

---

---

## APPENDIX A

DRAFT August 7, 2013

### Guidelines for Data Access and Research Transparency for Qualitative Research in Political Science<sup>1</sup>

In October 2012, the American Political Science Association (APSA) adopted new policies requiring transparency in political science research. The new policies have been integrated into Section 6 of the Association's *Guide to Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms* (and are reproduced in the Appendix to this document).

The new standards require researchers making evidence-based knowledge claims in their published work to provide data access, and engage in production transparency and analytic transparency.

- *Data access* requires authors to reference the data on which their descriptive and causal inferences and interpretations are based and, if they generated or collected those data, to make them available or explain why they cannot.
- *Production transparency* requires authors who collected and/or generated the data serving as evidence for their claims to explain the genesis of those data. Production transparency is necessary for other scholars to understand and interpret the data which authors have made available.
- *Analytic transparency* requires that authors demonstrate how they used cited data to arrive at evidence-based claims.

The promulgation of an APSA standard underscores a growing disciplinary (and multi-disciplinary) consensus that data access, production transparency and analytic transparency are all critical aspects of the research process. Transparency contributes to the credibility and legitimacy of political science research and facilitates the accumulation of knowledge. Assessing, critiquing, and debating evidence-based claims made in published research require access to the data cited to support them, documentation and metadata describing how those data were generated or collected, and an explanation of how the evidence and claims are connected. Providing access to data, and to documentation describing data generation or collection, also makes data more useful for testing new theories, for the development of new datasets and bodies of evidence, and for other forms of secondary data analysis.

Data access, production transparency, and analytic transparency are interconnected. Data access is a precondition for evaluating how data are used. Production transparency is a key prerequisite for evaluating author-provided data, and the connections that authors posit between those data and their inferences and interpretations. Conversely, one can more effectively evaluate an author's data generation or collection techniques (revealed through production transparency) when one knows for what analytical use the data are intended.

---

<sup>1</sup> We gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Louise Corti, Associate Director and Functional Director, UK Data Service, for helpful comments on earlier versions of this document.

This document is a resource for scholars, journal editors and academic evaluators (reviewers, funders or award committees) who seek assistance in satisfying these new data access and research transparency obligations in the context of qualitative research.<sup>2</sup> Accordingly, the document provides prospective guidance for meeting the obligations, as well as for retrospectively assessing whether they have been satisfied. While the new standards encourage as much data sharing and research transparency as possible, they should not be viewed in all-or-nothing terms: these activities often face friction, for example in the form of human subjects or copyright concerns. Sharing some data and being as transparent as possible, within those or other limits, will generally be better than doing neither at all.

The document's contents apply to all qualitative analytic techniques employed to support evidence-based claims, as well as all qualitative source materials.<sup>3</sup> No matter which qualitative techniques scholars use, research-tradition specific standards of transparency allow scholars to demonstrate the richness and rigor of qualitative work, and make clear its considerable contributions to knowledge accumulation and theory generation.

### **The Argument for Research Tradition-Specific Transparency Practices**

The need for transparency in qualitative political science research derives from the fundamental principles which underlie social science as a community-based activity. Enhancing transparency both augments the quality of qualitative political science and increases its salience in and contributions to the discipline. Transparency is best achieved in qualitative political science in ways that preserve and honor that research tradition. We argue each of these points in turn.

### ***Why Adopt Transparency Practices?***

Transparency is an indispensable element of rule-bound intersubjective knowledge. Scholarly communities in the social sciences, natural sciences and evidence-based humanities can only exist if their members openly share evidence, results and arguments. Transparency allows those communities to recognize when research has been conducted rigorously, to distinguish between valid and invalid propositions, to

---

<sup>2</sup> A parallel set of guidelines intended primarily for quantitative data has also been developed. Of course, the guidance concerning ways in which research can be made more transparent offered in these documents is not exhaustive. In particular, nothing here is intended to prevent or discourage the development of more fine-grained requirements attuned to a particular subset of research, such as registering research designs involving experiments prior to conducting research with the aim of preventing publication and reporting bias.

<sup>3</sup> Such materials encompass traditional sources, such as primary textual documents and published primary sources; data from interviews, focus groups, or oral histories (in either audio or video form or transcripts from or summaries thereof); field notes (for instance from participant observation or ethnography); diaries and other personal records; and press clippings. The guidelines also apply to less conventional sources such as samples from bodies of secondary work; photographs; maps, posters and other representational work; and artwork.

---

---

better comprehend the subjective social understandings underlying different interpretations, to expand the number of participants in disciplinary conversations, and to achieve scientific progress.

To date, this fundamental attribute of community-based knowledge generation has played out in political science primarily in the realm of replicating quantitative research. In contrast to the situation in legal academia, historical studies, classical philology and some other disciplines, in qualitative political science transparency norms have been weak or non-existent. To be sure, citations and references in qualitative research appear to assure openness. Nevertheless, imprecision in citation, the high transaction costs of actually locating cited evidence, and the opacity of links between data and conclusions, combine to make the critical evaluation of descriptive and causal inferences or cumulative deepening of data analysis a rare event.

The aim of transparency is to make the rigor and power of good qualitative research more visible, allowing and empowering each consumer to identify such research, and facilitating the awarding of appropriate credit. Further, increasing the ease with which a larger number of scholars can critically engage with qualitative research, and the depth with which they can do so, makes it more likely that such work will be incorporated into scholarly discussion and debate, and future research. In all these ways, enhancing understanding of the processes and products of qualitative research facilitates the accumulation of knowledge.

### ***Why an Approach to Transparency that is Specific to Qualitative Research?***

Transparency in any research tradition – whether quantitative or qualitative – requires that scholars show they followed the rules of data collection and analysis that guide the specific type of research in which they are engaged. That conformity is foundational to the validity of the resulting interpretations and inferences and its demonstration is a key component of social science.

A shared commitment to openness, however, does not oblige all research traditions to adopt the same approach. Rather, transparency should be pursued in ways and for reasons that are consistent with the epistemology of the social inquiry being carried out. There are several reasons why qualitative scholars should not (and sometimes simply could not) adopt the transparency practices employed by quantitative political scientists, but must instead develop and follow their own.

We begin from the position that qualitative research is invaluable, generating knowledge that could not be produced through any other form of inquiry. Such research generally entails close engagement with one or more cases, producing thick, rich and open-ended data. These data are collected and used by scholars with a range of epistemological beliefs, producing a wide variety of interpretations and inferences.

For qualitative scholars who are comfortable with replication (i.e., the repetition of a research process or analysis in an attempt to reproduce its findings), the case for transparency makes itself. Without transparency there can be no replication. Yet even qualitative scholars who do not share a commitment to replication should value greater visibility of data and methods. For instance, those who believe that an important social scientific task is to encourage recognition of the extent and importance of cultural, historical and social diversity should acknowledge the value of transparency in permitting the record of actors speaking in their own voices to reach readers of social scientific texts. In short, the more sense scholars can make of authors' arguments and evidence, the better they can engage them, the more varied techniques they can use to evaluate and document their legitimacy, and the more scholars can enter the conversation.

Transparency in qualitative research needs to be achieved and evaluated in ways that are sensitive to the nature of qualitative data, how they are gathered, and how they are employed. As the list offered previously suggests (see footnote 3), qualitative data take on more varied forms than quantitative data, and are less-structured. In terms of data collection/generation, qualitative scholars very commonly gather their own data, rather than rely solely on a shared dataset. Evaluating the processes used to obtain data is a key element in assessing qualitative work – not least because those processes have a critical effect on the research product. With respect to employment, qualitative data are used in a range of research designs, including single case studies, small-n case studies, and various mixed-method designs. A variety of methods are used to analyze qualitative data (e.g., narratives, counterfactual analysis, process tracing, Qualitative Comparative Analysis, content analysis, ethnographic analysis), and different inferential structures underpin each method. These fundamental facets of qualitative research have implications for how transparency can and should be achieved.

These epistemological considerations are reinforced by the especially acute ethical and legal imperatives, and the sociological framing of transparency, in qualitative research. The two most important ethical and legal imperatives with which transparency can be in tension in qualitative research are human subject and copyright concerns. Sometimes data are collected in circumstances that require discretion to protect the rights and welfare of subjects. This will, quite properly, limit transparency. Moreover, many sources are not, in their entirety, in the public domain, and there are limitations on how they can be shared. As noted below, scholars should only make qualitative data (and information about the decisions and processes that produced them) available in ways which conform to these social and legal imperatives.

Sociologically, no amount of written guidance will result in changes in transparency practices unless scholars believe that methods and research goals about which they care are being preserved and improved. A separate set of guidelines for qualitative research helps to establish that the aim of transparency is to demonstrate the power of qualitative research designs, data-collection techniques, interpretative modes, and analytic methods. In other words, rather than tacitly encouraging changes to qualitative research practices, the goal of enhanced transparency in qualitative research is precisely to *preserve* and *deepen* existing qualitative research traditions, render current qualitative

---

---

research practices more accessible, and make clearer the tremendous value-added qualitative research already delivers.

In short, while transparency is a universal principle, for epistemological, ethical, and sociological reasons, its instantiation in qualitative research needs to conform to traditions specific to qualitative work.

### **Data Access**

Clause 6.1 in the revised APSA *Ethics Guide* obliges a scholar who makes evidence-based claims in her published work to reference the data she used to make those claims. If the scholar generated or collected the data herself, then she should also make those data available or explain why she cannot.

### ***What data should be referenced and/or made available, and how?***

Researchers making evidence-based knowledge claims should clearly and completely reference the data on which they base their interpretations or their descriptive or causal inferences. Generally, these are the data the author explicitly cites to support those claims.

Referencing textual data requires a full and precise bibliographic citation including page numbers and any other information necessary for readers to locate the material cited and find within it the passage an author suggests is evidence for his claims. For primary archival sources, for instance, information about the archive and collection, and the number of the box in which the document was found should be included. For non-textual sources, information allowing an equivalent degree of precision should be included.<sup>4</sup> This information should be provided upon publication.

The new APSA standard entails a more stringent obligation for scholars who themselves generated or collected the data on which their evidence-based knowledge claims are based. Those scholars must, whenever possible, make those data available.<sup>5</sup> Later in this document, we discuss strategies for, and issues involved in, sharing qualitative data.

Sharing cited data is sufficient to meet the APSA standards. Nonetheless, for many qualitative researchers, cited data are often a small subset of the information collected and used in a research endeavor. As such, researchers are strongly encouraged to share data which are implicated in their research but not cited in their publication – for

---

<sup>4</sup> To give an example, when citing an audio tape, scholars might indicate the exact moment during the interview at which the cited material was mentioned (i.e., cite the time stamp), or might provide an extract of the recording and cite where it came from within the interview (e.g. this clip is six minutes in).

<sup>5</sup> As noted later, scholars using Active Citation to achieve transparency must provide substantial excerpts from the data sources underlying their claims (and ideally provide the actual data sources) no matter whether they generated or collected those data or other scholars did so. If the source or the relevant portion thereof cannot be provided for ethical or legal reasons, a summary or redaction must be offered.

instance, additional data used to generate the argument (rather than test it), or to infirm alternative interpretations and inferences.

### ***What limitations might there be on making qualitative data available?***

It is critically important that scholars sharing data comply with all legal and ethical obligations. As paragraph 6.4 of the *APSA Guide to Professional Ethics* notes, while it is incumbent upon researchers to accurately represent the research process and study participants' contributions, external constraints may require that they withhold data, for instance, in order to protect human subjects or to comply with legal restrictions.

Confidentiality and Human Subjects: If scholars have promised the individuals whom they involved in their research confidentiality, it is incumbent upon them not to reveal those subjects' identities. Personal identity can be disclosed both directly (for example, through divulging a participant's address, telephone number, age, sex, occupation, and/or geographic location) or indirectly (for example, by disclosing information about the person that, when linked with publicly available information, reveals his/her identity).

Data garnered from human subjects can often be shared legally and ethically if the appropriate informed consent is granted by project participants.<sup>6</sup> Where necessary, additional protective steps can be taken including guaranteeing confidentiality when soliciting informed consent;<sup>7</sup> employing anonymization strategies;<sup>8</sup> carefully controlling access to data; and/or requiring that special measures to protect confidential information be clearly specified in a data-use agreement signed by anyone who wishes to view or analyze the data.

Documentary Data: Sometimes the owners or licensors of data collected through non-interactive techniques—archives or non-governmental organizations, for instance—place limitations on their use or dispersion. Likewise, such materials sometimes have copyright restrictions. Scholars should make every attempt to explain the value of data-sharing to those from whom they acquire documentary data, and investigate to what degree, and which, copyright law applies.

---

<sup>6</sup> To be clear, there are instances in which a researcher who has obtained permission from a subject to share data should nonetheless not do so because, for example, the subject is not in a good position to evaluate the risk of information connected with him/her being made accessible, or the circumstances under which permission was granted have changed. Alternatively, the author may decide to impose additional safeguards not specified in the informed consent when sharing the data.

<sup>7</sup> When seeking informed consent researchers should secure permission for data sharing where possible, and should avoid including statements in consent forms that purposefully preclude data sharing beyond the researchers or team.

<sup>8</sup> For instance, on some occasions scholars will only be able to characterize their source ("a senior government official"), but will be able to attribute full quotations to him or her; on other occasions, they will be able to indicate that they consulted with particular people, but will not be able to attribute any specific information to them.

---

---

**Proprietary Data:** When research is based on proprietary data, authors should make available sufficient documentation so other scholars can evaluate their findings. Owners of proprietary data should be encouraged to provide access to bona fide researchers.

As the discussion of types of data ‘friction’ in this section makes clear, the exclusions and restrictions that can prevent authors from sharing the data that support their analytic claims are circumstantial, ethical and legal. Accordingly, where data cannot be shared, the author should clearly explain why not, and include as much information about those data as is ethically and legally possible, to help readers understand and evaluate the author’s inferential and interpretive claims.

### ***When should data be made available?***

The APSA standards recognize that “Researchers who collect or generate data have the right to use those data first.” A particular collection of data should be made available no more than one year after the earliest publication (either electronic or paper) of evidence-based statements made using that collection.

The APSA standards also recognize that journals and funding agencies may have different requirements (for instance, obliging researchers to make the data used in a book or article available prior to any publication). The one-year allowance specified by APSA does not alter any time limits established by journals and funding agencies.

### ***Where and in what form should data be made available?***

The best practice is for digital data (e.g. PDFs of documents, audio files, video files) to be made accessible online, at an established repository that can be discovered by standard Internet search engines. Standard and non-proprietary file formats are preferable, because they are more likely to remain accessible over time. For non-digital data, scholars should provide a metadata record identifying the source.

When deciding on a venue for making their data available, scholars should consider multiple desiderata. These include: the practices and rules of the publishing venue, the transaction cost for the reader of accessing the evidence in context, the potential storing venue’s ability to make the data accessible to all interested persons, as well as to support annotation of citations (on which, more below), the likely durability of the venue (i.e., whether it has stable and long-term funding sources), the availability and quality of assistance with curation, and the cost to data users.<sup>9</sup>

Scholars who anticipate incurring incremental costs when preparing data for sharing (e.g., for anonymizing to protect confidential information) should consider building those costs into funding applications, and/or they may request reimbursement (perhaps

---

<sup>9</sup> Although university repositories will often meet these criteria, scholars are discouraged from hosting data themselves on local websites as such sites are notoriously unreliable. While doing so may be a good temporary measure, longer-term plans for storage in an established repository should be developed.

drawn from fees paid by researchers requesting to use shared data). Likewise, when distribution involves additional costs (e.g., for administration of special conditions of access to confidential information), data distributors may request reimbursement for the incremental costs of making data available (see Section 6.5 of the *Ethics Guide*).

**What is a “persistent identifier”? Why should I get one? Where can I get one?**

A persistent identifier is a permanent link to a publication, data collection, or unique metadata instance that points to (and records versioning of) a data collection on the Internet. The publisher of the resource agrees to maintain the link to keep it active. Over time the link behind the persistent identifier may be updated, but the identifier itself remains stable. There are several kinds of persistent identifiers (DOI, URN, Handle, etc.).

Persistent identifiers are “machine-actionable” and facilitate the harvesting of data references for online citation databases, like the Thomson-Reuters Data Citation Index. Scholars can easily track the impact of their data from citations in publications. An increasing number of journals are requiring persistent identifiers for data citations.

Persistent identifiers can be useful for keeping track of bodies of data. One way to obtain a persistent identifier for data is to deposit them in an established institutional or social science repository, for instance, members of Data-PASS (<http://www.data-pass.org/>).

**Production Transparency**

In order to achieve *production transparency*, researchers should provide comprehensive documentation and descriptive metadata detailing their project’s empirical base, the context of data collection, and the procedures and protocols they used to access, select, collect, generate, and capture data. To offer three specific examples, authors should address basic issues of how documentary sources were selected or sampled, the terms under which interviews were granted, and how participant observation or ethnographic work was conducted.

Production transparency is a prerequisite for an author’s data to be intelligible to other researchers. Providing information about decisions made and processes carried out in the course of collecting and generating data, selecting them for inclusion in published work, and presenting them makes it easier for other scholars to understand and interpret the data; allows them to assess whether those processes were carried out in an unbiased manner; and helps them to evaluate the validity of the claims made on the basis of the data.

The production transparency requirement is triggered when scholars themselves collected or generated the data that support their evidence-based claims. Accordingly, the same timetable and constraints that apply to making those data available apply to

---

---

production transparency in relation to those data. As noted previously, APSA allows scholars a one-year period for first use of data they collected and thus for describing the data-collection process.

If the data are subject to ethical or legal restrictions, it is likely that production transparency will be similarly constrained. Conforming production transparency to relevant limits helps to ensure that other scholars can evaluate or replicate authors' data-collection procedures legally and without threatening the privacy of human subjects.

Although documentation is often supplied in text files or spreadsheets, an advanced standard for documenting data (at the study level) in the social sciences is the Data Documentation Initiative (DDI). DDI is an XML markup standard designed for social science data. Since DDI is machine actionable, it can be used to create custom codebooks and to enable online search tools. A list of tools for creating DDI is available at the DDI [Tools Registry](http://www.ddialliance.org/resources/tools) (<http://www.ddialliance.org/resources/tools>). Original documents (e.g., technical reports, questionnaires, and showcards) can be submitted as text files or PDF/A.

### **Analytic Transparency**

Achieving *analytic transparency* requires scholars to describe relevant aspects of the overall research process, detail the micro-connections between their data and claims (i.e., show how the specific evidence they cite supports those claims), and discuss how evidence was aggregated to support claims.

The APSA standard for analytic transparency prescribes no epistemology or methodology; it simply requires that authors be clear about the analytic processes they followed to derive claims from their data, and demonstrate how they followed the general rules that attend the interpretive or inferential approach they are using.

### **The Transparency Appendix and Active Citation**

One way in which qualitative researchers can provide data access, achieve production transparency, and engage in analytic transparency, is by developing a transparency appendix to their published work. A transparency appendix typically consists of two elements: active citations and an overview section.

Active citations follow the format of traditional footnotes or endnotes, but are digitally augmented to include:

- a precise and complete reference and any additional information that scholars will need to locate the cited source and find the relevant information within it;
- excerpts from cited sources;
- the cited sources themselves if the author possesses them and is in a position to share them, and/or hyperlinks thereto;

- annotations that
  - explain how individual pieces of data, sources, citations, and facts were interpreted and why they were interpreted as they were;
  - illustrate precisely how those individual pieces support claims in the text;<sup>10</sup>
  - address any important interpretive ambiguities or counter-arguments;
  - explain how individual pieces of data aggregate to support broad interpretative and theoretical conclusions.

Because active citations follow the format of traditional footnotes or endnotes, they are ideally suited to elucidate particular inferences or interpretations in the author's text. Certain aspects of research that should be explained if transparency is to be achieved, however, do not comfortably attach themselves to a particular subsection of text or footnote. These matters are instead best dealt with holistically. When such overarching concerns cannot be addressed in the main text, authors should include a brief "overview" in the transparency appendix clarifying their overall research trajectory (e.g., how interpretations and hypotheses were generated and evaluated); outlining the data-generation process; and demonstrating how the analysis attends to the inferential/interpretive rules and structures that underlie the type of analysis the author is doing.

Information provided in a transparency appendix *supplements* rather than replaces or repeats information offered in the text and footnotes of a book or article: it supplies additional context and background to authors' research efforts, offering an opportunity for authors to describe the rigor and thoroughness of their research (and field research), and allowing other scholars to understand and evaluate the appropriateness of their use (and, where relevant, generation) of data. What is "appropriate" depends upon the interpretive or inferential structures implied by the author's underlying epistemology and employed in the type of qualitative research he or she is conducting.

With respect to data access, scholars using active citation provide excerpts from the data sources underlying their claims (and ideally provide the actual data sources). In terms of production transparency, authors who cannot provide basic information about data collection in the main text of their publications due to length-limitations can include additional information in an introductory overview.

As for analytic transparency, the traditional representation in qualitative research—elaboration of an argument in the text combined with a simple citation—is often inadequate to make the link between an argument and evidence apparent. The critical element in the evidence is often difficult to discern, and the evidence is often interpretable in multiple ways. Likewise, a passage in a source can often only be properly interpreted within a broader textual context. Moreover, abbreviated ("scientific" or endnote) footnote formats, shrinking word limits for published work, and

---

<sup>10</sup> The standards the author may seek to meet or rules he may follow when detailing these micro-connections can vary: they may include the scholar's interpretation of the relative persuasiveness and consistency of evidence, explicit process-tracing, discussing narrative plausibility, making arguments about the plausibility of counterfactuals, advancing a systematic scheme for weighting data, mixed method approaches, etc.. Analytic transparency requires only that scholars be consistent and transparent, so that the reader can follow how their overall conclusions follow from smaller-scale findings.

---

---

unfamiliarity with careful textual interpretation have rendered traditional journals (and even books) inhospitable forums for achieving rigorous analytic transparency.

In sum, the introductory overview component of a transparency appendix empowers authors to enhance readers' understanding of the context, design and conduct of research. Using active citation empowers authors to clarify the micro-connections between data, analysis, and conclusions. Both enhance the rigor and persuasiveness of qualitative research.

### **Publishers' Responsibilities**

Journals, editors, and publishers should assist authors in complying with data access and research transparency guidelines.

Publishers should:

- inform authors of options for meeting data access and research transparency requirements;
- host scholars' cited sources and transparency appendices on line, or guide authors to online archives which will house these materials, and provide links from articles (at the level of the individual citation, if needed) to those materials;
- provide guidelines for bibliographic citation of data;
- include consistent and complete data citations in all publications.

### **Resources**

- Corti, Louise. 2000. "Progress and Problems of Preserving and Providing Access to Qualitative Data for Social Research – The International Picture of an Emerging Culture." *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 1 (December). <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1019> (August 13, 2009).
- Corti, Louise. 2005. "Qualitative Archiving and Data Sharing: Extending the Reach and Impact of Qualitative Data." *IASSIST Quarterly* (Fall): 8-13.
- Swan, Alma and Sheridan Brown. 2008. "To Share or Not to Share: Publication and Quality Assurance of Research Data Outputs." A report commissioned by the Research Information Network. School of Electronics & Computer Science, University of Southampton. <http://www.rin.ac.uk/files/Data%20publication%20report,%20main%20-%20ofinal.pdf> (August 13, 2009).
- UK Data Archive
  - Managing and Sharing Data: A Best Practice Guide for Researchers (<http://data-archive.ac.uk/media/2894/managingsharing.pdf>)
  - Create and Manage Data (<http://data-archive.ac.uk/create-manage>)
- UK Data Service
  - Advice and Training (<http://ukdataservice.ac.uk/use-data/advice.aspx>)
  - Prepare and Manage Data (<http://ukdataservice.ac.uk/manage-data.aspx>)

- Van den Eynden, Veerle and Louise Corti. 2009. "Tensions between data sharing and data protection in research with people." *SRA News* (May): 12-15.
- Wolf, Virginia A., Joan E. Sieber, Philip M. Steel, and Alvan O. Zarate. 2006. "Meeting the Challenge When Data Sharing is Required." *IRB: Ethics and Human Research* 28 (March-April): 10-15.

## **Appendix**

Section 6 of the American Political Science Association's *Guide to Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms* as amended in October 2012:

*"6. Researchers have an ethical obligation to facilitate the evaluation of their evidence-based knowledge claims through data access, production transparency, and analytic transparency so that their work can be tested or replicated.*

*6.1 Data access: Researchers making evidence-based knowledge claims should reference the data they used to make those claims. If these are data they themselves generated or collected, researchers should provide access to those data or explain why they cannot.*

*6.2 Production transparency: Researchers providing access to data they themselves generated or collected, should offer a full account of the procedures used to collect or generate the data.*

*6.3 Analytic transparency: Researchers making evidence-based knowledge claims should provide a full account of how they draw their analytic conclusions from the data, i.e., clearly explicate the links connecting data to conclusions.*

*6.4 Scholars may be exempted from Data Access and Production Transparency in order to (A) address well-founded privacy and confidentiality concerns, including abiding by relevant human subjects regulation; and/or (B) comply with relevant and applicable laws, including copyright. Decisions to withhold data and a full account of the procedures used to collect or generate them should be made in good faith and on reasonable grounds. Researchers must, however, exercise appropriate restraint in making claims as to the confidential nature of their sources, and resolve all reasonable doubts in favor of full disclosure.*

*6.5 Dependent upon how and where data are stored, access may involve additional costs to the requesting researcher.*

*6.6 Researchers who collect or generate data have the right to use those data first. Hence, scholars may postpone data access and production transparency for one year after publication of evidence-based knowledge claims relying on those data, or such period as may be specified by (1) the journal or press publishing the claims, or (2) the funding agency supporting the research through which the data were generated or collected.*

---

---

*6.7 Nothing in this section shall require researchers to transfer ownership or other proprietary rights they may have.*

*6.8 As citizens, researchers have an obligation to cooperate with grand juries, other law enforcement agencies, and institutional officials. Conversely, researchers also have a professional duty not to divulge the identity of confidential sources of information or data developed in the course of research, whether to governmental or non-governmental officials or bodies, even though in the present state of American law they run the risk of suffering an applicable penalty.*

*6.9 Where evidence-based knowledge claims are challenged, those challenges are to be specific rather than generalized or vague. Challengers are themselves in the status of authors in connection with the statements that they make, and therefore bear the same responsibilities regarding data access, production transparency, and analytic transparency as other authors.”*