

Statecraft Global
Strategy Economics
War Ideas Power Identity

INTERNATIONAL HISTORY POLITICS

Relations Empire
Change

An organized section of the American Political Science Association (APSA)

In This Issue

Message from the President.....	1
Roundtable: Discussion on the DA-RT.....	2-18
Friendly Fire: DA-RT.....	17-29
Upcoming Events & Workshops.....	30

International History and Politics (IHAP)

[Website](#)

Section Officers

President:	Peter Trubowitz
Vice President:	Karen Alter
Secretary -Treasurer:	David Edelstein
Program Chair:	Kelly Greenhill
<hr/>	
Newsletter Editor:	James A. Morrison
Assistant Editor:	Yuan (Joanne) Yao

Newsletter Winter 2016 Volume 1, Issue 2

Message from the President

In this second issue of the International History and Politics Newsletter we take up the most important issue facing APSA this season: the DA-RT initiative. An impressive list of contributors has weighed in, including Karen Alter, Giovanni Capocchia, Eric Grynaviski, Jeffrey Isaac, Andrew Moravcsik, James A. Morrison, and Jelena Subotic.

With this issue of the Newsletter, the International History and Politics (IHAP) section stakes out an important place in the debate on this issue, which will certainly be one of the focal points of APSA annual meetings in Philadelphia.

I would like to thank all of the contributors to this issue of the Newsletter for their thoughtful and serious contributions. I also want to thank James A. Morrison (Newsletter Editor) and Joanne Yao (Assistant Editor) for their fabulous work pulling this issue together.

At our upcoming meeting in Philadelphia, we will be holding our annual business meeting and award ceremonies on Friday September 2 from 6:30-7:30 pm in the Tubman room at the Loews Hotel. The business meeting will be followed by a reception that we are jointly hosting with our good friends in the Politics and History section. I look forward to seeing you there.

Peter Trubowitz
IHAP President
London School of Economics & Political Science (LSE)
p.trubowitz@lse.ac.uk

Board Members:

Keith Darden, American
Victoria Tin-bor Hui, Notre Dame
Elizabeth Kier, University of Washington
Timothy McKeown, UNC
Kate McNamara, Georgetown
Chris Reus-Smit, Queensland

Special thanks to the Department of International Relations at the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE) for its financial support in publishing this newsletter.

Roundtable **Debating DA-RT**

Introduction: DA-RT in History and Politics

By Joanne Yao, London School of Economics & Political Science (LSE)

In early 2016, a number of political science [journals](#) released the first set of DA-RT (Data Access—Research Transparency) policies in an effort to increase openness and legitimacy in political science research. These new data sharing and transparency standards have caused widespread [controversy](#) and inspired much heated [debate](#) across the discipline, particularly among qualitative scholars who fear the new standards will disproportionately burden certain methodological choices over others. Indeed, much has been written and said about DA-RT. APSA’s Section for Qualitative and Multi-Methods Research has designed a [platform](#) for deliberations over DA-RT standards, and APSA’s Comparative Politics Section has dedicated its [Spring 2016 newsletter](#) to the issue with a webpage for further discussions. The following roundtable on the merits and pitfalls of DA-RT contributes to the debate by elaborating on what DA-RT standards would mean for scholars interested in international history and politics—particularly scholars who engage in extensive qualitative archival research.

In addition to the roundtable, the friendly fire section presents two competing views on these policies as a leading proponent of DA-RT (Andrew Moravcsik) and a leading opponent (Jeffrey Isaac) directly engage one another in impassioned scholarly debate.

As the varied voices below suggest, this topic stirred a lively response, and the volume of contributions has delayed the publication of our winter newsletter. The controversy surrounding DA-RT is a quickly moving target, and we apologize if discussions and events may have overtaken some of the insights expressed below. However, we feel that the wealth of perspectives represented here adds to the debate and reveals a vibrant discipline where members willingly confront and contest the standards that ought to govern our scholarly inquiry.

DA-RT Controversy: An Old Methodological War in New Clothing

By Jelena Subotic, Georgia State University

The ongoing controversy over the new journal submission requirements in political science, DA-RT, has animated APSA membership like nothing else since the “Perestroika” wars of the early 2000s.¹ It almost seems like every ten years, political science engages in a self-assessment exercise that promises to open the discipline to more diverse voices and methodological approaches, and ends, inevitably, with a status quo victory for positivism and scientism and further retrenchment of the alternative. I do not think the DA-RT story will end much differently.

As is by now well-known, the DA-RT initiative began in 2010 as an APSA ad-hoc committee to “increase transparency in social science”.² DA-RT gained momentum in 2014 and 2015 when editors of 27 leading political science journals signed a statement announcing the implementation of DA-RT principles starting January 2016.³ Among many specific requirements for manuscript data management, archiving, and depositing, the demands on qualitative researchers, especially those who rely on extensive interviews, ethnographic fieldwork, and interpretive approaches produced a massive backlash. This has led to an online petition signed by 1,173 political science scholars (including 10 former APSA presidents) to delay DA-RT implementation until further deliberations are exhausted.⁴

The specific DA-RT requirements that caused most concern among the petition signatories include requests to hand over all field notes, archival notes, and interview transcripts as part of a manuscript submission process, while journal editors retain discretion over what “raw data” are acceptable and what manuscripts would be desk rejected for failure to submit the requested material.

The idea that field notes and interview transcripts are “raw data” that need to be publicly available for other scholars to retest and replicate, presumably for ensuring external validity, has generated strong responses from a variety of scholarly positions.

¹ Kristen Renwick Monroe, *Perestroika!: The Raucous Rebellion in Political Science* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005).

² From the initiative’s website: <http://www.dartstatement.org>.

³ See the Journal Editors’ Transparency Statement, <http://www.dartstatement.org/#!blank/c22sl>.

⁴ <http://dialogueondart.org/petition>. In the spirit of transparency (!), I am one of the signatories.

Interpretivists, ethnographers, and critical scholars from all subfields of political science have had much to say about DA-RT's poor understanding of interpretive work, the role of positionality, intersubjectivity, and constitutive explanations—which all do not lend themselves to the type of replicability DA-RT requires.⁵ Perhaps the strongest complaint had to do with DA-RT's ethical blind spot and a lack of care the new requirements provide to issues of human subjects research, confidentiality of interviews, and serious harm such open access to people's private testimonies could pose to real lives of the people we study.⁶

“Active Citations may be an insurmountable burden for early career faculty who need to produce manuscripts quickly and for all researchers who may not have the resources to spend on such a tasking enterprise.”

For scholars of international history, of particular concern is the DA-RT requirement that archival notes as well as Active Citations⁷ be used as a condition for journal manuscript submission. This incredibly labor-intensive process asks archival researchers to “digitally enhance the citations” by providing hyperlinks to digitally available archival data, but also to link citations that provide support for the argument to a Transparency Appendix (TRAX) where scholars would provide an annotated bibliography of all citations used. The burden on historical researchers to provide all this seems quite severe, as Jack Snyder recently demonstrated in his effort to “retrofit” a chapter in his 1984 book on military decision-making at the dawn of World War

⁵ See “[Transparency in Qualitative and Multi-Method Research: A Symposium](#)” Spring 2015 issue of the newsletter of the APSA Qualitative and Multi-Method Research section, edited by Tim Buthe and Alan Jacobs, available at http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2652097, especially contributions by Cramer and Pachirat.

⁶ On this point see the contribution by Wood and Parkinson in the APSA QMMR newsletter symposium. It is notable that, in large part in response to these concerns, the editors of the *American Political Science Review*, an early adopter of DA-RT, have since somewhat relaxed the interview transcript depository requirement, in a FAQ available at <http://www.politicalsciencenow.com/apsr-frequently-asked-questions>.

⁷ See <https://qdr.syr.edu/deposit/projects>.

I.⁸ As Snyder documents, it took him several months to provide the required digital citations, and he needed the help of an assistant in Russia and a graduate assistant in the US. Even though in general he remained favorably inclined toward the use of Active Citations, Snyder acknowledged that at best, all they can provide is more meaningful context for the archival research done and inferences a scholar has made, than for any “smoking gun” that would prove or disprove the external validity of a particular piece of work. In light of such a conclusion, it seems that the insistence on including Active Citations may be an insurmountable burden for early career faculty who need to produce manuscripts quickly and for all researchers who may not have the resources to spend on such a tasking enterprise.

So what is the DA-RT initiative really about? What problem is it trying to fix? At the debate about DA-RT I attended at the APSA annual meeting in San Francisco in 2015, the initiative's advocates presented two strategic reasons. The first had to do with eroding public trust and the perceived value of higher education and scholarly enterprise, especially in the US. They argued a clear focus on research transparency would go a long way to getting back this trust. The second focused on the perceived “softness” of qualitative research, with DA-RT providing an opportunity for qualitative scholars to show that they too work on rigorous data collection and evidence-based research on par with that of their quantitative peers.

While I don't doubt the genuine nature of this effort, both lines of reasoning strike me as fundamentally flawed and very incomplete. The devaluation of academic research in the US has almost nothing to do with the inherent validity of our work, and much more to do with the broader political environment of the corporatization of universities, pulling back of public funding, and public fostering of an anti-intellectual atmosphere at all levels of public discourse.⁹ Providing a digital depository of confidential interviews will do absolutely nothing to change that and thinking that it would is astoundingly naïve.

The second reason—to increase the “seriousness” of qualitative research—also manages to profoundly misunderstand the nature of much of qualitative

⁸ Jack Snyder, “Active Citation: In Search of Smoking Guns or Meaningful Context?,” *Security Studies*, Vol. 23, Issue 4 (2014)

⁹ On this point, see for example Jeffrey Isaac, “Is More Deliberation about DA-RT Really So Good,” available at <http://www.the-plot.org/2016/01/23/is-more-deliberation-about-da-rt-really-so-good>.

research that does not purport to make causal claims and predictive statements about the empirical world, but instead aims to better understand political and social phenomena, often from the perspectives of individual people whom we study. All that DA-RT will accomplish is to create further obstacles and barriers for qualitative researchers to publish in top journals—an issue that has been visible for decades¹⁰—because the burdens of DA-RT compliance for qualitative researchers will be insurmountable in terms of time, cost, scholarly integrity, and deep ethical commitments to people whose confidence and trust we would betray by

¹⁰ On the continuing domination of positivist approaches in top journals in International Relations, see Ayse Zarakol, "Tripping Constructivism," *PS: Political Science & Politics* (forthcoming).

Thinking Holistically about Transparency

By Eric Grynaviski, George Washington University

When I first heard of DA-RT, I must admit that I was not particularly enthusiastic. While in principle transparency is important, I worried that DA-RT creates important disincentives for high-quality historical scholarship. In reading some of the forums dedicated to DA-RT, I have become increasingly apprehensive. In this piece, I want to briefly relate my concerns.

Before describing my concerns about DA-RT, I want to first discuss why it is a good idea. Within quantitative social science, there are important reasons why datasets should be made available to researchers who want to replicate analyses. If qualitative research follows the same template, then there are correspondingly strong reasons to believe that qualitative research should be equally transparent. Making the research process transparent allows others to examine our claims and detect bias and failures of analysis. Transparency also aids in the collaborative research enterprise by allowing others to gain access to difficult to get materials. Despite the strong case for DA-RT, I have significant reservations.

Does DA-RT Aid Transparency?

The first question I would like to raise is whether there is a problem to which DA-RT responds. If there is no problem, there is no need for new standards. Supporters of DA-RT sometimes use strident language in describing the current problem. Andrew Moravcsik, for example, describes our lack

opening their private interactions with us to the world.

All of which brings me back to my original take on the DA-RT wars: that this time around feels very much like the last time around. An effort to discipline our discipline, provide boundaries for one kind of acceptable knowledge, and foreclosing the opportunities for a different kind of political science. A cynic might ask—so has this been the purpose of DA-RT from the very beginning? It may not have been its purpose, but it will be its consequence.

of transparency as a “crisis.”¹ Reading this is interesting. When I think about crises for qualitative scholars, I think about declining word limits that make detailed qualitative work impossible to present in many journals, tightening tenure standards that rule out multi-year qualitative projects early in one’s career, and even the slow process of declassification that affects studies of U.S. foreign policy. Before this debate surfaced, transparency would have been one of the last issues I would have considered a crisis for qualitative scholars. Scholars who favor imposing costly new standards should make a better case for why they should be a high priority for scholars interested in political history.

Even if there is widespread fraud, I am not sure if the current discussion of standards would do much to resolve it. My focus will be on Active Citation. Proponents of Active Citation provide the only detailed ideas for implementing DA-RT standards in the publication process, suggesting a range of options, from traditional citations to the creation of online appendices. While the reaction of qualitative scholars I have spoken to has been, in general, overwhelmingly negative, I believe that those who worked through the idea of Active Citation should be lauded for putting meat on the bones of DA-RT. Is a process like Active Citation likely to produce more transparent research?

Active Citation makes two main suggestions. First, there should be a full citation to any material cited within a paper. Most journals already require full citations; those that do not should update their style

¹ Andrew Moravcsik, “Active Citation: A Precondition for Replicable Qualitative Research,” *PS: Political Science & Politics*, Vol. 43, Issue 1 (2010): 29.

guides. This aspect of DA-RT is unobjectionable and requires little change in existing disciplinary practices. As Marc Trachtenberg notes, it would require journals like the *American Political Science Review* to change citation styles so that full citations to archival material can easily be included so that citations are directly in front of the reader.² Journal style guidelines could be refined and enforced, but this does not appear to me to solve some underlying crisis.

Thinking through the relationship of citations within text to transparency points to deeper issues. At present, scholars often feel the need to “shave” words from a manuscript, avoid complicated, interpretive discussions of documents, and reduce historical detail in order to comply with increasingly tight word limits. As an example, while working on a paper that was published in the *European Journal of International Relations*, I had to make a decision about which cases to use to illustrate my theory. One set of cases relied on secondary scholarship, where the conventional wisdom supported my view. Another set of cases required original, historical research. I had already done this research. Which did I choose? To keep within the word limit, I focused on the less novel cases in the journal article, moving the original historical research to a book manuscript. The key point is that the text within the paper would have been the same length, but the need for citations drove the novel cases out of the paper because the notes were too long. Even worse, word-of-mouth suggests authors frequently strip citations from important claims because including bibliographic information is too cumbersome. When scholars are asked to cut evidence to reduce the word count, we are encouraging less transparency.

To encourage scholars to provide full citations, I would suggest not counting citations to archival evidence as part of the word limit. This would encourage scholars not to reduce words by eliminating evidence or avoiding novel cases. I believe this single practice would lead to tremendous gains.

The second part of Active Citation calls for parts of documents to be placed into a qualitative appendix, so that reviewers and readers can identify whether a quote is in fact in the document and whether the quotation is in context. I am not sure that this practice has much value. First, I am not aware of a large number of qualitative pieces where quotes are

² Marc Trachtenberg, “Transparency in Practice: Using Written Sources,” *Qualitative & Multi-Method Research*, Vol. 13, Issue 1 (2015): 13–17.

made up out of thin air. Why are quotes in archival materials rarely invented from whole cloth? One reason is that the vast majority of qualitative scholarship focused on archival materials in International Relations emphasizes documents that anyone can easily gain access to with a minimum of institutional resources. For my own research on the Nixon administration, most of the documents are available through the Digital National Security Archives or other databases and services. Other documents are published as part of the *Foreign Relations of the United States* series or other publications. The relevant White House Tapes are available online through the Miller Center at the University of Virginia.³ Very few IR scholars do original, archival research that draws on material not included in these publications.⁴

“I believe that those who worked through the idea of Active Citation should be lauded for putting meat on the bones of DA-RT. Is a process like Active Citation likely to produce more transparent research?”

Out of context quotations present a distinct problem. There are instances in which a single quotation is taken out of context. I find this practice—in our and nearly every other field—to be reasonably pervasive. The question is whether Active Citation cures that problem. I do not believe that it does.

The primary reason is that almost all of the examples I can find from reading others’ work relates to inadequate use of secondary sources. IR scholars frequently misuse authors’ conclusions when citing a secondary source. An online appendix does almost nothing to resolve this problem, for the simple reason that it is quite easy for subject matter experts to detect these problems. When I review papers in my area of expertise, I frequently turn to the original sources to see if the cited work supports the authors’ conclusions, especially when the citation seems

³ Eric Grynaviski, *Constructive Illusions: Misperceiving the Origins of International Cooperation* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2014).

⁴ Note that even when scholars do primary source archival research, they often fall back on using the documents found in these publications or databases as the key pieces of evidence. Rarely are the conclusions drawn from those sources rejected in favor of interpretations drawn from other sources.

strange or out of context. These works are on my bookshelf, they have been read extensively, and I know their context. This strikes me as the appropriate way to avoid errors.

Of course, some works slide by in the review process. The discipline should encourage ways to self-correct. One idea may be to create an additional outlet for publications. If someone has problems with the empirical matter in a book, they might offer to review the book for *Perspectives on Politics*, emphasizing problems with evidence. If the problem is in an article, we might use online forums to review articles or published correspondence to highlight problems and disagreements. For this system to work, scholars should be encouraged to submit unsolicited evidentiary reviews. This poses no additional costs on researchers, and by moving the debates into the public sphere would like generate the most transparency.

What about new and novel documents, perhaps the least frequently used kind of evidence? If a cache of documents were discovered, perhaps the online appendix would be important, because subject matter experts would otherwise have little idea of their content. Yet, I doubt the online appendix would work as envisioned. In a current book manuscript I am working on, I am using documents concerning the United States' recruitment of militias, focusing on cases between 1776 and 1945; these documents are rarely consulted. Many of the cases of cooperation with militias in Samoa or small ethnic groups in the Philippines have received little attention, and therefore many of these documents are used for the first time. In these cases, I can easily produce quotations, whole documents, whole collections of documents, and secondary sources supporting positions that I am sure are wrong. If the researcher gets to select what to upload, the mere presence of a qualitative appendix is not particularly heartening as a method of achieving transparency.

In short, I do not believe we are in a crisis of transparency, nor do I believe that Active Citation would do much to solve the problem. For the small group of researchers intent on defrauding the discipline, at best it would produce new guidelines to game.

Is DA-RT Dangerous?

The practice of Active Citation, on balance, would provide some level of additional transparency despite these concerns. If DA-RT did no damage to the research process, perhaps whatever limited gains

for transparency would overwhelm the costs to individual researchers. So much attention has been paid to these issues that it is worth noting a couple of issues.

The primary practical concern is length of the process. Elizabeth Saunders and Jack Snyder recently did pilot projects in part to determine whether it was feasible. Their reports in a recent forum in *Security Studies* were not promising.⁵ Jack Snyder described “a yawning active citation sinkhole” that “was about to open up and swallow all of my free research time and my assistant’s.”⁶ These remarks are incredible in part because Saunders and Snyder were supplied with research assistants to compile material related to a single chapter of their respective books. Snyder’s description of how much work was involved for so little reward is frankly scary.

A related concern surrounds the incentives DA-RT creates. To ask qualitative researchers, who are often “book people,” to spend several additional months producing online appendices would discourage people from doing rigorous, primary source work during the early phases of a career, when time is most precious. To ask graduate students or tenure-track faculty members to spend this much time dedicated to complying with DA-RT would significantly shift burdens onto scholars interested in quality historical scholarship that are not shifted onto other kinds of scholars.

A second liability of promoting Active Citation is that it could discount the role of history and historiography within texts themselves, especially journal articles. If one aim of DA-RT is to improve the handling of evidence, then a first effort might be a serious discussion about how to incorporate better historical and historiographical reasoning into the evidence as it is presented to readers. My concern is that strategies like Active Citation may move discussions of history from the main text to appendices. I believe qualitative research would improve dramatically if the opposite strategy is pursued. There are two related issues. First, debates about context are often really about whether a document supports a single explanation, or whether it also provides ground for supporting alternative explanations. To respond to these concerns means

⁵ Elizabeth N. Saunders, “Transparency without Tears: A Pragmatic Approach to Transparent Security Studies Research,” *Security Studies*, Vol. 23, Issue 4 (2014): 689–98; Jack Snyder, “Active Citation: In Search of Smoking Guns or Meaningful Context?,” *Security Studies*, Vol. 23, Issue 4 (2014): 708–14.

⁶ Snyder 2014: 714.

outlining alternative explanations and placing the evidence within the context of those alternatives in an explicit, direct fashion. These discussions belong within a text because they are so central to the arguments. Second, taking historiographic debates seriously—outlining the problems within the existing literature on secondary sources and explaining why citing out of context is appropriate—should also occur within the text. This point is a little more subtle. Much of the work on the Spanish-American War and the Philippine-American War has happened during three periods: shortly after it occurred, during Vietnam, and after counterinsurgency campaigns in Iraq. The ways historians write about these conflicts are informed by the political context in which they are writing. I believe that one can rely on secondary sources where citations are slightly out of context if one makes a reasonable case that the context in which the historian wrote led her to reach the wrong conclusion. For example, one can profitably read and cite Vietnam-era sources on the Philippine-American War, if one is explicit about the liabilities of the Vietnam-era histories that require revising their conclusions. This historiographical detail belongs within the text if the case material is to be taken seriously.

In Sum

Deferred Automatic Disclosure: Ensuring Data Access and Protecting the “Right to First Use”¹

By Giovanni Capoccia, University of Oxford

After an initial period in which the debate on the appropriateness of the DA-RT guidelines for political science research rightly focused on issues of sensitivity, confidentiality, and burden of data disclosure relevant for various forms of qualitative research, the issue of properly ensuring the “right of first use” of original datasets is now rightly becoming an important additional topic for discussion. The “right to first use” refers to the possibility of an embargo period for original data after the first publication of results so the researcher can make full use of the data for other publications before releasing them to the public. Although in principle this is an issue for all types of newly collected evidence, it is particularly important for

¹ I thank Steve Hanson for comments on a previous version of this piece.

Do any of these concerns mean DA-RT in the form of Active Citation is a bad idea? I do not believe so. Transparency is important. Active Citation, for some projects where context and historiography really are not important, may provide a mechanism to increase transparency. Yet, I worry that the future development of work involving international history may be forced into a kind of straightjacket through the development of a single process for representing complicated historical evidence. Rather than allowing authors to experiment with different methods of making work transparent, adopting any single technique might stifle innovation.

In developing DA-RT, I would suggest three principles. First, the implementation of DA-RT should not impose excessive costs on junior researchers, deterring them from pursuing historical work. Second, the length of a piece should not inhibit the maximum level of transparency. Compliance with DA-RT’s principles should not make work less rich by moving central issues into online appendices, moving the evidence away from readers and reviewers. Third, we should adopt a holistic perspective, thinking about ways to encourage reviews and correspondence to improve transparency after publication. Thinking holistically could lead to more transparency, more depth, and more interesting debates.

original quantitative datasets, which are often more immediately usable by others than qualitative data.²

Despite being included in the 2012 APSA Ethics guidelines,³ this issue has been relatively neglected in the DA-RT debate. This, however, is rapidly changing. Six distinguished colleagues responded to APSA’s decision to move forward with DA-RT despite a popular petition to delay its implementation by mentioning that the DA-RT guidelines endanger “...the ability to publish out of original data sets without being required to share

² Most of what I say about data access and right to first use applies to original qualitative data too. These, of course, present distinctive and important problems, including for example the often excessive burden of data disclosure that the imposition of DA-RT guidelines would entail for researchers. For the purpose of this short contribution, I focus on quantitative data.

³ <http://www.dartstatement.org/#!2012-apsa-ethics-guide-changes/c13ay> Point 6.6 Accessed January 25, 2016.

them too early”⁴. The letter of 7 January 2016 by 20 past, present, and future APSA Presidents openly defines the JETS statement as “...flawed in neglecting the admonition in the APSA Ethics Guidelines that the creators of new data sets should have first access and a period of personal use before making them available”⁵.

The criticism of the JETS standards as “flawed” may come across as direct, but it has significant merit. Of the 27 journals that subscribed to the JETS guidelines, at the time of writing (January 2016) 17 do not mention at all on their website the possibility of embargoes for original data in their “Instructions for Authors” or similar documentation. One journal even explicitly rules out the possibility of an embargo to protect the “right to full use”. What is more, the 10 other journals generally qualify the possibility of embargoing original data as an “exemption” from the rule of immediate disclosure, not as a right. Authors can apply to the editors for an exemption but the editors retain full discretion over whether the exemption will be granted. No criteria are spelled out for granting the exemption, and therefore, there is no way for authors to know whether they can reasonably expect such an exemption.

The language of “exemptions” hardly accords with treating the “right of first use” as a right, which, by definition, should at the very least give the researcher clear guarantees in advance that her data will be protected for long enough to allow her to make full use of them. Importantly, the failure to clearly protect first use disincentivizes the collection of original and innovative data to answer new questions. This has already been noted by other colleagues,⁶ but it is perhaps worthwhile briefly restating the point here. The position of the JETS journals outlined above risks creating powerful disincentives for scholars—in particular for individual scholars—to invest in the creation of innovative data sets. Many would reasonably think that the large amount of time and resources involved would not be adequately rewarded: simply being

⁴<http://dialogueondart.org/2015/11/25/response-apsa-leadership-risks-pre-empting-necessary-deliberation/> Accessed January 25, 2016.

⁵<http://www.politicalsciencenow.com/letter-from-distinguished-political-scientists-urging-nuanced-journal-interpretation-of-jets-policy-guidelines/> Accessed January 25, 2016.

⁶See <http://dialogueondart.org/2015/11/11/bryan-jones-on-how-da-rt-may-undermine-the-production-of-collective-goods/> and <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2015/11/09/political-scientists-are-debating-a-new-initiative-to-make-research-more-trustworthy-heres-why-im-skeptical/> Accessed January 25, 2016.

cited as the author of a new dataset would not, in most cases, be seen as sufficient incentive. Graduate students in particular would have no incentives to embark on the construction of innovative data sets. The option of analyzing “off-the-shelf” data sets, which of course have no cost of collection and no problems of disclosure, would look more attractive to many than embarking on the expensive operation of generating innovative data sets. This in turn is likely to impact on the types of questions that researchers ask. The prevailing incentive would be to ask questions that can be answered with *existing* data, rather than to invest substantive resources to collect original data to answer new questions, for which adequate empirical data may not exist.

“The prevailing incentive would be to ask questions that can be answered with existing data, rather than to invest substantive resources to collect original data to answer new questions...”

“Deferred automatic disclosure”: Decoupling the release of data to the journal from release to the wider public

The key objection to providing clear criteria for embargoing new data is that if the author is not required to disclose data at the time of publication, there is no way to force data disclosure at the end of the embargo period. There is no guarantee that the data used in the study will ever be made accessible, and therefore, data release must be imposed as a condition of publication.⁷

This is an important concern, and it should be taken seriously. One response would be to decouple the release of original data to the journal from their release to the wider public. This could be implemented in various ways, but the basic principle is simple—an author using original data would be required to release the data to the *journal*, or to a public repository such as Dataverse or ICPSR, as a condition of publication. The journal, or the repository, would in turn not release the data *to the wider public* before an agreed upon date. Such a “deferred automatic disclosure” system would not

⁷ See e.g. CJ Savage and AJ Vickers, “Empirical Study of Data Sharing by Authors Publishing in PLoS Journals,” *PLoS ONE* Vol. 4, Issue 9 (2009): e7078.

only provide the infrastructure for guaranteeing an adequate embargo for original data but seems to present several advantages over the current situation. First, it would solve the moral hazard problem mentioned earlier and guarantee data access for the wider community, albeit only at the end of an embargo period. Second, it would provide *more* transparency and data access than the current system because the data and coding operations at the basis of *all* published quantitative studies (and not only the articles not exempted by the editors) would be eventually released to the public. Third, transparency for authors would also be enhanced because the decision to release their data would no longer depend on “exemptions” granted by individual journal editors based on unstated criteria. Fourth, a system that guarantees deferred disclosure would allow a more open discipline-wide discussion on the general criteria to be used to establish the length of an embargo. Clearly, an excessive or arbitrary length would be detrimental to data access, so any embargo should certainly be limited in time. At the same time, the length of the embargo should be adequate to protect the “right to first use” — following principles similar to those of copyright and patent law—by giving the researcher a reasonable amount of time to make full use of the data. The APSA Ethics guidelines state that embargoes should last one year (point 6.6.). This might be appropriate in some cases, but not necessarily in all cases. In some cases, the nature of the data and the professional condition of the researcher (e.g. in terms of teaching load and available resources) might require a longer embargo period.

At the same time, a system of deferred automatic disclosure would retain some key mechanisms necessary for transparency. If the journal’s policy is to replicate the results in-house before agreeing to publish the article (as is the case for some journals, e.g. AJPS), it could still do so. Moreover, the system would still provide full transparency on the exact date of public release of the data, which, once agreed upon between the editors and the author based on the discipline’s guidelines, could be clearly stated in the first footnote of the article.

Depending on how it is implemented, a system of “deferred automatic disclosure” such as the one outlined above may impose small costs on journals or on repositories. They would have to release the data by the agreed end-of-embargo date and would have to commit to protecting the data from outside

access until that time. Some journals may not have the internal resources to monitor the release of data one or more years after publication of the article. Some attention to logistics would be needed when journals change editors to reliably transfer embargoed data from the old to the new editorial team. These, however, do not appear to be insurmountable problems. For example, a system could be put in place by which, once the data are lodged with the journal as a condition of publication, the journal could immediately transfer the data to a public repository and destroy its copy.⁸ The repository could in turn put in place a system of “automatic release” to the public after a certain date. Individual journals, of course, could still opt out of the system altogether if they wished.

Other issues of detail will certainly emerge in the discussion, and it is beyond the scope of this short piece to address them all. What is key here is that a system based on the principle of decoupling disclosure to the journal from disclosure to the wider public (however it is implemented in detail) would provide a better framework for protecting adequately the “right to first use” than under the current scenario. At the same time, it would guarantee data access, even though not immediately for newly collected data, and indeed improve it, since it would no longer allow wholesale “exemptions” from data release. To reiterate, adequately protecting the “right to first use” of original data is important not only because it constitutes a fair reward for the time and resources that a researcher invests in collecting original data, but also because it safeguards the incentive to collect original data to answer the new questions that constantly arise in the field. New quantitative (as well as qualitative) data constitute a crucial public good for the discipline. We should be careful not to undermine the incentives for producing them, while at the same time ensuring, and in some respects enhancing, the transparency and integrity of scholarly work.

⁸ Similar practices are already current in some journals. For example, *State Politics and Policy Quarterly* allows for a limited embargo not for the data used in an analysis but “for any additional information included in the source dataset.” The author should still release this information to the journal, however. The journal editorial staff “...guarantees that the embargoed data will be used strictly to verify the integrity of the replication materials, and will not be retained after that has been established.” See http://spa.sagepub.com/site/misc/SPPQ_Instructions/guidelines_for_preparing_replication_files.pdf Accessed January 5, 2016.

Has Active Citation been a Boon for Replication? Lessons from Law Review Publishing

By Karen Alter, Northwestern University

Because I publish a lot in law journals, I am used to the active citation approach that is a lighter version of what is proposed in DA-RT. Law publishing fact-checks the sources and asks for quotes that guide inferences, including access to hard to find published and archived materials (but not interviews, since these are protected by IRB rules). These sources are not hyperlinked in a public way, but the goal is the same—to check the validity of inferences and to provide a way for the reader to find the source. In this contribution, I identify some unintended and perhaps unknown costs of active citation. To state up front where I stand—I will only accept an invitation to contribute to a law journal when the work is co-authored with a law professor who will oversee the assistants who undertake the busywork involved. This is the position of a faculty member at a wealthy research institution with access to law librarians and research assistants. If it is too much for me, then imagine the effects on someone less resourced.

On the positive side, I have become a fan of pincites (adding page numbers that lead to the relevant pages). Going back to the source to find the argument so as to cite the relevant pages has meant that I am more careful, specific and accurate in my attributions. Pincites also allow the reader to find the relevant part of the book. It is frankly surprising that pincites are not as widely demanded in political science. It is worth pointing out that the more replicable quantitative studies often do not follow a pincite norm—and they should.

Beyond pincites, however, I see some real trade-offs in adopting active citation. Publishing in law has taught me that active citation is both a time sink—as discussed by Subotic in this newsletter—and mostly a tremendous waste of time.

Copy-editing in law journals is 95% to 100% about checking citations. Both student and professional editors return page after page of questions, nearly all of which pertain to citations. It takes a long time to respond, and the effort does not improve the clarity or quality of the manuscript. So, one cost of active citation is that the focus of copy-editing switches to a focus on footnotes.

Law faculty rely on an army of assistants who do the grunt work of the active citation process. By grunt work, I mean that my co-author's assistants follow

our pincites, adding the sentences when journals want the author to provide the quote (since not all journals do want this replication of the text from which the inference is drawn), double checking that the links are live, creating PDF copies of links that might go dead, and creating a Dropbox file with the original copies of every cited source for the copy-editors to consult, etc. For the work-study law students, this sort of work is pre-professional practice. I can tell you from experience, most of our political science graduate assistants—and all of our undergraduate assistants—won't be able to replicate what law assistants are doing for law faculty. Law students are also supported with professional and highly skilled law librarians, who are onsite sleuths that will find and scan esoteric citations. And law faculty have the back up of professional assistants who can answer a request during vacations and exams and when a quick answer is needed for publication.

There are other trade-offs too. One trade off concerns article lengths. Larry Helfer and I use law journals as a chance to get the basic stories out. Our articles are from 15,000 to 27,000 words long. Looking over some of my recent law journal publications, I broke down the text versus footnote counts of the pre-publication word versions of the documents (see *Table 1*). The first four publications were in peer-reviewed, and thus faculty-led law journals. The last publications (in italics in *Table 1*) are in political science journals. Sometimes we have the power to push back on editors and thereby limit the citations to levels that rival political science venues, but mostly active citation footnotes add 25-39% to the text.

Personally, I am a fan of shorter articles. It forces the author to be clear and concise, and it saves a lot of trees. If journals are going to adopt active citation, then they really need to be willing to bust the word limit lengths that are the current norms. The alternative, putting active citations online, ensures that the DA-RT citation process is nothing but a complete waste of time because only an extremely small number of scholars will really consult the online citation. These are the same scholars who already write me personally to ask for hard to find materials.

A second trade off will be scholars voting with their feet. I am based at a resource rich research institution, yet I refuse to publish in law journals without my law professor co-author. My guess is that qualitative scholars who lack an army of assistants will simply avoid journals where the

publishing requirements would take too much of their time. If the higher prestige journals require active citation, then qualitative scholars might not submit manuscripts. The *de facto* result is likely to further privilege quantitative scholarship at research institutions.

A third trade-off is that the time sink accrues more significantly for qualitative scholars. For quantitative scholars, replication involves sharing their dataset (which I have also done). My sense is that quantitative scholars mainly shrug, supporting DA-RT out of a sense of fairness. But in reality, the time required for active citation is above and beyond the time required to research, write and publish. It is like an extra tax on qualitative scholars.

“A recent study of publications in top journals reveals that women are much more drawn to qualitative work compared to men who publish much of the quantitative work. So the titling of the scales to quantitative work may come at the cost of historical and qualitative studies, and of female scholars.”

A fourth trade off concerns tenure processes and gender balances in the discipline. I have observed a creeping notion that a book and a handful of articles is a 'fairly light record' of publication. If you add in how much longer active citation will take, and how adoption of DA-RT will tip the scales towards quantitative work published in ranked venues and plentiful numbers, we may well see a further diminishment in the attraction of qualitative work among graduate students. A recent study of publications in top journals reveals that women are much more drawn to qualitative work compared to men who publish much of the quantitative work.¹ So the tilting of the scales to quantitative work may

come at the cost of historical and qualitative studies, and of female scholars.

All of this, and for what? Right now, there is a replication process. Even with active citation, much of the material I draw on will not become publicly available. I can't post on the internet documents handed to me in trust, even if these documents should in principle be publically accessible. And I can't publish the interviews. Instead, right now, interested scholars write to request the source—this has occurred a handful of times. When it happens, a work-study student will scan shareable material and send it on. Or, scholars find material on their own, and they publish their disagreements—another form of replication. And, one day I will turn all of my materials—interviews as well—over to an archive as I have for my 1990s research on the European Court of Justice.

Political science is a multi-method discipline. If replication is rightfully the norm for quantitative work that does not mean that it is rightfully the norm for all methods. A practice of active citation can be acculturated, and doing so will lessen the amount of time that scholars need to spend to backfill the active citations. But DA-RT may end up demanding more than what its proponents suggest. The risk is that 'voluntary' practices *de facto* become integral requirements for publishing in DA-RT journals. In law publishing, citation creep has taken over. Copy editing has become mostly about checking citations, and much of the citation work is done by a cohort of student and professional assistants that political scientists mostly lack. If what is 'voluntary' comes to be seen as obligatory, there is a risk of diversionary effects where less resourced scholars avoid venues where significant extra work is required for publishing. Transparency for all is a good goal, as is an effort to prioritize quality over quantity. But if replication becomes easier for quantitative compared to qualitative scholarship, the discipline may yet again end up privileging a male dominated subsection of the discipline. The solution could end up exacerbating what is already an enduring problem by generating further unintended consequences for the publishing process.

¹ Dawn Teele and Kathleen Thelen, "Gender in the Journals: Methodology, Coauthorship, and Publication Pattern in Political Science's Flagship Journals," Presented at APSA 2015.

Table 1. Comparison of Body Text to Footnote

Journal	Total Word Count	Body Text	Footnotes	% Footnotes
American Journal of Comparative Law	16,054	10,866	5,188	32.32
American Journal of International Law	27,096	16,315	10,781	39.79
European Journal of International Law	17,060	12,796	4,264	24.99
Law and Contemporary Problems	14,270	11,642	2,628	18.42
Theoretical Inquires in Law	10,607	7,401	3,206	30.23
<i>International Organization</i>	14,222	11,250	2,972	20.90
<i>European Journal of International Relations</i>	13,118	11,383	1,735	13.23

Dearly Bought Wisdom: My Experience with DA-RT

By James Ashley Morrison, London School of Economics & Political Science (LSE)

I first heard about DA-RT in the winter of 2013. Following a presentation at Princeton University, Andrew Moravcsik asked whether I would be willing to make my paper DA-RT compliant as an additional pilot study. I agreed; and I subsequently approached *International Organization* about doing so after the article had been conditionally accepted. The article itself is more than 15,000 words long.¹ The [DA-RT online appendix](#) is an additional 20,000 words. Constructing that appendix, which I did myself, took me 80 hours.

In the end, DA-RT was far more work than I expected. But the experience has helped me appreciate DA-RT's considerable promise, even as I recognize its potential perils.

DA-RT's Ambition: Increasing Transparency, Reducing Opaqueness

DA-RT is sometimes framed as a modest proposal to return to the old citation practices of the past—a journey “back to the future”—and to challenge us to meet the standards prevailing in fields like history

¹ James Ashley Morrison, “Shocking Intellectual Austerity: The Role of Ideas in the Demise of the Gold Standard in Britain,” *International Organization*, Vol. 70, Issue 1 (2016): 175-207

and law.² Critics retort that we have never lost this transparency.³ I believe that DA-RT, if happily embraced, has the potential to take us beyond anything that has been achieved in our field or, indeed, in any other.

The great promise of DA-RT is to increase transparency—or, put another way, to *reduce opaqueness*. Opaqueness in scholarly work follows from four types of factors: scholars' deliberate obfuscation; the inherent limitations of language; material constraints; and the norms that shape knowledge production, transmission, and consumption. Most of the discussion surrounding DA-RT has focused on the former two; but, arguably, the DA-RT initiative is more deeply connected to the latter two.

Some recent high-profile cases serve as a poignant reminder that opaqueness is sometimes deliberately created by scholars themselves. DA-RT would indeed be a “daunting...price to pay” to atone for the sins of a few malfeasants.⁴ Moreover, it is not clear that this would significantly disincentivize fraud. After all, one could fabricate transcriptions of phony interviews or fake documents in far-flung archives

² Andrew Moravcsik, “Qualitative Transparency: Pluralistic, Humanistic and Policy-Relevant,” *IHAP Newsletter*, Issue 2 (2016): 20.

³ Peter A. Hall, “Transparency, Research Integrity and Multiple Methods,” *Comparative Politics Newsletter*, Vol. 26, Issue 1 (2016): 30-31.

⁴ Ben Ansel and David Samuels, “CPS Editors' Response to DA-RT Symposium,” *Comparative Politics Newsletter*, Vol. 26, Issue 1 (2016): 53.

just as easily as populate spreadsheets with concocted data.⁵ Still, though, DA-RT might increase the size of the paper trail, facilitating forensic investigation.

Opaqueness partly follows from the inherent limitations of language. It is difficult—or impossible—for a scholar to convey to a reader the meaning of the intersubjective moments that were shared between an interviewer and the interviewee.⁶ Similarly, no author can convey the richness of the experience of consuming—reading, feeling, smelling—materials in “the archives.”

“Opaqueness partly follows from the inherent limitations of language...DA-RT will never overcome these limitations simply because no amount of words can recreate the researcher’s experience of ‘being there’. But having more space... does grant researchers the opportunity to provide a better approximation.”

DA-RT will never overcome these limitations simply because no amount of words can recreate the researcher’s experience of “being there.” But having more space, as DA-RT is intended to deliver, does grant researchers the opportunity to provide a better approximation.

Few shifts have more potential to affect the academic enterprise than the sudden, steep fall in the cost of transmitting ideas. From blogs to eBooks, scholars enjoy a host of new channels through which they can disseminate their research. In the first instance, the rise of this kind of competition—and, perhaps, the compression of attention spans—has prompted traditional academic publishers to demand

⁵ Eric Grynaviski, “Thinking Holistically about Transparency” *IHAP Newsletter*, Issue 2 (2016): 4-7.

⁶ Marc Lynch nicely highlights these kinds of challenges. He explains, “My interview notes tell only part of any story developed through deep knowledge of local context, dense webs of interlocutors engaged over years, and immersion in distinctive narratives and interpretive worldviews.” Marc Lynch, “Area Studies and the Cost of Prematurely Implementing DA-RT,” *Comparative Politics Newsletter*, Vol. 26, Issue 1 (2016): 38.

parsimony. Discursive content has been cut in time with publishers’ profit margins.

But it does not have to be that way—as the advocates of DA-RT remind us.⁷ Why must the entirety of an academic text fit between two cloth covers? Why must an academic text be considered strictly that which is fit to print—to *literally* print? The state of the art affords a better approach. The different components of a text can be published in different channels: the main text as an “article” or “book”—print and/or electronic—and the discursive and supplementary materials as online, linked appendices.

Given the availability of these new technologies, it seems bizarre to allow presses’ material interests to define the norms of publishing, especially given that the principal producers are paid virtually nothing and the costs of transmission could be even less.

Yet, we have acceded to these dictates. Writ large, we are producing more, trimmer work. Discursive footnotes have been replaced by parenthetical citations, which both provide less information and interpose more distractions.⁸ We hear harrowing reports of scholars trimming citations and choosing the same old cases over new, under-conceptualized cases.⁹ This has woeful implications since we know that there is already bias in citation practices and case selection.¹⁰ This need to trim threatens to reproduce the disparities of the past.¹¹ It erects new impediments to venturing beyond engaging the same old analyses of dead white men written (largely) by dead white men.¹²

⁷ Colin Elman and Arthur Lupia, “DA-RT: Aspirations and Anxieties,” *Comparative Politics Newsletter*, Vol. 26, Issue 1 (2016): 50.

⁸ Andrew Moravcsik, “Qualitative Transparency: Pluralistic, Humanistic and Policy-Relevant,” *IHAP Newsletter*, Issue 2 (2016): 19.

⁹ Eric Grynaviski, “Thinking Holistically about Transparency” *IHAP Newsletter*, Issue 2 (2016): 5.

¹⁰ Daniel Maliniak, Ryan Powers, and Barbara F. Walter, “The Gender Citation Gap in International Relations,” *International Organization* Vol. 67, Issue 04 (2013): 889–922.

¹¹ I assume that reviewers expect to see citations to particular “classic” works—e.g. Waltz—and that the majority of these are written by white males. If scholars are forced to trim citations, I fear that they may be more likely to trim from the (more diverse) non-classic set of citations.

¹² Of course, my own previous research has focussed primarily on dead white men. And I would not suggest that we should cease studying the likes of, say, Adam Smith, despite the fact that doing so necessarily entails engaging centuries of scholarship largely written by scholars who have mostly been dead white men. Yet, even within that, we should push to engage as diverse a group of scholars as possible. And, of course, we don’t want scholars to feel compelled to do this kind

DA-RT's goal is to increase the quality of scholarship. It assumes that granting more time and space to each piece of work will increase the average quality of scholarly work. Importantly, it recognizes that the author herself is the best judge of how best to capitalize on this opportunity.¹³

But does it work?

DA-RT at the Coalface

My experience taught me that the costs of complying with DA-RT are indeed non-negligible. But my experience has also given me a perspective that differs from that which I see in much of the current discussion of DA-RT.

I did *not* upload the 10,000 photographs of archival documents I took for this project. Contrary to some widespread apprehensions, even those journals that have signed onto the JETS would not ask scholars to do so in analogous cases. Doing so would imperil my relationships with the archivists upon whom I rely. It would also bury my evidence in a mound of documents—my specific needles in a stack of 10,000 other needles. And it would do nothing to explain *how* and *why* I focussed on the bits of evidence that undergird my particular account.

Nor did I make my citations “active” by generating hyperlinks or “pincites” for my primary sources. This was precluded by incompatibilities with the journal's publishing platform. Also, virtually none of my primary sources are available online; and I could not even be sure that hyperlinks to the archives' catalog entries would persist over time. Last, I was also not particularly keen to expend hours merely to save readers a few seconds of running catalog searches.¹⁴

Instead, the bulk of my time was spent documenting my interpretations and analysis. In some cases, drafting these extended citations prompted me to rethink how I was using my evidence. I do not believe it affected the upshot of my narrative, but it did deepen and enrich my use of particular pieces of evidence. Thus, this endeavour required

of work who might be inclined to study other types of figures and questions. Having more citation space allows scholars to bring new questions and more voices into the discussion.

¹³ Andrew Moravcsik, “Qualitative Transparency: Pluralistic, Humanistic and Policy-Relevant,” *IHAP Newsletter*, Issue 2 (2016): 19.

¹⁴ Karen Alter is particularly powerful on this point. Karen Alter, “Has Active Citation been a Boon for Replication? Lessons from Law Review Publishing,” *IHAP Newsletter*, Issue 2 (2016): 10-12.

considerable time and—importantly—considerable thought.

This labour was indeed “onerous,” but I do not think it was “a tremendous waste of time.”¹⁵

Kapiszewski and Kirilova nicely summarise the benefits promised by DA-RT.¹⁶ Simply put, complying with DA-RT ought to visibly make one's research more robust and more useful.¹⁷ Hall suggests that this extra layer of scholarly self-justification is largely redundant with a serious review process.¹⁸ Alter questions how many subsequent scholars will benefit from this (largely) superfluous discursiveness.¹⁹ Both qualms are warranted.

At the same time, however, we cannot know what posterity will find valuable. And we certainly cannot expect reviewers to possess the same level of expertise as that which will be enjoyed by subsequent scholars writing on the same topic.

Readers understandably do not want extensive explanations about source use in the body of an article that is already 15,000 words long. Traditional publishing constraints simply do not grant enough space in the footnotes to fully document the interpretive work done to craft this piece. Modern technology, however, offers the opportunity to preserve more of the insights powering an analysis than ever before. While the expected return of most extended citations might hover near zero, a certain (albeit unknowable) subset of these citations are sure

¹⁵ Andrew Moravcsik, “Qualitative Transparency: Pluralistic, Humanistic and Policy-Relevant,” *IHAP Newsletter*, Issue 2 (2016), 19; and Karen Alter, “Has Active Citation been a Boon for Replication? Lessons from Law Review Publishing,” *IHAP Newsletter*, Issue 2 (2016): 10.

¹⁶ Diana Kapiszewski and Dessimslava Kirilova, “Transparency in Qualitative Security Studies Research: Standards, Benefits, and Challenges,” *Security Studies*, Vol 23, Issue 4: 703-04.

¹⁷ As Saunders puts it, “The purpose of transparency is not to do all the work for each reader, but to increase confidence in inferences, reduce the transaction costs of assessing the quality of inferences, and raise the real and perceived quality of scholarship.” Elizabeth N. Saunders, “Transparency without Tears: A Pragmatic Approach to Transparent Security Studies Research,” *Security Studies*, Vol. 23, Issue 4: 696.

¹⁸ Peter A. Hall, “Transparency, Research Integrity and Multiple Methods,” *Comparative Politics Newsletter*, Vol. 26, Issue 1 (2016): 30-31.

¹⁹ Alter argues, “...the DA-RT citation process is nothing but a complete waste of time because only an extremely small number of scholars will really consult the on-line citation.” Karen Alter, “Has Active Citation been a Boon for Replication? Lessons from Law Review Publishing,” *IHAP Newsletter*, Issue 2 (2016): 11.

to provide immense value to scholars in the fullness of time.

A few examples might illustrate the sorts of benefits offered by DA-RT. My article challenges much of the conventional wisdom about Britain's departure from the gold standard in 1931. Making this argument requires engaging extensively with text from both primary and secondary sources.²⁰ For instance, I argue, "Prior to suspension, few Britons advocated leaving gold."²¹ I then provide an 84-word footnote that points the reader to those few instances in which leaving the gold standard was mooted. But this is hardly satisfying. So, in the DA-RT online appendix, I expand that footnote to 1300 words, providing numerous quotes and exegesis. This allowed me to demonstrate the marked tepidness of those few such discussions.

"Complying with DA-RT does indeed slow one down. But this does not need to be a bad thing. If DA-RT increases the quality of research—and I think it can—we are simply trading quantity for quality. 'I wish I had more low quality pieces of research to read,' said no scholar, ever."

I also used the DA-RT appendix to explain and document my specific interpretive decisions. As other qualitative scholars will recognize, such interpretations are seldom straightforward. In one case, some insightful notes from a telephone conversation were dated by their author as "Tuesday, July 29, 1931, 12:40 PM." Yet, 29 July was actually a *Wednesday*. The date of the telephone call is crucial because a contentious meeting occurred early on Wednesday. Knowing whether that phone call occurred before or after the heated meeting is key to interpreting the meeting, the phone call, and the actions that followed. Yet, the average reader of *International Organization* is unlikely to get this deep into the weeds. He or she will (quite

²⁰ On this project, there is much room for disagreement on evidentiary grounds. Snyder's experience suggests that this might vary across projects. Jack Snyder, "Active Citation: In Search of Smoking Guns or Meaningful Context?," *Security Studies*, Vol 23, Issue 4 (2014): 709.

²¹ James Ashley Morrison, "Shocking Intellectual Austerity: The Role of Ideas in the Demise of the Gold Standard in Britain," *International Organization*, Vol. 70, Issue 1 (2016): 181.

reasonably) expect that my narrative puts the events into the proper sequence. Future scholars writing about these events, however, *will* appreciate my explanations for these interpretative decisions.

The DA-RT Tax

Critics argue that DA-RT creates "an extra tax on qualitative scholars."²² As I have said, complying with DA-RT is indeed taxing.

Yet, it is not clear that this tax need only apply to qualitative work. Increased transparency can, and should, be pursued in both qualitative and quantitative research. Indeed, transparency is not achieved simply by uploading a dataset of quantitative data any more than by simply uploading a "dataset" of archival manuscripts or interview transcripts. The compiling of all such datasets involves immense work. This creates room for bias and mistakes. To mitigate this, transparency requires that scholars explain the provenance, transcription, and interpretation of their data—quantitative and qualitative data alike.

To the extent that the burden of the tax does fall unevenly, this is just saying that achieving the same level of quality takes longer for some types of work than for others. But what else is new? Here, as ever, comparing CVs populated by different kinds of work is akin to comparing apples and oranges.

The scholarly community recognises this. Some questions are best answered using quantitative methods. Some questions are best answered using qualitative methods. All questions should be answered with the greatest vigour possible. This is not a sports competition in which we need to handicap—read: adjust the standards of—certain types of work so as to give each side an equal chance of "winning."

Establishing DA-RT's ROI

A number of scholars have concluded that DA-RT does more harm than good—both for the discipline as a whole and for individual scholars.

DA-RT's strongest critics remind us of the opportunity cost that attends implementing DA-RT.²³ The time we spend debating DA-RT could be

²² Karen Alter, "Has Active Citation been a Boon for Replication? Lessons from Law Review Publishing," *IHAP Newsletter*, Issue 2 (2016): 11.

²³ Jeffrey C. Isaac, "In Praise of Transparency, But Not of DA-RT," *IHAP Newsletter*, Issue 2 (2016): 24-29.

spent grappling with “issues that really do matter.”²⁴ The time it takes scholars to comply with DA-RT could be spent on other endeavours. These costs must loom larger (relatively) for junior scholars and those with higher resource constraints.²⁵

Complying with DA-RT does indeed slow one down. But this does not need to be a bad thing. If DA-RT increases the quality of research—and I think it can—we are simply trading quantity for quality. “I wish I had more low quality pieces of research to read,” said no scholar, ever.

From the standpoint of individual scholars, the return on investment of complying with DA-RT is currently rather low. In the short run, the principal benefit appears to be regaining the right to submit work to the journals that have signed onto the

²⁴ Lee Ann Fujii, “The Dark Side of DA-RT,” *Comparative Politics Newsletter*, Vol. 26, Issue 1 (2016): 25.

²⁵ Jelena Subotic, “DA-RT Controversy: An Old Methodological War in New Clothing,” *IHAP Newsletter*, Issue 2 (2016): 2.

compliance requirements. In other words, complying with DA-RT merely saves one from a newly created stick.

But what if there were a carrot as well? DA-RT’s success hinges on recognizing and rewarding those scholars who embrace its mandate. DA-RT’s return on investment is largely a function of the value that we, as a community, place on the production it elicits—on the insights it evinces.²⁶ In effect, committing to DA-RT means committing to seriously prioritize quality over quantity. This seems to be the only way to capitalize on the potential of DA-RT’s dearly bought wisdom.

²⁶ Saunders addresses the return on investment by going after the cost side: “This article argues that there are significant individual and collective benefits to making qualitative security studies research more transparent but that reaping these benefits requires minimizing the real and expected costs borne by individual scholars.” Elizabeth N. Saunders, “Transparency without Tears: A Pragmatic Approach to Transparent Security Studies Research,” *Security Studies*, Vol. 23, Issue 4: 689. I emphasize that we must increase those benefits as well.

FRIENDLY FIRE

Qualitative Transparency: Pluralistic, Humanistic and Policy-Relevant

By Andrew Moravcsik, Princeton University

Data Access and Research Transparency (DA-RT) is an informal initiative to enhance the transparency of political science research.¹ It encourages more public access to evidence and details about scholarly interpretation, analysis and research design. This effort has generated considerable support in the profession, but also much criticism.

Prominent among those who oppose transparency is Jeffrey Isaac, editor of *Perspectives in Politics*. In an influential editorial criticizing DA-RT, Isaac divides political science into two warring camps with incompatible visions of the discipline's future.² He charges that DA-RT is a partisan effort: a "one-size fits-all" scheme that deliberately helps impose upon all political scientists "a broader agenda" of "resurgent neo-positivism," "methodological purity," "scientific rigor" (or "scientism"), and "a quest for certainty" modelled on the quantitative and experimental social sciences, for example psychology. Isaac opposes DA-RT in the name of an opposing camp, which he characterizes as favouring a "pluralistic, reflexive, and relevant political science" based on "greater methodological pluralism," more practices drawn from "humanities," and "a more broadly interesting political science" that is "publicly relevant, intelligible and readable." Opposition to DA-RT, he argues, defends the legacy of the "Perestroika" reform movement in political science a decade ago.³

Isaac is sincere and passionate. His critique is valuable in that the controversy it helped to spark has drawn scholarly attention to transparency in a way that five years of non-stop open meetings, consultation groups, conferences and published symposia by DA-RT advocates could not. DA-RT's most basic organizing principle is autonomy among

pluralistic research communities and individuals. No one disputes the right—indeed, responsibility—of those running a journal like *Perspectives in Politics* to vet and reject proposals they deem incompatible with the values of their research community.

Yet Isaac's editorial is not just as the statement of one journal's policy. It is framed as a call for all political scientists—at least, all qualitative scholars who favour openness, pluralism, and relevance—to oppose DA-RT transparency. This is problematic, because while I share Isaac's laudable objectives, his description of the DA-RT initiative and of the values that inspire me and other qualitative scholars to support it is largely incorrect. Limited space permits just three responses, which focus on how transparency affects qualitative political science.⁴

First, far from establishing a "one-size fits-all" plan, DA-RT is better seen as a decentralized, flexible, individualized, and non-binding set of norms predicated on pluralism and autonomy among individual journals and scholars—the very core values Isaac advocates.

Second, I (and others in DA-RT) do not, as Isaac charges, aim to universalize a quantitative (or any other) notion of scientific rigor. Rather, I view transparency is a meta-norm shared by scholars in every discipline. In qualitative political science, DA-RT norms have the opposite effect. Above all, they encourage more richness: work infused with local knowledge of diverse languages and cultures, policies, and histories. They expand the visible presence of epistemologies, skills and techniques from the humanities and interpretive social science. They help reverse recent format changes (shorter word limits, scientific citation, less narrative) hostile to qualitative research. Transparency helps further Isaac's own aim of greater methodological diversity.

Third, a look across political science and disciplines such as law and history belies Isaac's claim that transparency would undermine the theoretical diversity or political relevance of scholarship. To the contrary, scholars, journals and disciplines with higher qualitative transparency tend also to be theoretically richer and more policy-relevant. Again,

¹ I am grateful to Colin Elman, Peter Hall and Skip Lupia for comments.

² Jeffrey C. Isaac, "From the Editor: For a More Public Political Science," *Perspectives in Politics*, Vol. 13, Issue 2 (2015): 269-283.

³ Isaac 2015: 269, 270, 272, 274-6, 282-283. Isaac devotes the first 13 pages to situating the DA-RT debate in this dichotomy. For example, on p. 282: "It is important to be explicit about what is at stake in current disciplinary discussions... and why it is important... Gary King is correct to observe that 'large parts' of the social sciences are 'moving from the humanities to the sciences.' But large parts of the political science discipline are not part of this move and do not wish to be part of this move."

⁴ I address other transparency issues elsewhere. See, for example, "Trust, but Verify: The Transparency Revolution and Qualitative International Relations," *Security Studies*, Vol. 23, Issue 4 (2014b): 663-688; "Active Citation: A Precondition for Replicable Qualitative Research," *PS: Political Science & Politics*, Vol 43, Issue 1 (2010).

enhancing transparency furthers Isaac's own vision of a political science relevant to the real world.

Qualitative Transparency as a Pluralist Project

Do DA-RT's qualitative proposals, as Isaac claims, establish "new bureaucratic procedures" enforcing "one-size-fits-all expectations" that undermine "methodological and intellectual pluralism?"⁵ No. DA-RT's basic institutional value is the decentralized autonomy of pluralistic research communities.

The clearest way to appreciate the depth of DA-RT's commitment to institutional pluralism is to examine its proposals for qualitative work. Oddly, this is something Isaac never does. He devotes paragraphs to rehashing American Political Science Association (APSA) Council discussions—which are irrelevant, because DA-RT norms do not stem from APSA decisions—yet tells us nothing about DA-RT's concrete proposals, which are actually at issue. Here I focus on the institutional *form* of DA-RT proposals, while in the next section I turn to their substance. The key is this: *DA-RT proposals respect pluralism among methods, journals and scholars.*

Pluralism among Major Methods: From the start, DA-RT has been divided methodologically into separate qualitative and quantitative committees and processes, which have promulgated different sets of transparency recommendations.⁶ This properly reflects (I argue elsewhere) the distinct epistemologies, practical constraints and normative values that inform quantitative and qualitative research.⁷ No one would subject quantitative and qualitative research to identical rules, which is why DA-RT's general norms are actually quite vague.

Pluralism among Journals: DA-RT norms and recommendations also remain non-binding (except as ethical duties) on individual journals. Editorial boards, representing diverse research communities, decide whether to implement transparency. Neither DA-RT nor the APSA has enforcement power in this matter. DA-RT has never been a formal APSA initiative—a point Isaac himself, after having

repeatedly accused DA-RT proponents of stealthy bureaucratic centralization, now quietly concedes.⁸

Yet pluralism among journals runs deeper. DA-RT norms are broad, so even if a journal chooses to embrace them, exactly how it does so—i.e. what implementation actually means—remains flexible. This matters because transparency, even within a particular epistemology of explanation, is never an absolute imperative. Each journal must decide the appropriate balance between transparency and ethical responsibilities to human subjects, intellectual property law, logistical burdens, reasonable "first use" of data, and existing journal practices. Diverse research communities in our discipline adjudicate such trade-offs in distinctive ways, with editorial boards acting as *de facto* representatives of those communities, reflecting those differences—a role Isaac himself assumes and acknowledges in his editorial.⁹

Pluralism among Scholars: DA-RT's institutional pluralism digs even deeper. Case-by-case discretion about how to comply with norms stays largely in the hands of individual authors. Journals set general formats, but individual authors make almost all substantive decisions about how to employ them: which empirical claims are "contestable" and "knowledge-based" enough to require transparency, how much (or what type of) source material to provide, and what annotation or process information to add. The DA-RT requirements do not require that these be subject to review, and it does not foresee editors or reviewers exercising extensive case-to-case discretion or enforcement of qualitative content.

To see how decentralized and non-bureaucratic this actually is in practice, consider the form of qualitative transparency journals are most likely—for both epistemological and practical reasons—to employ as a "default" standard. (It has already been adopted by the APSR.¹⁰) This is *Active Citation (AC)*, a system of digitally enabled citation. AC is the only cost-effective and epistemologically appropriate "default" model of qualitative

⁵ Isaac 2015: 276, also 270.

⁶ Arthur Lupia and Colin Elman, "Openness in Political Science: Data Access and Research Transparency," *PS: Political Science & Politics*, Vol. 47, Issue 1 (2014): 19-42. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1049096513001613>.

⁷ Andrew Moravcsik, "Trust, but Verify: What the Digital and Transparency Revolutions in Social Science Mean for You" (Presentation at the 2015 University of Chicago – Peking University Summer Institute on International Relations Theory and Method, August 2015); Moravcsik 2014: 669-670.

⁸ Jeffrey C. Isaac, "Further Thoughts on DA-RT," *The Plot: Politics Decoded*, Blog Posting, November 2 (2015b).

⁹ A simple example is the trade-off between human subject protection and transparency. Almost all qualitative journals give absolute priority to human subject protection and would never reject an article because it employs confidential evidence. Some quantitative journals would. DA-RT leaves unchanged the right of journals and research communities to resolve this tension according to their diverse and pluralistic beliefs and practices.

¹⁰ APSR "American Political Science Review Submissions Guidelines," (2016) Available at: <http://www.apsanet.org/apsrsubmissions2016>

transparency on offer. Political scientists may find this surprising, because they often think the natural default mode of transparency is to archive documents in a self-contained database. Yet, though archiving might sometimes be useful, it is too often logistically burdensome, or incompatible with human subject or intellectual property considerations, to serve as a default transparency format for qualitative work. It also fails to render the interpretation of evidence transparent. DA-RT does not mandate archiving, and I would oppose any effort to do so.¹¹

Active Citation (AC) is far less demanding and cumbersome than archiving. In AC, scholars provide a limited number of “law review”-style discursive notes in a digital appendix. It works like this. Each conventional citation (footnote, endnote, in text citation) to a source that backs a “contestable “knowledge-based” research claim” is hyper-linked (within the document) to an entry in an attached appendix (“Transparency Appendix” or TRAX). Each resulting appendix entry contains at least three elements: (1) a source excerpt (recommended 50-100 words); (2) an interpretive annotation, at a length of the author’s choice, explaining how the source supports the underlying descriptive, interpretive or causal claim; (3) a full citation; and (4) *optionally*, and if legally and logistically feasible, a scan of or link to the original document. The TRAX also reserves a unique, open-ended first entry to address general issues of how evidence, theories, interpretation, and research design were selected, again at a length of the author’s choice. That’s all.

AC is simple, practical, familiar and useful. For readers, it places textual evidence, the author’s interpretation, and research design information one click away. Yet articles remain as easily readable as they are today, because all the new material remains invisible to any reader who chooses not to click.

For journal editors, existing hard-copy formats remain unchanged, and digital formats add only hyper-links. AC can also be added to journal submissions, unpublished papers, e-books—all as stand-alone appendices, a known quantity. It is easy to implement: DA-RT is developing beta- software (a Word add-on) that creates active citations at a touch, and *ad hoc* software is easy to write.

¹¹ Current discussion forums and committees could contribute positively by removing any remaining misunderstanding.

For authors, AC provides benefits with only limited demands. Because appendices lie outside word limits, qualitative authors gain unlimited new scope to present their research. The explicit demands are relatively narrow, because only a fraction of citations—sometimes none—in published work would be actively cited. AC applies *only* to that subset of citations backing “*contestable knowledge-based research claims*”—that is, empirical research findings that are essentially controversial within the context of the existing research, largely as defined by the author. Unlike law review practice, no additional information is needed for definitions, obvious points, background information (even if controversial in another context), literature reviews, theoretical claims, conjectures, interpretations unconnected with specific evidence, philosophical claims, or informal (i.e. non-ethnographic) personal impressions. Many qualitative articles—normative topics, literature reviews, theoretical work, etc.—might have no or almost no active citations at all.

“Textual quotations, annotations, and procedural information need not be extensive or even present at all. If you don’t care and you don’t think anyone else does, just don’t fill in the blanks.”

Authors choose the length of source excerpts and annotations, within legal and human subject limitations—as with discursive footnotes today. Even if a journal permits review of active citations, binding oversight often cannot occur—such as in exactly how to balance transparency and human subject protection, or the extent of logistical burden—because the information required to make a decision is known only to the author.¹² Even where such information can be shared publicly, it is unlikely that authors would be asked to do more than “provide more evidence” for this or that scattered point—a demand to which we are all already subjected today and which qualitative scholars intensely engaged with local knowledge would surely welcome. In practice, real-world decisions

¹² This is another area where forums and committees could contribute by removing ambiguities.

about how to employ the AC format, once a journal adopts it, remain largely at the author's discretion.¹³

Some may still fear that AC, despite its limits, imposes on scholars so much busy-work that their productivity will suffer. Yet how onerous is AC? In essence, it is simply a softer, non-binding, invisible version of something we know: citation in law reviews, historical journals and those political science journals where rich qualitative work is most prized. Publishing in an AC journal involves less work than in a law review, with much longer word limits and far more thorough transparency standards (for all footnotes, not just contestable empirical ones). It requires effort analogous—albeit slightly different in form—to publishing in many historical, sociological or policy journals, or in those political science journals that still permit longer articles with interpretive footnotes, such as *International Security*, *Studies in American Political Development*, or *Comparative Politics*. Scholars publish in such venues without complaining about the “imposition” of extra length. Why? Because almost all qualitative scholars—especially ethnographers, interpretivists and policy analysts—want to write more words, not fewer. AC subtly pressures the political science discipline to let them show more of what they do best.

We know AC is workable because it is essentially a “back to the future” scheme. In recent decades, most journal word limits in political science have shrunk from 10-14,000 words to around 8000 words, and are dropping in some cases toward 4-6000. Citation formats have increasingly shifted from discursive footnotes, which permit interpretive annotation, to

¹³ AC functions as a weak form of what legal theorist Cass Sunstein calls a “personalized default rule”—that is, a formal normative expectation that is substantively activated only by voluntary individual choice. Sunstein recommends such rules to avoid “one-size-fits-all” regulation and centralized enforcement. (Cass R. Sunstein, “Deciding by Default,” *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, Vol. 162, Issue 1 (2013): 1-57) In this case, journals mandate the *form* of AC transparency, i.e. the hyperlinks and the empty appendix, but authors retain in practice nearly all the *de facto* choice over its *substance*, i.e. what they want to put into it, what is a “contestable knowledge-based claim,” how much of the source to cite, how much and how to annotate, and what research design elements to emphasize. The same goes for the management of issues such as human subject protection. Qualitative research communities generally believe authors are in the best position to decide what evidence must be anonymous, redacted, summarized, or suppressed entirely, because they negotiated with IRBs and human subjects, they are most familiar with local knowledge and research conditions, and they assume the logistical and legal costs of any solution. All this remains unchanged, but qualitative scholars have more options, not just to portray the richness of their work, but to empower others to engage with it.

brief name-and-date “scientific” notes. This suits quantitative scholars just fine but is deeply unfair to qualitative researchers, who can present rich evidence and interpretation only through *words*, and for whom notes are employed to cite evidence, not just other scholars. AC simply turns the clock back, restoring a format friendly to rich qualitative work—and, most importantly, restoring our ability as qualitative scholars to have a rich conversation amongst ourselves about such work—by expanding *de facto* word limits, citation formats and narrative structures. We know it is viable not just because other disciplines function this way, but because we have been there before and it worked.

“...transparency applies only to the subset of citations backing ‘contestable knowledge-based empirical claims’... So only a fraction of citations, sometimes none, in published work would have to be actively cited.”

Still, if you are an exceptional qualitative researcher who prefers publishing shorter articles with *less* evidentiary richness and interpretive nuance, remember that qualitative articles need provide active citations only for a modest sub-set of sources (those backing “contestable knowledge-based empirical claims”), and that what you what you deem contestable knowledge, necessary source text, relevant annotation, and pertinent procedural information remains your authorial choice. Textual quotations, annotations and procedural information need not be extensive or even present at all. If you don't care and you don't think anyone else does, just don't fill in the blanks.

Qualitative Transparency as a Humanistic Project

Isaac asserts that qualitative scholars (like me) who promote enhanced transparency actually do so for a hidden purpose. We seek to spread “scientism” at the expense of methods from the humanities; to privilege “technically advanced” approaches and “methodological purity” over richness and relevance as the “primary thing that political scientists ought to be worrying about;” and to establish “neopositivism” and the “standard method of hypothesis-testing...normative for the entire discipline.”¹⁴

¹⁴ Isaac 2015: 282, 276. Isaac makes this very clear: “It is important to be explicit about what is at stake in current

I share Isaac's view about the discipline, but he misunderstands and misreads the motives of qualitative transparency advocates. We are his allies. Of course we praise some virtues of scholarly rigor, as does Isaac. He rightly cites a paragraph of my own that enumerates reasons why transparency might help scholars to conduct “more careful, systematic and replicable” research. Yet it does not follow, as he asserts, that qualitative scholars pursue transparency out of a “methodological obsession” with rigor akin to what quantitative scholars espouse. And he errs in singling me out as one scholar typical of the qualitative fellow traveller: “At the same time, [Moravcsik] also makes clear that what joins DA-RT proponents is a commitment to heightened methodological rigor,” which Isaac expressly links to a peculiar “preoccupation with methodological purity” characteristic of quantitative political science.¹⁵

In fact, the opposite is true: quantitative and qualitative DA-RT advocates came to agree on transparency despite deep disagreements about relative importance of that—or any type—of scientific rigor. To the limited extent I do advocate transparency as a means to encourage greater rigor—that is, “careful and systematic” scholarship—I favour a very different notion of “rigor” than my quantitative colleagues. I believe transparency makes visible, and thus helps encourage and reward, more problem-driven research, humanistic learning, cultural understanding and multi-perspectival analysis—precisely the academic virtues that Isaac thinks DA-RT advocates are trampling in their rush toward rigor. Isaac obscures our agreement by taking my quotation about “rigor” above badly out of context. Immediately after the sentence he cites, I provide concrete examples of methodological “best practices.” They are not from economics, psychology or natural science, but from history and law. Moreover, when I mention “enhancing qualitative methodological skills,” I list “fine-

disciplinary discussions... Gary King is correct to observe that ‘large parts’ of the social sciences are ‘moving from the humanities to the sciences.’ But large parts of the political science discipline are not part of this move and do not wish to be part of this move.” *Ibid.* The first two sections of his essay discuss only this dichotomy, which remains a *Leitmotif* throughout.

¹⁵ Isaac 2015: 275-276, also 270. Isaac is unambiguous. After parsing my statement, he portrays “quantitative and qualitative methodologists...joined by a commitment to methodological rigor as the preeminent source of political science’s credibility.” These characterizations of my scholarship and commitment to transparency are so wide off the mark that I have Isaac to thank for much subsequent ribbing from my quantitative colleagues.

grained process tracing,” “superior qualitative data collection,” and “virtues such as the ability to read texts carefully and creatively, to place them in historical and cultural context, to speak and read foreign languages, and to appreciate multiple perspectives.”¹⁶ This is not the “scientism” Isaac eschews but precisely the humanistic respect for perspectival diversity he advocates.¹⁷

Yet the most basic reason I favour enhancing transparency is not to increase rigor. Isaac seems to miss the essential point, namely that transparency is a meta-norm one may favour for many reasons: to render research (and conversations about it) richer, more relevant *or* more rigorous.¹⁸ And one may define these virtues in many ways. Whether a scholar is interpreting a Shakespeare sonnet, analysing the causes of World War I, or measuring gravitational waves, transparency is a widely acknowledged norm. It is an ethical responsibility to other scholars and outsiders; a way of rendering scholarship richer and more vivid; a means to encourage more careful, rigorous and nuanced interpretation; a precondition for effective debate and criticism; a necessary means of promoting improvement and secondary use of research; a tool to increase the policy relevance of research; and a legitimating force inside and outside of academia. For all these reasons, transparency enables rich and fair conversation among scholars and with the public—the value of which does not depend on a specific method or epistemology.

“...the most fundamental benefit of qualitative transparency is the greater richness of scholarship—and of the subsequent conversation about it. That is the main reason I support DA-RT.”

For me the most fundamental benefit of transparency is the greater *richness* of scholarship—and of the subsequent conversation about it. That is the main

¹⁶ Moravcsik 2014b: 36, emphasis added. I also mention some distinctively qualitative social science techniques, such as counterfactual analysis, case selection and analytic narratives.

¹⁷ Ironically, had Isaac actively cited this passage and provided 50-100 words of context, he might well have realized that he actually agrees with the motives of DA-RT advocates.

¹⁸ At one point Isaac all but *defines* DA-RT transparency as a form of “rigor” in “data analysis,” thereby making the point essentially tautological. Isaac 2015: 275.

reason I support DA-RT. Transparency helps authors render qualitative evidence, and scholarly interpretation of it, more vivid, subtle and contextual. Readers find it more informative and compelling to read source material in which a political actor or observer addresses the reader in his or her own words, rather than a reference to, say, “Interview Materials.” Like most qualitative scholars, I also believe that scholars interpret each of evidence. Thus a massive difference in real comprehension exists between a text accompanied by interpretive annotation explaining how and why a scholar interprets it as she does (as in AC), and a naked cite or quote, which leaves the reader to puzzle out its precise meaning.¹⁹

Can transparency realize this humanistic promise? AC should inspire confidence, for it brushes up for the digital age the tried-and-true humanistic tool for linking evidence to interpretation within narrative: the discursive footnote. Such notes were once the norm in political science, and still are in law, history and humanistic disciplines. The fact that AC lengthens articles adds further richness. All this helps make the experience of publishing qualitative work in *APSR*, *IO* or *Comparative Political Studies* closer to publishing in an academic law review, a history journal, a monograph, or one of the remaining political science journals with longer articles (14,000 words or more), interpretive citations and a tolerance for discussing text, such as *International Security*, *Studies in American Political Development* or *Comparative Politics*. Does Isaac really object to this—or just misunderstand it?

In a deeper sense, every time scholars employ AC, they vindicate basic principles of humanistic and interpretivist social science. One example is the insight that scholars always select, interpret, contextualize, arrange and weight individual pieces of evidence in ways that are neither obvious nor incontestable.²⁰ Making this interpretive act transparent via annotation creates the precondition for what Isaac rightly terms a “productive dialogue” about “interpretive dimension of inquiry... characteristic... of all human living.”²¹

If we want disciplinary pluralism, we can start by making journals as supportive of rich narrative, text and interpretation as they are of derivation,

specification and calculation. A close reading of AC and other DA-RT proposals shows that they address Isaac’s precise concerns. Many readers of *Perspectives in Politics* might well share these humanistic aspirations, though DA-RT preserves the right of Isaac and his editorial board to disagree.

Qualitative Transparency as a Relevant Project

Isaac’s final concern is that enhancing transparency will undermine the theoretical richness and policy relevance of political science by narrowing the number of interesting ideas and theories that scholars consider and by couching them in complex and specialized language intelligible to a public concerned with real-world problems. Isaac lists many relevant insights published in *Perspectives in Politics*, implying that transparency norms would have prevented their publication. He favours a “plain speaking” political science aimed at introducing more new and relevant ideas into disciplinary debates and disseminating them more widely.

Yet does qualitative transparency really undermine theoretical fruitfulness and policy relevance? This claim—for which Isaac provides no evidence—is exaggerated, if not wholly imaginary. Isaac seems mostly concerned to defend space for that small subset of political science not based on what he terms “data analysis.” This worry is misplaced, however, because such work is largely exempt from transparency norms. Isaac’s most extended example is research linking political theory and empirical sub-disciplines to generate a “multidimensional and rich understanding of “democracy.”²² One example that fits this category well is an article I co-authored recently in *International Organization* with colleagues in political theory (Stephen Macedo) and international relations (Robert Keohane).²³ It addresses the policy-relevant normative issue of how best to define and evaluate the “democratic deficit” in global governance.²⁴ Yet DA-RT imposes few transparency obligations upon it, because it consists largely of definitions, legal claims, normative premises, non-controversial empirical claims and secondary research. As in Isaac’s other examples, no more than a few published quotes would be needed.

¹⁹ Andrew Moravcsik, “Transparency: The Revolution in Qualitative Political Science”, *PS: Political Science & Politics*, Vol 47, Issue 1 (2014a): 676ff; Moravcsik 2015. The great majority of qualitative scholars employ more traditional humanistic and interpretive case-study approaches.

²⁰ Moravcsik 2014b: 52.

²¹ Isaac 2015: 269.

²² Isaac 2015: 281 and, on “data analysis,” 275.

²³ Robert O. Keohane et al. “Democracy-Enhancing Multilateralism,” *International Organization*, Vol. 63, Issue 1 (2009): 1–31.

²⁴ Let’s set aside the obvious irony, namely that Isaac accuses DA-RT supporters like me of acting, consciously or unconsciously, to narrow political science to exclude just such normatively-infused, problem-driven, policy-relevant research.

Most political science, of course, does involve data analysis. Yet even where policy-relevant articles report original empirical analysis, no clear trade-off exists between transparency and policy relevance or theoretical fruitfulness. Indeed, the reverse may be true. A distinct methodological advantage of “process-tracing” is its fruitfulness in generating new hypotheses. The richer and more open the evidentiary and interpretive basis of the case studies, the easier it is for authors and readers alike to engage in this generative process. As qualitative scholars like James Scott attest, the most detailed and transparent qualitative scholarship is often not only the most vivid, but also the most theoretically and politically engaging.²⁵ Moreover, transparency may well strengthen the quality and prestige of qualitative research in the discipline, thereby bolstering diversity of theory, method and substance, and sparking more policy-relevant work.

This is not just hype. A quick cross-disciplinary comparison suggests, indeed, that *qualitative transparency is correlated with theoretical fruitfulness and policy relevance*. Consider first political science. Qualitative journals committed to the highest standards of qualitative transparency—narrative detail, long articles, extensive footnotes, nuanced local knowledge—are also among the most theoretically fruitful and politically engaged. These include *International Security* (widely read in the foreign policy world on issues of moral and political importance), *Studies in American Political Development* (in which recent articles cover the history of tax policy, the welfare state, judicial review, vote suppression, immigration policy, banking regulation, gun control), and *Comparative Politics* (covering conflictual domestic issues across the globe, especially in developing regions).

The same elective affinity exists in neighbouring disciplines. Legal academia sets the “Gold Standard” for qualitative transparency, demanding much more than DA-RT proposes. Yet no discipline conducts such impassioned and policy-relevant debates about current policy issues, with such a self-consciously reflexive impact on politics. And few fields house a

wider range of normative and positive approaches, from “critical legal studies” to “law and economics.” History, anthropology, education, development studies, and other disciplines with qualitative excellence are similarly engaged.

This correlation exists because policy research must often be transparent in order to be relevant. Political decision-makers, policy analysts and journalists typically possess detailed knowledge and considerable “feel” for issues. And, sadly, they are often now *more* transparent than we scholars who study them. Making a genuine and credible academic contribution requires corresponding substantive command, interpretive subtlety and openness. What good, for example, does it do for a legal academic to interpret existing laws or facts in a way that could never withstand scrutiny before a court of law or a legislature? Similarly, a World Bank project in which I am currently involved seeks to supplement current, largely quantitative, assessments of program evaluation with qualitative analysis, so better to incorporate local political, social and cultural factors. Such research must be transparent to be effective: to fulfil legal mandates, to enhance credibility inside the organization, and to facilitate nuanced adoption by developing countries.

Isaac and others concerned with policy-relevance have one last worry. Would more transparent qualitative research become too complex and cumbersome for “plain-speaking” people to read? Here AC offers an innovative solution. The existence of two separate digital layers (the main text and the appendix) joined by hyperlinks creates a novel opportunity, never before available, for political scientists to write at once in different styles for diverse audiences. The main text can employ a more direct and persuasive narrative style aimed at a broader audience, while the appendix contains the methodological, analytical and evidentiary “scaffolding” of more interest to experts. This bifurcated approach is increasingly the norm in modern journalism, policy analysis, government documents, the natural sciences, and websites. Political science should change with the times.

For all these reasons, I believe enhanced transparency can help qualitative political science be more readable, relevant and diverse, as well as richer and more rigorous—all at modest cost.

²⁵ “A hero student of mine [wrote] an ethnography of vision in the slaughterhouse...you cannot put down, it is so gripping.... You could only write this ethnography, I think, by actually doing this work...I always believed that social science was a progressive profession because it was the powerful who had the most to hide about how the world actually worked and if you could show how the world actually worked it would always have a de-masking and a subversive effect on the powerful.” “An Interview with James C. Scott,” *Gastronomica*, Vol 15, Issue 3 (2015) <http://www.gastronomica.org/fall-2015/>.

In Praise of Transparency, But Not of DA-RT

By Jeffrey C. Isaac, Indiana University

Andrew Moravcsik is a distinguished scholar of international relations, and I am an admirer of his work. Because he has chosen to center his most recent defense of DA-RT on a critique of my writing, I feel the need to offer some response. At the same time, because I have already published a great deal on this topic that is easily accessible to interested readers, and because the topic itself increasingly bores me, I will try to be as concise as possible.

Moravcsik generously describes my *Perspectives* essay as “influential” and notes that “Isaac’s critique is valuable in that the controversy it helped to spark has drawn scholarly attention to transparency in a way that five years of open meetings and published symposia by DA-RT advocates could not.” I hope this is true, and if it is, then I have accomplished my purpose, which was loudly and clearly to announce a position in a way that called attention to the issue and allowed the vast majority of colleagues, who were uninformed about DA-RT, to pay attention and to think for themselves.

I appreciate Moravcsik’s most recent clarifications of DA-RT. I also appreciate that in recent months there have been many such clarifications, and conversations, and efforts to wrestle with the challenges presented by DA-RT, and to incorporate a greater variety of voices and perspectives. Broadening the discussion was precisely my goal. It was my hope that some colleagues, and journals, would develop a more sophisticated and inclusive understanding of what DA-RT required, and other colleagues, and journals, would clarify their reasons for either refusing to participate in DA-RT or for actively opposing it. This has happened. I am pleased.

At the same time, while Moravcsik generously credits me with having “valuably” drawn attention to the issues, he attributes to me a set of positions that I do not recognize, and based on this attribution, declares me to be rather wrongheaded and something of a scholarly Know Nothing. I’d like briefly to set the record straight.

(1) Moravcsik implies that I misleadingly attribute to DA-RT a lack of flexibility and formality, claiming on the contrary that “Data Access and Research Transparency (DA-RT) is an informal initiative to

enhance the transparency of political science research.” He continues that “From the start, DA-RT’s most fundamental organizing principle has been autonomy among methodologically pluralistic research communities, and its transparency norms are nothing more than suggestions for voluntary adoption.” But in fact, from the start a great many people were very unclear about what DA-RT meant. While it is indeed true that two committees were formed, and approved by the APSA Council, to discuss “transparency” and its implications, it is also true that these committees worked mainly below the radar, and that many members of at least one of these groups lacked a clear idea about what they were discussing. Many Council members—myself included—found the entire discussion to be rather obscure. And in 2012 when the Council approved some professional ethics language about research integrity, it was very general, explicitly voluntary, and said nothing about journal policies or something called “DA-RT.”

“It was my hope that some colleagues, and journals, would develop a more sophisticated and inclusive understanding of what DA-RT required, and other colleagues, and journals, would clarify their reasons for either refusing to participate in DA-RT or for actively opposing it. This has happened. I am pleased.”

Moravcsik writes about “five years of open meetings and published symposia by DA-RT advocates.” I question whether most of those meetings were open; I note that the symposia in question never sought to include skeptics or critics of what DA-RT might mean; and I note in particular that the October 2014 Ann Arbor meeting at which the DA-RT principles were approved by participating journal editors was not open and did not include the editors of many important political science journals. I was included—though illness prevented me from attending, and my Managing Editor attended in my stead. And when I saw the principles, I wrote an open letter to the organizers and participants explaining why I could not agree to these principles, and why I considered their adoption by any responsible journal editors to be premature. As far as

I am aware, that letter was not shared with the list, nor was it answered in any meaningful way. When I then shared the letter with many colleagues, who included former Presidents of APSA and a number of journal editors who were not invited to attend the meeting, I discovered that many of these colleagues were shocked to learn about all of this. It was then that I decided to write the *Perspectives* essay to which Moravcsik responds.

Ironically, the DA-RT principles of transparency were *not* drafted in a fully transparent way. For a long time it was not clear that these principles were “voluntary,” or motivated, as Moravcsik says, by a deep commitment to “pluralism”—and for many colleagues, these things are still not clear. Further, it was not clear that DA-RT was an “informal” effort not promulgated by APSA. APSA supported the Ann Arbor meeting. APSA leadership seemed to give its imprimatur to DA-RT—even though these things had never been discussed, much less acted upon, by the APSA Council. Moravcsik writes that “DA-RT does not invoke centralized enforcement power and the American Political Science Association does not possess such power, which is why it is not a formal APSA initiative—all points Isaac himself, having accused DA-RT proponents of bureaucratic centralization, later quietly conceded.” In fact, I was one of a small number of APSA Council members to argue persistently that APSA needed to make *clear* that DA-RT is not a formal APSA initiative. Only in November 2015 did APSA leadership issue a number of statements designed to clarify this. These statements were not universally regarded as satisfactory, and they indeed sparked further discussion and debate (all of this is posted on the [Dialogue on DA-RT website](#), created not by the proponents of DA-RT nor by APSA, but by a group of distinguished colleagues seeking to furnish a space for genuine dialogue. I commented extensively on this in a [December 2015 post](#), “A Broader Conception of Political Science Publicity”).

Some of these things are clearer now than they were then. Some are not. But to the extent that this is true, it is precisely because my open letter, and then my essay, got people’s attention, and helped to make DA-RT the *big issue* that it now is, by highlighting the lack of transparency, clarity, and perhaps even legitimacy of much of what was moving forward under the banner of DA-RT.

While Moravcsik presents DA-RT as a benign and straightforwardly professional initiative, I would suggest that it was in fact very political (in the sense of disciplinary politics), and that as more and more

colleagues came to understand what was going on, they began to raise lots of questions and express their own concerns and objections. It is perhaps the case that the thousand-plus colleagues who signed the [“Gang of Six” letter](#) calling for delay were very poor readers. It is also perhaps the case that they were over a *thousand* very accomplished political scientists who read what was available, found much that was either obscure or objectionable, and expressed their serious objections in the very name of their commitment to political science.

(2) Moravcsik writes that “Isaac divides political science into **two warring camps** with **incompatible visions** of the discipline’s future,” and continues: “He charges that DA-RT is a **partisan effort**: a ‘one-size fits-all’ **scheme that deliberately seeks to impose** upon all political scientists a ‘uniform’ ‘broader agenda’ of ‘resurgent neo-positivism,’ ‘methodological purity’ and ‘scientific rigor’ (or ‘scientism’) modeled on the quantitative and experimental social sciences, especially psychology. **The ultimate goal is to suppress** ‘humanistic’ practices and politically relevant discussion in political science. Isaac opposes DA-RT **in the name of an opposing ideological camp.**”

There is an element of truth to this set of claims, for in my *Perspectives* essay I did claim that there was a “resurgent neo-positivism,” that this threatened “humanistic” and “pluralistic” tendencies in political science, and that I was against this. But it is worth noting that Moravcsik, the proponent of “active citation,” creates a misleading impression by weaving together some of the phrases in my essay with a range of more highly charged phrases which do not appear in my piece at all (these phrases are bolded in the quotation above so readers can see for themselves how *actively* Moravcsik uses citation to exaggerate the defensiveness and hostility contained in my piece). I do not believe that political science is riven by “two warring camps,” and everything I have done as an editor of *Perspectives* since 2005 has been dedicated to bridging subfield and methodological divides and to publishing problem-driven articles, essays, and reviews that appeal to a broad political science readership. I do believe that DA-RT is motivated by the sincere desire of some colleagues to elevate the level of methodological rigor in political science, and that behind this are certain commitments I consider “neo-positivist.” But I do not regard this effort as a scheme that has an “ultimate goal” or “seeks to impose” upon colleagues. I regard it as a sincere effort to promote a vision of science, and I have said this repeatedly. I acknowledge that it unites some people obsessed

with quantitative methods and others obsessed with qualitative methods and that what joins these people is *not* a particular method but a broader obsession with methodological probity. I do not impugn the motives of the advocates of DA-RT, though I question their conception of science. And I acknowledge that the people with whom I disagree include some of the most excellent political scientists in the discipline.

In short, I am not a “partisan,” and I do not speak for “an opposing ideological camp.”

“I regard it [DA-RT] as a sincere effort to promote a vision of science...I acknowledge that it unites some people obsessed with quantitative methods and others obsessed with qualitative methods and that what joins these people is not a particular method but a broader obsession with methodological probity.”

I do maintain that the advocates of DA-RT, while well-intentioned, promote a vision of political science that is methodologically obsessed and inhospitable to the way a great many colleagues do their work. And I further maintain that *Perspectives on Politics* rests on a different, more pluralistic, and more broadly “public” conception of political science. And I welcome further debate. Yes, I am opposed to DA-RT. But this does not make me a follower of Carl Schmitt who believes that everything is reducible to a simplistic opposition of “friends” and enemies.” Such a Manichean vision cannot be found in what I have said about DA-RT, and it is surely at odds with the very public work I have done with *Perspectives*—work that has twice been reviewed and praised by ad hoc APSA review committees.

I am not interested in ideological or cultural wars. I am interested in preserving and expanding the spaces for a broad, pluralistic, and publicly engaged discipline. If Moravscik is also interested in these things, then I welcome his collaboration.

(3) Moravscik accuses me of having a very simplistic idea of the public relevance of scholarly work. This is a big and complicated topic. I have no

doubt that there are a great many ways of developing and writing high-powered scholarly research so that the work is both publicly relevant and publicly accessible. And I surely am in favor of there being a range of venues and options for the publication of such work. There is no kind of work that is *a priori* irrelevant, and no approach to research or to methodological transparency that ought to be dismissed. At the same time, I do think that DA-RT is linked to an “expert” conception of public relevance and that this is not the only way of thinking about the ways that scholars and reading publics can relate. I also think that while the kinds of efforts that Moravscik would mandate are fully consistent in principle with efforts to simultaneously make scholarship more broadly accessible, as a matter of fact these bureaucratic expectations and requirements take time and energy, both of which are scarce resources. I do not think that a discipline that is serious about promoting greater scholarly relevance and accessibility would consider “data accessibility and research transparency” a top priority. And while it is not inconsistent with other priorities in principle, in practice Moravscik and his DA-RT colleagues have chosen to focus their attention *not* on the broad theme of “publicity” but on the very narrow theme of methodological probity. If that’s what they care most about, this is fine. But it is not what most political scientists care most about, nor in my opinion, what they should care about.

(4) Moravscik claims that I “oppose transparency not just in practice, but in principle.” This is both wrong and unfair. The double-blind peer review processes that I have curated since 2009 center on transparency. In the June 2015 essay that Moravscik criticizes, I state clearly that: “accessibility and transparency are no doubt good things.” In my “Further Thoughts” piece, I wrote that: “Attentiveness to data and analytic integrity has indeed always been important to the peer review processes of any serious political science journal. At the same time, greater attentiveness, in moderation, can hardly be a bad thing.” My Introduction to the December 2015 issue of *Perspectives on Politics*, “Varieties of Empiricism in Political Science,” further expands on the importance of integrity, transparency, and never-ending critique to political science. This is what I wrote:

“When a political science article, or book, is published, what happens is that it is given a particular space, and then set free in the public realm of inquiry, dialogue, debate, and further inquiry *ad infinitum*. Publication

is not sanctification. It is not a signal, to the scholarly community or to the broader public world, that the published work is True, Final, Perfect. It is a signal that the work has been evaluated by a range of scholars, and has been found to rise to a level of plausibility, validity, and excellence that merits publication and that warrants being treated with particular seriousness by scholarly colleagues. That is all. People are then free to read it or ignore it—we have all experienced both. They are free to engage it, critique it, build on it or tear it down. And every single publication will experience every one of these possible responses . . .

These observations are commonplace. We all know them to be true. But at the same time, when many political scientists talk, with a spirit of great seriousness, about “science,” they forget such things, and act as if there is some method, or set of rules, or system of bureaucratic requirements of “data access and research transparency,” that can mitigate the inherently interpretive and inherently contestable and *provisional* character of even the best contributions to political science. We want to see *all* the data. We want to know all the steps in the process of reasoning. We want to be able to subject everything to an ultimate test, to an essential judgment of Truth or Falsity. But there is no such test, no such judgment. There is no Archimedean point from which our complex and constantly changing political world can be apprehended, and no vantage point from which our truth claims can be insulated from provisionality.

Of course this does not mean that “anything goes.” At every step in the ongoing process of scholarly inquiry—and such inquiry consists of a never-ending recursive cycle of pre-publication and post-publication review—political scientists are liable to *questioning*. “Why do you say this?” “What is your evidence for this?” “Are you sure you have interpreted this evidence properly?” “What about this alternative interpretation of your evidence?” “What about this alternative evidence?” “Are you so sure that an alternative explanation doesn’t work better?” Whether one’s work involves multivariate analysis or formal modeling or descriptive case studies or detailed ethnographic description or

constitutional analysis or textual exegesis or normative argument, one is always liable to questions such as these. Different kinds of evidence or argumentation may be relevant in different situations. Scholars will often disagree about the kinds of evidence or argumentation that are relevant. A level of meta-argument ensues, sometimes even followed by a deeper level of meta-argument. This is the life of scholarship, and every experienced editor knows that while this life can be facilitated, and in some ways regulated, it cannot be purified or perfected. Every good editor also knows that there is a difference between editing—an intellectual activity involving facilitation, engagement, communication, and the cultivation of spaces for argument—and *policing*. *Publication is not the end of critique, contestation, and critical review by peers. It is one step in an iterative and interminable process.*”

I stand by this long-standing commitment to the idea that ongoing critique is the hallmark of serious scholarship. Of course scholars ought to be held accountable for their evidence and their analysis. That is exactly what existing practices of publication in political science promote. I await some evidence from DA-RT proponents that these practices are in need of a substantial overhaul.

“Of course scholars ought to be held accountable for their evidence and their analysis. That is exactly what existing practices of publication in political science promote. I await some evidence from DA-RT proponents that these practices are in need of a substantial overhaul.”

At the same time, at my initiative—and after full discussion with and the unanimous support of my editorial board—*Perspectives on Politics* recently adopted a policy statement on “scholarly recognition.” This policy makes the commitment to transparency as transparent as can be, and at the same time links this commitment to broader questions of professional ethics and intellectual

integrity that I wish were as important to DA-RT activists as the new bureaucratic rules they seek to institute. Here is the statement, which is posted on the [APSA website](#).

Perspectives on Politics has long been committed to promoting scholarly sharing, among political scientists and between political scientists and other reading publics, that is serious, rigorous, relevant, honest and intellectually fair.

In light of all rhetoric of intellectual probity surrounding the controversy over the DA-RT (“Data Access and Research Transparency”) initiative, we think it important to issue a statement publicly reiterating one of our journal’s long-standing practices and also announcing a new policy regarding citation practices.

(1) *Perspectives* has long been committed to the highest standards of general research transparency.

Perspectives is a scholarly journal of political science fully committed to double-blind peer review of all research articles and to honest and open sharing of ideas and evidence. We regard such commitments as essential to the publicity and intellectual care at the heart of all serious scholarly inquiry and publication. Our policies have reflected these commitments from the start of our editorship.

Since 2009 we have thus shared versions of the letter below with all authors of articles we are publishing. The letter encourages authors to make their evidentiary sources, including data, accessible, and invites them to take advantage of resources provided by the journal and Cambridge University Press (who hosts supplemental material at permanent links) to prepare these sources in a manner that seems reasonable given their work and their personal convictions as authors and valued colleagues.

This policy has been voluntary and it will remain voluntary. At the same time, we work very closely with authors in the development of their work, and in recent years this policy has been strongly encouraged as part of a more general

conversation about how to publish the best work possible.

(2) *Perspectives* is fully committed to the ethical value of inclusivity and appropriate scholarly recognition of the work of others.

Two years ago, in response to widespread discussion of the issue within the profession, our editorial board initiated a serious discussion of the problem of gender bias in citation practices and other forms of bias as well. At our 2015 annual board meeting in San Francisco, the board voted unanimously to adopt changes in the instructions we send to all book and manuscript reviewers that underscore the importance of citing all relevant sources.

We have thus incorporated the following language into all reviewer letters:

“In considering these questions, the work’s treatment of relevant literatures and authors is particularly germane to your evaluation. If you have concerns about citation bias, regarding gender, people of color, or other under-represented scholarly communities, these would also be worth noting. Obviously, your evaluation will be based largely on your reading of the work as a scholarly expert. But please keep in mind that *Perspectives on Politics* is a distinctive kind of political science journal, and seeks to promote research that is integrative and that reaches broadly within political science.”

Both of these measures serve the same purpose: promoting forms of research practice and scholarly discourse that enact proper regard for the *intersubjective* character of scientific practice. We believe strongly that all scholars ought to pay attention to and acknowledge the work of others relevant to their own work, and that all scholars ought to present their work in a way that makes it accessible to critical scrutiny by others in the field.

Jeffrey C. Isaac, Editor in Chief,
Perspectives on Politics
James Moskowitz, Managing Editor,
Perspectives on Politics

As far as I am aware, *Perspectives* is the first and indeed the only major political science journal in the U.S. to issue such a general statement on the theme of scholarly recognition. The part about research transparency reiterates the journal's long-standing commitment in a way that is respectful of the integrity and autonomy of our authors, who we regard as "valued colleagues" and not as untrustworthy supplicants requiring new forms of policing. And the part about inclusive citation breaks new ground in making explicit both the problem of gender citation bias and the need for greater mindfulness about the importance of recognizing the work of others more generally. This is truly an *activist* citation policy, and I would hope that Moravcsik, who has written about gender equality in the academy¹, would devote the same energy to supporting such a policy for all political science journals as he has devoted to promoting his ideas about hyperlinking footnotes. Yet I am sorry to note that at least thus far the leading proponents of DA-RT have been single-mindedly obsessed with

¹ Andrew Moravcsik, "Why I Put My Wife's Career First," *The Atlantic* (October 2015).

promoting a much narrower agenda centered on policing the argumentative practices of colleagues.

I am all in favor of transparency, in scholarly research and in the activism of colleagues seeking to shape the agenda of academic disciplines. But I do not think scholarly openness requires the new principles and bureaucratic apparatuses being promoted under the rubric of DA-RT. I consider such measures unnecessary, costly, and alienating to many colleagues. I also think that they are a distraction from bigger issues of principle that ought to be at the center of a truly publicly-oriented political science discipline. I don't believe the proponents of DA-RT are bad. I simply believe they are wrong and that they do not speak for many in the discipline. And while I have quite deliberately expended some time and energy trying to explain why I consider them wrong, I choose to spend most of my time and energy editing *Perspectives on Politics*, and demonstrating in practice that a political science journal can be intellectually serious, engaging, and genuinely interesting all at the same time, and without need of new principles and rules and regulations.

Upcoming Events and Workshops

JUNE 2016

ISA CISS Thessaloniki 2016
June 13th-15th: American College in Thessaloniki, Greece

[More Information](#)

BISA 41st Annual International Conference
June 15th-17th: Radisson Blu Hotel, Edinburgh

[More Information](#)

8th Pan-European Conference on the EU
June 16th-18th: Università degli Studi di Trento, Trento, Italy

[More Information](#)

CEEISA-ISA 2016 Joint International Conference
June 23rd-25th: University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

[More Information](#)

ISA Asia-Pacific Conference 2016
June 25th-27th: City University of Hong Kong

[More Information](#)

EISA 10th Pan-European Conference
September 7th-10th: Izmir, Turkey

[More Information](#)

British Sociological Association - Political
Citizenship and Social Movements
June 27th-28th: University of Portsmouth, UK

[More Information](#)

ECPR Research Sessions
June 28th-July 1st: Radboud University Nijmegen, Nijmegen, Netherlands

[More Information](#)

(ISCSC) International Society for the Comparative
Study of Civilizations 46th Annual Conference
June 29th-July 2nd: Monmouth University, West Long Beach, New Jersey, USA

[More Information](#)

JULY 2016

Critical Theory Workshop
July 4th- July 22nd: Villanova University, West Long Branch, New Jersey, USA

[More Information](#)

ECPR Short Methods Courses
July 10th: University of Tartu, Tartu, Estonia

[More Information](#)

ECPR Graduate Student Conference
July 10th-13th: University of Tartu, Tartu, Estonia

[More Information](#)

PolText 2016 - International Conference on the
Advances in Computational Analysis of Political
Text
July 14th-16th: Centre for Advanced Academic Studies, University of Zagreb, Dubrovnik, Croatia

[More Information](#)

ECPR Summer School
July 28th-August 13th: Central European University, Budapest, Hungary

[More Information](#)

AUGUST 2016

(CGP) Common Ground Publishing, Eleventh
International Conference on Interdisciplinary Social
Sciences - A Common Ground Conference
August 2nd-4th: Imperial College London, UK

[More Information](#)

Proud In Europe? LGBTI Emancipation in
Comparative Perspective
August 4th-5th: University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands

[More Information](#)

SEPTEMBER 2016

112th 2016 APSA Annual Meeting
September 1st-4th: Philadelphia Convention Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA

[More Information](#)

ECPR General Conference
September 7th-10th: Charles University Prague, Czech Republic

[More Information](#)

ISA West Annual Conference 2016
September 23rd-25th: Hilton Pasadena, Pasadena, California, USA

[More Information](#)