subfields, have signed the Journal Editors' Transparency Statement requiring data access and research transparency (DA-RT). As norms regarding research openness develop, an increasing number and range of journals and funding agencies may begin to implement DA-RT-type requirements. If Canadian political scientists wish to continue to participate in the global political science community, we must take careful note of and be proactive participants in the ongoing developments concerning research openness.

Introduction

Research openness -- no serious scholar would dispute its importance as a principle. In practice, however, discussions concerning openness in relation to how researchers collect, organize, and analyze forms of evidence have provoked intense debates. In other words, it is not the idea that provokes debates but its particular instantiations (see Pachirat 2015). This has been especially true within the American Political Science

* We would like to thank the following individuals for their contributions to our paper: Mary Burns, Michelle Dion, Alan Jacobs, William Jacoby, James Johnson, Dave Peterson, Kerry Porth, Vera Troeger, and Qinghua Yi. We take full responsibility for lingering weaknesses.

Association (APSA) with respect to Data Access and Research Transparency (DA-RT). While an organized movement in favor of DA-RT began in earnest seven years ago, the issue has sparked vociferous debates over the past five years at APSA's annual general meetings, in symposia published in the Association's journal, *PS: Political Science & Politics* (2014), and the newsletters of its Organized Sections in Qualitative and Multi-Method Research (Büthe and Jacobs 2015a) and Comparative Politics (Golder and Golder 2016a). Lively discussions continue to take place at conferences and in the blogosphere.

In Canada, debates about research openness have not been nearly as pronounced or as animated. But, this lack of disciplinary-wide discussion belies a shift propelled by our national funding agencies in guidelines that govern the Canadian research environment -- a shift toward increased openness, which has been ongoing for a number of years. In June 2016, the Tri-Agency¹ released a "Statement of Principles on Digital Data Management". This document states that data management planning is "necessary at all stages of the research project" and includes "how data are collected, formatted, preserved, and shared. . ." (2016, 2). Research data that result from CIHR, NSERC, or SSHRC funding "should normally be preserved in a publicly accessible, secure and curated repository or other platform for discovery and reuse by others" (2016, 3). Furthermore, metadata should also be accessible, which includes information about who created the data, as well as when and how they were created (2016, 3). All Canadian-based researchers with Tri-Agency funding are expected to have a data management plan, preserve their data, and make them publicly available. While we may not be discussing it as a disciplinary community, insofar as our research is funded by one of the three

agencies, political scientists in Canada who derive claims from evidence -- evidence from texts and documents, focus groups and interviews, experiments and large-N studies, *et cetera* -- are expected to fulfill responsibilities toward research openness. Unlike the US debates and discussions, which have focused on the access and transparency requirements of journals, in Canada, the expectations and responsibilities for research openness apply to researchers regardless of the venues in which we are publishing.

Our objective in this paper is to initiate a discussion within the Canadian political science community -- i.e., the community of political scientists who are based at Canadian institutions, apply to Canadian funding agencies, and/or attend the Annual General Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association -- about research openness. Specifically, we hope to stimulate a discussion about concrete standards of access and transparency for our respective sub-fields. Although a number of Canadian-based scholars have already been participating in DA-RT discussions, including in the more recent Qualitative Transparency Deliberations, it is insufficient merely to draw principles and practices from the US debates. Discussions specific to the Canadian political science community could very well reveal different standards of openness. Regardless, these discussions will be important if we are going to respond effectively to top-down expectations of openness and accept standards implemented as legitimate. We need to have our own dialogue in order to reach an understanding of what research openness legitimately entails for the diverse subfields within our research community.

This discussion is important for Canadian-based political scientists, not just because of developing Tri-Agency expectations, but also because of the *Journal Editors' Transparency Statement* (JETS 2014), which articulates a commitment "to greater data

access and research transparency, and to implementing policies requiring authors to make as accessible as possible the empirical foundation and logic of inquiry of evidence-based research” (JETS 2014). The journals that have signed on to JETS are not limited to a single sub-discipline or to the US. Rather they include journals in public policy (e.g., *Journal of European Public Policy*), international relations (e.g., *International Interactions* and *International Security*), and political behaviour (e.g., *Political Behavior* and *The Political Methodologist*), as well as several omnibus journals (e.g., *American Journal of Political Science*, *American Political Science Review*, *Comparative Political Studies*, and *Journal of Politics*). A number of journals based in Europe have also signed on (e.g., *British Journal of Political Science*, *Political Science Research Methods*, *European Journal of Political Research*, *European Journal of Politics*, *European Political Science*, *European Union Politics*, and *Rivista Italiana di Scienza Politica*). As norms regarding research openness evolve, an increasing number and range of journals may begin to implement DA-RT-type requirements. If Canadian political scientists wish to continue to participate in the global political science community, we must take careful note of and be proactive participants in the ongoing developments in data access and research transparency.²

Our paper proceeds in four parts. Upon defining research openness, we provide highlights from the history of DA-RT in the US. We then consider concerns that have been raised in response to DA-RT and the challenges that research openness may pose in Canada for quantitative and qualitative researchers working within either positivist or non-positivist traditions. We close by outlining recommendations for a multifaceted dialogue on how Canadian political scientists can move forward to engage in a

productive discussion about research openness that results in concrete measures to ensure that our research materials, data, methods, and findings are maximally accessible and transparent while respecting the epistemological and methodological plurality of our discipline, upholding legal and ethical obligations related to our research and research participants, protecting precarious communities and networks of research participants, and working within the confines of limited resources.

This paper is the outcome of a collaboration between four Canadian researchers who take divergent approaches to the study of politics. Rémi's expertise is in contemporary political theory, in particular justice and equality in diverse societies. Eline's lies in the areas of electoral and non-electoral political behavior, intergroup relations, and field experimental methods. Mark's areas of expertise include quantitative methods, political identities, electoral accountability, and democratic responsiveness. Genevieve has a background in contemporary political theory but has always been interested in examining timely issues in Canadian public policy using non-positivist qualitative methodologies. Our process included extensive conversations among ourselves and with others, in which we all learned a great deal. In any collaboration, compromise is required, which may be particularly the case when those involved work from such divergent perspectives. In the end, each of us felt that we had been heard, that our perspectives were respected, and that we reached general agreement on the value of research openness and on steps toward achieving it. Although as individuals we may not agree with every statement made in this paper, we all endorse the general principles and recommendations for research openness while acknowledging the need for inclusive and differentiated deliberations focused on addressing concerns related to its realization.

Research Openness

Research openness can be understood as encompassing multiple facets, including but not limited to openness with respect to ensuring that our positionality and subjectivity as researchers are clarified, that our research participants know how data derived from them will be used, that conflicts of interests are declared and avoided, and that funding sources and amounts are publicized. Within APSA, where discussions have been the most prominent relative to other political science communities, research openness has focused in on three particular aspects: data access, production transparency, and analytic transparency (2012, sec. 6). In APSA's *Guide to Professional Ethics in Political Science*, as amended in 2012 to incorporate DA-RT principles, research openness is expressed in terms of access to data -- or forms of empirical evidence -- and transparency in the production and analysis of that evidence. Data access requires researchers to reference the data they use in making evidence-based claims. If they generate or collect data, "researchers should provide access to those data or explain why they cannot" (2012, sec. 6.1). Production transparency involves offering "a full account of the procedures used to collect or generate the data" (2012, sec. 6.2). Analytic transparency involves researchers providing "a full account of how they draw their analytic conclusions from the data to conclusions" (2012, sec. 6.3). Tim Büthe and Alan Jacobs summarize the DA-RT view by articulating the following three questions for thinking about research openness:

-How was the evidence gathered?

- How do the conclusions or interpretations follow from the empirical information considered?

-What is the relationship between the empirical information presented in the research output and the broad evidentiary record? (2015b, 3-4)

Drawing directly from the US-based debates, the most basic claim in favor of research openness centers on the *advancement of social scientific knowledge*. The development of knowledge based on verifiable evidence, careful analysis, and valid reasoning is a collective enterprise that involves intersubjective exchanges among research community members (see Lupia and Elman 2014 and Elman and Kapiszewski 2014). This necessarily involves sharing information about what is being researched, how that research is being conducted, and how findings and conclusions are being reached. Knowledge advancement thus requires researchers to share information concerning the processes involved in their development of knowledge claims and to have these processes scrutinized, replicated, and/or built upon by other researchers. Ultimately, openness enables researchers to make contributions to, and to learn from, the rigorous development of knowledge by communicating not only the results and conclusions of their work but also the processes by which they arrived at those results and conclusions.

Discussions and debates on research openness also include more specific claims. For example, a claim made by political scientists engaged in the US debate is that greater openness in research, analysis, and communication activities will enhance the *credibility and legitimacy* of individual studies and the discipline as a whole (see Lupia and Elman

2014). This is not just an issue of stamping out the few instances of willful misconduct (Flaherty 2015) but also of correcting and reducing unintended errors found in published works. In the Canadian context, the Tri-Agency articulates a claim for research openness relating to *concrete benefits*, stating that storing, accessing, reusing, and building upon digital research data “supports innovative solutions to economic and social challenges, and holds tremendous potential for Canada’s productivity, competitiveness and quality of life” (2016, 1). A different but related claim concerns *accountability and responsibility*, especially where public funds are deployed for research. The Tri-Agency writes that “research data collected with the use of public funds belong, to the fullest extent possible, in the public domain and available for reuse by others” (2016, 2). From this perspective, research openness enables other researchers and research participants to see how data were collected and analyzed and to check them against the conclusions drawn from them.

Other claims relate to *decreasing the burdens of research*, which can be placed on both research participants, especially members of vulnerable populations who may be “over-researched”, as well as researchers who do not have the resources to conduct primary research. Some communities, such as street-involved sex workers from the downtown eastside of Vancouver, Canada, tend to be over-sampled. Members of such communities and their allies express frustration concerning how frequently researchers want to conduct surveys and interviews with them and then essentially retreat to their ivory towers (see Lebovitch 2015). Creating access to, for example, survey data, interviews transcripts, and ethnographic notes from previous research may enable scholars either to conduct their own analysis without going into the field or to narrow in on a novel research question that they can pursue in the field.

Yet another claim is that research openness has *pedagogical value* (Elman and Kapiszewski 2014). Seeing how other researchers frame and conduct their studies can be useful for seasoned academics as well as students. In the same way that students of quantitative methods often practice exercises in Stata or R based on existing datasets, those of qualitative methods could practice either grounded theory or *a priori* analyses of content from previously collected qualitative research materials. Pedagogical value is created from learning how to do good research by working with detailed examples. This access to potential training materials is also argued to reduce the barrier to entry into social science research (Dafoe 2014), something that is seen as a good in and of itself. Although perhaps initially articulated as a way of addressing problems of replicability in positivist analyses (see Pachirat 2015), research openness has value for all of us who engage with empirical forms of evidence within either a positivist or non-positivist framework.

As we mentioned at the outset, research openness and DA-RT have provoked lively and at times difficult exchanges within the American political science community. We briefly outline DA-RT's history in the following section, before discussing concerns and challenges relating to research openness.

DA-RT History

While discussions of data access and research transparency have been taking place for quite some time (e.g. King 1995), the DA-RT movement began informally in 2010 within APSA (see Lupia and Elman 2014). Drafted by an ad hoc committee, the initial set of

principles was reviewed and amended by the APSA Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights, and Freedoms. The amended text was approved by the APSA Council in the spring of 2012 and subsequently circulated to the membership. In the fall of 2012, the council formally voted to include the new principles in its *Guide to Professional Ethics in Political Science* (see Lupia and Elman 2014; see also <http://www.dartstatement.org/>). Although advanced as a single set of general principles for openness in political science, Lupia and Elman write, “it was understood that different research communities would apply the principles in different ways” (2014, 19).

Following these changes to the ethics guidelines, APSA DA-RT sub-committees held a number of meetings, sessions, and workshops to begin developing the principles in light of the different approaches to and traditions of studying politics (see <http://www.dartstatement.org/events>). As part of this process, separate draft documents for quantitative and qualitative researchers were circulated to members for comment. These were the draft *Guidelines for Data Access and Research Transparency for Qualitative Research in Political Science* (Appendix A in Lupia and Elman 2014, 25-37) and the draft *Guidelines for Data Access and Research Transparency for Quantitative Research in Political Science* (Appendix B in Lupia and Elman 2014, 38-42). These draft guidelines were never ratified and are thus not official APSA statements, but they play an important role in helping to think through the development, refinement, and operationalization of DA-RT principles for particular research communities.

In the fall of 2014, a group of political science journal editors produced JETS, which represents an agreement that, by 15 January 2016, the signatory journals would make available their authors’ data and analytic materials. As of December 1st, 2016, 27

journals had signed the joint statement. Specifically, JETS requires authors “to ensure that cited data are available at the time of publication through a trusted digital repository” and “to delineate clearly the analytic procedures upon which their published claims rely, and where possible to provide access to all relevant analytic materials” (2014). In addition, it requires that signatory journals maintain “a consistent data citation policy to increase the credit that data creators and suppliers receive for their work” (2014). Importantly, the statement includes exemptions for manuscripts with restricted data (e.g., that are “classified, require confidentiality protections, were obtained under a non-disclosure agreement, or have inherent logistical constraints”), leaving to the editors of signatory journals the decision to grant exemptions with or without conditions.

In November 2015, 1,173 political scientists signed a petition expressing serious doubts about JETS and calling for a delay in its implementation in order to allow for more disciplinary-wide dialogue (Petition 2015). In parallel, the President, Immediate Past President and President-Elect of the APSA signed a letter indicating their support for the *American Political Science Review* proceeding with the JETS guidelines and encouraging further discussion on the DA-RT initiative (Hochschild, Lake, and Hero 2015). In January 2016, 20 APSA past presidents signed a letter to JETS signatory editors expressing support for efforts “to improve research transparency and facilitate replication in political science” while strongly urging them to develop a more nuanced statement on the implementation of transparency policies (Powell 2016). The letter argued that JETS is vague and flawed and insensitive to the complexities of qualitative studies. In the following section, we discuss the concerns and challenges raised in these missives and publications, and their relevance to the Canadian political science

community.

Concerns and Challenges

Based on our review of the documents used to reconstruct the DA-RT history, we identify eight concerns and challenges that may be pertinent to the Canadian political science community. These are the following:

1) *A (largely) Non-Existent Problem*: While supporters of the DA-RT movement view data access and research transparency as providing a number of benefits for the advancement of knowledge, others ask: “What’s the problem, and do we all need to address it?” Jeffery Isaac, for example, writes that DA-RT “is linked to no particular scholarly problem” (2015, 275). Most scholars already engage in best practices as determined by their specific research communities (see Cramer 2015; Schwartz-Shea and Yanow 2016) and seek to avoid the intentional misrepresentation of empirical evidence and manipulation of their results. On that basis, some argue that by pursuing DA-RT, valuable resources are being diverted away from real problems facing the discipline such as the lack of diversity among members (see Fujii 2016). In Canada, many may agree, as gender, indigenous, and visible minority group representation within the discipline continue to be serious concerns (see CPSA 2012).

2) *Epistemological and Methodological Plurality*: From the outset, DA-RT-related documents have stated that a uniform standard of data access and research transparency

should not be imposed on political scientists (see Golder and Golder 2016b). APSA's ad hoc committee on DA-RT was a collaboration between qualitative and quantitative political scientists. In its draft guidelines for DA-RT in qualitative research, it states that research openness does not obligate "all research traditions to adopt the same approach" and that it should be "achieved and evaluated in ways that are sensitive to the nature of qualitative data, how they are gathered, and how they are employed" (Appendix A in Lupia and Elman 2014, 27). Nonetheless, concerns articulated by DA-RT opponents are that the movement has been exclusionary and is based on a narrow conception of political science, that those involved represent only a particular sub-set of quantitative and qualitative scholars, and that it attempts to apply standards for access and transparency effectively prioritizing positivist over non-positivist approaches (Isaac 2015; see also Cramer 2015; Fujii 2016; Pachirat 2015; Parkinson and Wood 2015; and Schwartz-Shea and Yanow 2016). As Pachirat puts it, DA-RT is premised on "an extractive ontology" that holds that the research world is "a source of informational raw material (2015, 30). His view, and that of other interpretivists, is that "there is no prior non-relational, non-interpretive moment of raw information or data to reference back to" (2015, 30). A number of Canadian-based scholars may share this concern, especially given our tradition of blending normative theory with more empirical illustrations and case studies (e.g., Carens 2000; Kymlicka 1998; Warren and Pearse 2008; and Williams 1998).

3) *Ethics and the Law*: Key DA-RT-related documents address legal and ethical obligations of researchers, noting that these constitute proper limits to transparency.

APSA's *Guide to Professional Ethics* states that "Scholars may be exempted from Data

Access and Production Transparency in order to (A) address well-founded privacy and confidentiality concerns, including abiding by relevant human subjects regulation; and/or (B) comply with relevant and applicable laws, including copyright” (APSA 2012, 10). APSA’s Ad Hoc Committee’s draft guidelines for qualitative research uses stronger language, stating that “it is critically important that scholars sharing data comply with all legal and ethical obligations” (Appendix A in Lupia and Elman 2014, 30). All researchers must respect copyright laws, and all researchers working with human participants must uphold their ethics protocols. The draft guidelines also note that there may be cases in which a researcher who has the informed consent of a participant to share data should nonetheless refrain due to risks that have become apparent or to changes in the circumstances in which consent was initially given (Appendix A in Lupia and Elman 2014, 30). These statements have not assuaged all concerns that DA-RT principles may be in conflict with research ethics protocols and practices (see Petition 2015; see also Cramer 2015; and Parkinson and Wood 2015). In the Canadian context, additional ethical and legal concerns relate to obligations specific to research involving Aboriginal peoples (see TCPS 2014).

4) *Precarious Networks and Risky Research*: Even with robust ethics protocols and practices, there are concerns that research openness may serve as a disincentive for prospective research participants from marginalized, oppressed, criminalized, or otherwise vulnerable communities, many of which are situated under repressive regimes or in contexts of political violence, from involving themselves in research projects. Research openness could make it even more difficult for scholars to access precarious

networks and communities, especially those at serious physical or psychological risk. In both the US and Canada, research interviews and other materials have been subpoenaed, which may become more common with increased research openness. While manuscripts based on research involving risks to vulnerable individuals and communities would likely receive an exemption (either partial or complete) from the DA-RT requirements of journals (APSA 2012; Peterson 2015), and while many journals may never apply DA-RT requirements, this has not eliminated concerns that DA-RT may effectively shut down important research (Htun 2016 and Parkinson and Wood, 2015; see also Shih 2015). In Canada, again, the pressure for increased openness has provenance in the Tri-Agency thus raising such concerns for scholars regardless of their publication format and venue.

5) *Limited and Unequally Distributed Resources*: Achieving research openness can be very resource intensive, and concerns have been expressed that DA-RT will create additional burdens for researchers and journal editors in terms of time and costs. Currently, no journal requires that all data collected be made available. At most, JETS signatories require that the data directly included in the analytics contained in the paper and supplementary materials be made accessible. Nonetheless, preparing replication files for quantitative work or coding schemes for qualitative work involves expending significant amounts of additional energy on editing, refining, and formatting and can essentially double the work involved in publishing a manuscript. Concerns have been raised that these resource issues will disproportionately affect young scholars who face heightened pressures to publish, have smaller research budgets, and less job security (Hall 2016 and Parkinson and Wood 2015). A related concern is that DA-RT might

incline the next generation of scholars away from “taking on the politically sensitive questions that require sustained fieldwork with a range of methods, not all of which produce data that can, or arguably should, be made accessible” (Yashar 2016: 63; also Hall 2016: 29, 31).

6) *The Language of Knowledge*: While issues related to the language of knowledge production and communication have not emerged as dominant concerns in the US-based discussions on DA-RT, these should be of particular concern for the political science community in Canada. Most contemporary research around the world is published in English, and the burden of this state of affairs is unequally shared between native and non-native speakers of English (Gordin 2015). Those who do not speak English as their first language must invest resources in the acquisition of the language and in some cases the translation of their work (Séguin 2015). The move towards greater data access and research transparency may add additional burdens related to translating not only manuscripts but also transparency documents. This is a concern for all those who conduct their research in a language other than English.

7) *Who Gets to Decide?*: Another concern relates to who has the rightful authority over decisions to make research materials, data, and metadata publicly accessible. APSA’s *Guide to Professional Ethics* states that researchers are obligated to facilitate the evaluation of their evidence-based knowledge claims through access and transparency. The guide provides for exemptions, where there are legal and ethical concerns, stating that researchers must “exercise appropriate restraint in making claims as to the

confidential nature of their sources, and resolve all reasonable doubts in favor of full disclosure” (2012, 10). Taking issue with this top-down imposition of rules related to DA-RT, Peregrine Schwartz-Shea and Dvora Yanow argue that APSA was a service organization but with DA-RT has become an advocacy organization enforcing certain types of behavior (2016, 14). Numerous DA-RT commentators have expressed the view that the researcher conducting the study is in the best position to judge the ethical and legal consequences of making data available and that such decisions should be made by the researcher and not journal editors or reviewers (Cramer 2015; Petition 2015: Schwartz-Shea and Yanow 2016).

8) *The Need for More Dialogue*: Making the case for more dialogue, the petition to delay JETS states that “it is supremely important not to begin to enforce any particular policies until the relevant research communities have been able to discuss the issues fully and either come to consensus or clarify the issues on which their members disagree” (2015). Although numerous discussions concerning DA-RT have been ongoing, many scholars continue to believe that more are required within and across research communities in political science. Indeed, in light of Tri-Agency expectations, we believe that inclusive and differentiated deliberation toward taking a proactive stance on what research openness entails to our research communities is of great importance for the Canadian political science community.

Toward Inclusion, Differentiation, and Deliberation

Research openness has clear benefits for political science, including advancing knowledge, increasing accountability, credibility, and legitimacy, accessing potential research training material, and decreasing burdens on the over-researched. We believe it is an important goal that we have a responsibility to pursue. We also believe that it needs to be pursued in a way that recognizes the epistemological and methodological plurality of our discipline, upholds our ethical and legal obligations to research participants and copyright holders, does not threaten research networks and communities, and does not involve disproportionate burdens for scholars, journals, and institutions. Drawing from and building on discussions in APSA circles, we highlight possible steps towards a collective dialogue on these issues specific to the Canadian context. In particular, we recommend a dialogue that is informed by the interrelated principles of inclusion, differentiation, and deliberation with the goal of producing a separate set of openness standards for different research. We further recommend that these standards be communicated to the Tri-Agency and journals looking to adopt JETS-type requirements.

In terms of concrete steps to realize this dialogue, we propose initiatives be taken by departmental chairs, the Executive and Board of Directors of the Canadian Political Science Association (CPSA), and the *Canadian Journal of Political Science*. Activities could include collegial discussions at the departmental level, the CPSA's annual chairs' meetings, the CPSA's annual general meetings, and the annual general meetings of Canada's regional political science associations. Representatives from the Tri-Agency should also be included in this dialogue. Specifically, we call upon the CPSA executive and board to mandate a committee, with regional, institutional, and epistemological and methodological representation to oversee this dialogue and report back to the association

membership. To realize this community-wide deliberation, an on-line forum could enable the CPSA community located across the country to engage with each other. Participation in this on-line forum could then feed into a symposium on approaches to research transparency in Canada hosted by the *Canadian Journal of Political Science*.

Inclusion

As requirements or expectations for research openness are being articulated by both journals and funding agencies, it is important that dialogue on data access, production transparency, and analytic transparency includes scholars from a comprehensive range of research approaches. But inclusive deliberation involves not merely an open invitation to engage. Deliberations have to be structured to include all members of the Canadian political science community who believe that research openness is relevant to them and want their voices to be heard in developing approach-specific ways to achieve it.

A good example of inclusion in discussions on research openness is the Qualitative Transparency Deliberations (QTD) (<https://www.qualtd.net/page/about>). Launched by APSA's Organized Section in Qualitative and Multi-Method Research in 2015 and Co-Chaired by Tim Büthe and Alan Jacobs, the QTD is overseen by an intellectually diverse steering committee that includes scholars with backgrounds in positivism and training in comparative methods and process tracing, as well as scholars engaged in interpretive and ethnographic research from the perspectives of, for example, race and American political development and critical theory. Moreover, it includes 13 working groups organized by thematic clusters (i.e., Fundamentals, Forms of Evidence,

Analytic Approaches and Methodologies, and Research Contexts and Topics), each with diverse membership. The on-line forum is intended as a space for collective exchanges on the meaning and implications of research openness for the broad diversity of qualitative methods from the bottom-up, that is, from those who engage in these methods. Outputs of the process will include community transparency statements, which will articulate understandings of and practices for research openness current among scholars participating in each working group and which may serve as informational resources for editorial policies, research, and training. We recommend a Canadian forum based on these same principles that includes researchers representing all research approaches, quantitative, qualitative, positivist and non-positivist.

Differentiation

Closely related to inclusion is the principle of differentiation. Access and transparency will differ from one research approach and methodology to another. As such, it is important that scholars engaging in similar forms of research communicate with each other to develop a shared set of practices and policies that they consider appropriate. Scholars in some areas of research may, for example, agree on the value of electronic data and software code that reproduce the analysis (Dafoe 2014), or on the need to pre-register experimental and observational research designs (Humpreys, Sanchez de la Sierra and van der Windt 2013). Scholars in other areas may agree on the use of either active citation (Moravcsik 2014) or annotation for transparent inference (<https://qdr.syr.edu/deposit/activecitations>), which is hyperlinked to a transparency

appendix. Recognizing that not all interviews should be shared, scholars may develop templates for interview tables, including a brief description of the (de-identified) interviewee sample, the rationale for how this sample was assembled, and examples of interview questions (see Bleich and Pakkanen 2015). Some may develop ways of providing limited access to empirical evidence so as not to violate ethical or legal obligations. For example, when data cannot be made public, it may be possible for a third party to confirm that it does exist and that the analysis described in the paper does produce the results published in the paper. From differentiated deliberations, scholars may propose innovative practices to achieving research openness in a way that is appropriate for their work while meeting the demands of ethics and the law and not exceeding limited resources. Finally, while respecting the diverse mission statements of journals and the right of editors to decline manuscripts where they do not align with their particular mission, scholars may find ways of asserting their authority in decisions concerning the extent to which their research will be made accessible and transparent.

The *American Journal of Political Science* provides an example of how different practices can be developed for different research approaches (Jacoby and Lupton 2016). The *Journal* recently published separate guidelines for qualitative and quantitative research, within the latter, differentiating between matrix and granular types of qualitative research. AJPS also provides for possible exemptions based on considerations related to restricted access datasets, and research with research participants, and it requires replication materials only for work that includes analytic results in the paper or supporting materials. This level of disaggregation demonstrates how different (but not lesser or greater) practices and principles can be applied to different research approaches.

Deliberation

Another principle, which underpins inclusion and differentiation, is deliberation. The more approach-specific as well as cross-disciplinary deliberation that we have, the more nuanced our understanding of research openness, its implications, and its practices will be. Such deliberation, insofar as it involves exchanging and sharing perspectives on, considerations of, and reasons for particular positions, will help to minimize the risk of creating (or exacerbating) divisiveness within the Canadian political science community. Although there is disagreement over the application of principles of data access and research transparency across different research approaches, there are important areas of agreement, particularly on analytic transparency, as revealed in workshops and symposia (see Bütte and Jacobs 2015c and Golder and Golder 2016a). It is valuable for political scientists to understand where these areas of agreement exist and to appreciate the reasons for differences among approaches.

The benefits of collectively deliberating about research transparency in Canada, on inclusive and differentiated terms, include articulating to both funding agencies and journals guidelines that make sense to our community and that are appropriate for the different kinds of research in which we engage. In addition, such deliberations can make clear the need for additional resources for Canadian-based researchers.

Resources and Recognition

There is no doubt that meeting the standards of research openness necessitates more effort, time, and money, which could partly be addressed by universities and departments providing resources for making research open in the same way that they often provide resources for applying to grants. These resources could include the provision of both expertise and funding. Admittedly, some institutions have more resources than others to distribute in this way. In any case, scholars applying for Tri-Agency funding should also apply for and receive designated funds for the purposes of meeting these additional demands on resources. The resource issue could further be addressed by giving credit for activities that create greater access and transparency in scholarly research and publication. In terms of evaluation for both career progress and funding, scholars should receive credit for producing data, curating research materials, and creating transparency documents in ways similar to how we receive credit for publishing articles and books (see Carsey 2015). As the Tri-Agency states, “Researchers who responsibly and effectively share their data should be recognized by funders, their academic institutions and users benefiting from the reuse of the data” (2016, 4). Scholars should be encouraged to seek separate digital object identifiers (DOIs) for their datasets, replication files, and transparency documents from journals, publishers, or repositories. Journals and publishers should be encouraged to impose appropriate citation standards on those drawing from or using empirical forms of evidence collected and organized by scholars. Revising data citation practices could change the incentives of all scholars, but young scholars in particular, to share their data (Lupia and Alter 2014).

In terms of the disproportionate burdens placed on both new scholars and non-native speakers of English, we make a few suggestions. With respect to non-native

English speakers, a partial solution is to clearly distinguish knowledge production from communication. While research results may increasingly have to be communicated in English, political scientists should be free to make available their transparency documents in a number of languages. Another possibility is that departments, universities, and funding agencies could provide additional research funds to help achieve access and transparency to those who conduct their research in a language other than English. Additional start up funds to new scholars could also serve in addressing the disproportionate impact of resource issues related to achieving openness. Finally, as a discipline, we should be training graduate students in good data management planning, including approaches to realizing access and transparency across the full range of research approaches. This training should be an essential component of any research methods course.

Conclusion

This paper is the outcome of a collaboration of researchers committed to engaging in an open and respectful dialogue. Overall, we believe that research openness yields important benefits for both individual researchers and our research community. At the same time, we acknowledge that there are valid concerns about the particular ways in which this end is pursued. We also believe that it is important to be proactive in developing approach-specific standards of openness as funding agencies and research journals continue to develop and apply expectations and requirements. We have recommended principles by which Canadian political scientists can move forward to

ensure that our forms of empirical evidence, methods, and findings are maximally open while respecting the plurality of our discipline, upholding legal and ethical obligations, protecting precarious networks of research participants and communities, and working within the confines of limited resources. We encourage members of the Canadian political science community to engage in an inclusive and differentiated deliberation.

References

American Political Science Association (APSA). 2012. *A Guide to Professional Ethics in Political Science*. 2nd ed.

<http://www.apsanet.org/portals/54/Files/Publications/APSAEthicsGuide2012.pdf>

(September 12, 2016).

Bleich, Erik and Robert J. Pekkanen. 2015. "Data Access, Research Transparency, and Interviews: The Interview Methods Appendix." *Qualitative & Multi-Method Research* 13 (1): 8-12.

Büthe, Tim and Alan M. Jacobs, eds. 2015a. *Qualitative & Multi-Method Research: Newsletter of the American Political Science Association Organized Section for Qualitative and Multi-Method Research* 13 (1).

Büthe, Tim and Alan M. Jacobs. 2015b. "Introduction to the Symposium." *Qualitative & Multi-Method Research* 13 (1): 2-7.

Büthe, Tim and Alan M. Jacobs. 2015c. "Conclusion: Research Transparency for a Diverse Discipline." *Qualitative & Multi-Method Research* 13 (1): 52-62.

Canadian Political Science Association Diversity Task Force. 2012. *Report and Analysis of the Canadian Political Science Association Member Survey*. https://www.cpsa-acsp.ca/documents/pdfs/diversity/2012_Diversity_Task_Force_Report.pdf (May 2012).

Carens, Joseph. 2000. *Culture, Citizenship, and Community: A Contextual Exploration of Justice as Evenhandedness*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Carsey, Thomas M. 2014. "Making DA-RT a Reality." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 47 (1): 72–77.

Cramer, Katherine. 2015. "Transparent Explanations, Yes. Public Transcripts and Fieldnotes, No: Ethnographic Research on Public Opinion." *Qualitative & Multi-Method Research* 15 (1): 17-20.

Dafoe, Allan. 2014. "Science Deserve Better: The Imperative to Share Complete Replication Files." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 47 (1): 60–66.

Data Access and Research Transparency (DA-RT). <http://www.dartstatement.org> (June 2015).

DA-RT. “Events.” *Data Access and Research Transparency (DA-RT)*.
<http://www.dartstatement.org/events> (June 2015).

Elman, Colin and Diana Kapiszewski. 2014. “Data Access and Research Transparency in the Qualitative Tradition.” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 47 (1): 43–47.

European Union. 2016. Open Access & Data Management. In: *Horizon 2020 Online Manual*. http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/docs/h2020-funding-guide/cross-cutting-issues/open-access-dissemination_en.htm (December 7, 2016).

Flaherty, Colleen. 2015. “More Time on Transparency.” *Inside Higher ED*.
<https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/11/16/political-scientists-seek-delay-transparency-standards-publications> (November 16, 2015).

Fujii, Lee Ann. 2016. “The Dark Side of DA-RT.” *Comparative Politics Newsletter* 26 (1): 25-27.

Golder, Matt, and Sona N. Golder, eds. 2016a. *Comparative Politics Newsletter: The Organized Section in Comparative Politics of the American Political Science Association* 26 (1).

Golder, Matt, and Sona N. Golder. 2016b. "Letter from the Editors." *Comparative Politics Newsletter* 26 (1): 1-9.

Gordin, Michael. 2015. *Scientific Babel: How Science Was Done Before and After Global English*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

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

Hochschild, Jennifer, David A. Lake and Rodney E. Hero. 2015. "Data Access and Research Transparency Initiative (DA-RT)." *PS Now*.
<http://www.politicalsciencenow.com/data-access-and-research-transparency-initiative-da-rt/> (September 6, 2016).

Htun, Mala. 2016. "DA-RT and the Social Conditions of Knowledge Production in Political Science." *Comparative Politics Newsletter* 26 (1): 32-35.

- Humphreys, Macartan, Raul Sanchez de la Sierra and Peter Van der Windt. 2013. "Fishing, Commitment, and Communication: A Proposal for Comprehensive Nonbinding Research Registration." *Political Analysis* 21(1): 1-20.
- Isaac, Jeffrey C. 2015. "For a More Public Political Science." *Perspectives on Politics* 13 (2): 269–283.
- Jacoby, William G. and Robert N. Lupton. 2016. "AJPS Replication and Verification Policy." *AJPS*. <https://ajps.org/ajps-replication-policy/> (Sept 5, 2016).
- Journal Editors Transparency Statement (JETS). 2014. *Data Access and Research Transparency (DA-RT)*. <http://www.dartstatement.org/2014-journal-editors-statement-jets> (June 2015).
- King, Gary. 1995. "Replication, Replication." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 28 (3): 444-452.
- Kymlicka, Will. 1998. *Finding Our Way: Rethinking Ethnocultural Relations in Canada*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lebovitch, Amy. 2015. "Foreword," Shawna Ferris, *Street Sex Work and Canadian Cities: Resisting a Dangerous Order*. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press. ix-xi.

Lupia, Arthur and George Alter. 2014. "Data Access and Research Transparency in the Quantitative Tradition." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 47 (1): 54–59.

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

Lynch, Marc. 2016. "Area Studies and the Cost of Prematurely Implementing DA-RT." *Comparative Politics Newsletter* 26 (1): 36-39

Moravcsik, Andrew. 2014. "Transparency: The Revolution in Qualitative Research." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 47 (1): 48–53.

Pachirat, Timothy. 2015. "The Tyranny of Light." *Qualitative & Multi-Method Research: Newsletter of the American Political Science Association Organized Section for Qualitative and Multi-Method Research*, eds. Büthe and Jacobs. 1327-31.

Parkinson, E. Sarah and Elisabeth J. Wood. 2015. "Transparency in Intensive Research on Violence: Ethical Dilemmas and Unforeseen Consequences." *Qualitative & Multi-Method Research* 15 (1): 22-27.

Petition from Concerned Scholars. 2015.

<https://dialogueondartdotorg.files.wordpress.com/2015/11/petition-from-concerned-scholars-nov-12-2015-complete.pdf> (November 12, 2015).

Powell, Bing. 2016. "Letter From Distinguished Political Scientists Urging Nuanced Journal Interpretation of JETS Policy Guidelines." PS Now.

<http://www.politicalsciencenow.com/letter-from-distinguished-political-scientists-urging-nuanced-journal-interpretation-of-jets-policy-guidelines/> (January 13, 2016).

Research Councils UK. 2011. *Common Principles on Data Policy*.

<http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/research/datapolicy> (December 7, 2016).

Research Councils UK. 2015. *Guidance on Best Practice in the Management of Research Data*.

<http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/documents/documents/rcukcommonprinciplesondatapolicy-pdf> (December 7, 2016).

Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine and Dvora Yanow. 2016. "Legitimizing Political Science or Splitting the Discipline? Reflections on DA-RT and the Policy-making Role of a Professional Association." *Politics & Gender* 12(3): 1-19.

Séguin, Ève. 2015. “Quand ‘English’ rime avec ‘rubbish’.” *Découvrir: Le magazine de l’ACFAS*. <http://www.acfas.ca/publications/decouvrir/2015/04/quand-english-rime-avec-rubbish>

Shih, Victor. 2015. “Research in Authoritarian Regimes: Transparency Tradeoffs and Solutions.” *Qualitative & Multi-Method Research* 13 (1): 20-21.

Trachtenberg, Marc. 2015. “Transparency in Practice: Using Written Sources.” *Qualitative & Multi-Method Research* 13 (1): 13-17.

Tri-Agency Statement of Principles on Digital Data Management. 2016.
<http://www.science.gc.ca/default.asp?lang=En&n=83F7624E-1> (July 15, 2016).

TCPS2. 2014. *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans*. http://www.pre.ethics.gc.ca/pdf/eng/tcps2-2014/TCPS_2_FINAL_Web.pdf
(September 19, 2016).

Yashar, Deborah. 2016. “Editorial Trust, Gatekeeping, and the Unintended Consequences.” *Comparative Politics Newsletter* 26 (1): 57-64.

Warren, Mark E. and, Hilary Pearse. eds.2008. *Designing deliberative democracy: the British Columbia Citizens' Assembly*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Williams, Melissa S. 1998. *Voice, Trust and Memory: Marginalized Groups and the Failings of Liberal Representation*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

¹ The Tri-Agency includes the Canadian Institutes for Health Research (CIHR), Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC), and Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC).

² Funding agencies outside of Canada and the US have also developed standards on data access and transparency. See for instance: The Research Councils UK (RCUK)'s Common Principles on Data Policy (2011) and Guidance on Best Practice in the Management of Research Data (2015), as well as the European Union Horizon 2020's Open Access & Data Management guidelines (2016).