The Women's Caucus for Political Science
2017 Statement on DA-RT

In 2012, American political scientists, led by Colin Elman and Arthur Lupia, organized the DA-RT initiative to encourage greater data access and research transparency. The goal was to make visible both the logic of inquiry and the empirical foundation of research, and to allow others to replicate test results. With little public discussion of the practical implications of this initiative, many top journal editors signed the joint statement endorsing DA-RT (Journal Editors Transparency Statement, or JETS) in 2014, e.g., *APSR, AJPS, BJPS, JCR*, and the *JOP.* Leaders of the American Political Science Association also supported DA-RT and, despite new expressions of concern in 2015 and panel discussions at the APSA meetings in 2016, DA-RT is now being implemented by many journals in the profession.

Scholars nonetheless continue to raise concerns about DA-RT. Those concerns center on the privacy of human subjects and the ethics of disclosing data obtained from human subjects; whether certain forms of qualitative research can ever be replicable; and whether scholars can "fairly" (ethically, practically, epistemologically) be asked to share datasets, thereby waiving their right of first use and challenging their human subjects protection duties. The sharing of original datasets is a particular concern for junior scholars and scholars at institutions where the teaching load precludes high research output. Altogether, DA-RT burdens qualitative researchers as well as researchers at under-resourced institutions, and the vast majority of researchers in both groups are women and scholars of color.

The Women's Caucus for Political Science shares these concerns. Moreover, topics of particular interest to women scholars—such as domestic abuse, human trafficking, abortion and maternal health—will become more difficult to pursue under DA-RT. This is particularly disturbing, as ethical issues concerning, above all, protection of human subjects, but also the right to first use should take precedence over data transparency and replication. Finally, DA-RT tilts the balance more severely in favor of resource-rich scholars, who can rely on teams of graduate students and other paid assistants to help them create the translations, transcriptions, quantitative appendices, and other resources necessary to meet access, transparency, and replicability standards. DA-RT will make it even more difficult for many women and scholars of color to publish, as an inordinate number work in non-Research 1 institutions, with limited resources and high teaching obligations.

As DA-RT is likely to exacerbate divisions in the profession between the haves and the have nots, and between those who do quantitative and qualitative research, and because many of those who will be most disadvantaged by DA-RT are women and scholars of color in the profession, the Women's Caucus urges the APSA leadership and those political science journals that have endorsed and agreed to implement DA-RT to reconsider this approach. Specifically, we ask them to suspend the *requirement* of the transparency policy until the Qualitative Transparency Deliberations (QTD) are complete and a more inclusive version is developed that does not disproportionately burden women and scholars of color in our discipline.

To send a strong signal to the APSA community we urge the president and president-elect, writing as individual scholars, to issue a statement qualifying the APSA statement signed by Hochschild, Lake and Hero. In this statement, we recommend that the president and president-elect note that DA-RT provisions need to be revised to address the concerns of qualitative scholars, scholars from non-Research 1 schools, and scholars working on politically sensitive topics, many of whom are women and scholars of color. We also recommend that the president and president-elect urge editors to delay their implementation of DA-RT as a requirement until such revisions are made.