could have written the paper differently and corrected Meier. But his points were still valid and my efforts at replication, while accurate, irrelevant.

Often I believe that is the point. The major progress we make as a discipline is through asking interesting questions, applying careful methods, providing insightful analysis, and generalizing with useful conclusions. Those whose interests tend toward methodological issues certainly enhance our joint enterprise by providing us with tools for future work. But the requirement that all those engaged in original research provide sufficient documentation or data sets to encourage replication seems to me to be overkill and not an appropriate use of our scarce resources of time, energy, and money. In my view, continued insistence on adequate description in an appropriate methodological section meets the standard upon which we should insist.

Notes

1. The original version of this paper was given as the Presidential Remarks at the Annual Meeting of the New England Political Science Association, Portland, Maine, May 6, 1995. I thank those colleagues who commented on my address and suggested that I revise their remarks for this article. I am also grateful to the following with whom I have discussed these views, though none in any way bears responsibility for them: Patrice Franko, Robert McArthur, Linda Fowler, Warren Miller, Tony Corrado, Cal Mackenzie, and Ruth Jones.
2. I believe this is different from and probably more significant than the difficulties in replication, caused by changing time and circumstances, that King makes note of in his first footnote.
3. I thank Tony Corrado for pointing out these possibilities to me and allowing me to raise them in this forum—thus causing him what I am certain are needless nightmares.

References

Campbell, Angus, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald Stokes. 1960. *The American Voter.* New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Fenno, Richard F. 1978. *Home Style: House Members in Their Districts.* Boston: Little, Brown.

Jones, Charles O. 1994. *The Presidency in a Separated System.* Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

Meier, Kenneth J. 1995. "Get Your Tongue Out of My Mouth 'Cause I'm Kissing You Goodbye: The Politics of Ideas." Presented at the annual meeting of the Southwest Social Science Association, Dallas, TX.

Nie, Norman H., Sidney Verba, and John R. Petrocik. 1979. *The Changing American Voter.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

About the Author

L. Sandy Maisel is the William R. Kenan Jr. Professor of Government at Colby College, Waterville, Maine. He is chair of the Political Organizations and Parties Organized Section of the APSA and immediate past president of the New England Political Science Association. He can be reached at Department of Government, Colby College, Waterville, ME 04901; e-mail: lsmaisel@colby.edu; phone: 207-872-3271.

Data Accessibility in Political Science: Putting the Principle Into Practice

Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier and Katherine Tate, *Ohio State University*

Like Gary King and Paul Herrnson, we believe that making our data accessible can strengthen and advance scholarly knowledge. King and Herrnson, however, disagree about the measures necessary to ensure that data are widely available to achieve this collective good. Herrnson criticizes King's recommendations as potentially bad for the profession. As scholars who have collected data and relied on others' data for our own research, and—equally important—as relatively new Ph.D.s in political science, we have our own perspective in this debate over replication and data accessibility. Some of Herrnson's concerns about King's recommendations are legitimate ones. However, we do not think that release of data should be a voluntary matter—the status quo position. Our position is that the profession should formally adopt a data accessibility policy that will be fair to everyone within the profession. And we are bold enough to present the critical features of such a policy, recognizing that input should be solicited from broad segments within the profession before such a policy is adopted.

The principal point of disagreement between King and Herrnson is over the need for data accessibility. King maintains that published research needs to be replicated; he writes that "scholars, with only your publication and other information you provide, ought to be able to start from the real world and arrive at the same substantive conclusions." Given the lack of information available about published research findings and lack of access to the data employed in those articles, King contends that the restricted ability of scholars to replicate the research of others poses a serious problem to empirical political science. We think that data should be accessible for broader purposes than replication, as characterized by King. As Herrnson makes clear, replication, especially in the social sciences, takes on a broader meaning than in the life and physical sciences. Knowledge is less effectively advanced through mere verification of another researcher's findings than through secondary analysis. Verification alone raises its own potential problem of legitimizing and perpetuating existing paradigms, when new paradigms should be advanced. Because replication by itself is a more limited approach to advancing knowledge, verification followed by secondary analysis should be encouraged. Secondary analysis is possible only when the data used to generate the original study are made publicly available.

Herrnson opposes a general policy of data accessibility, primarily because he believes that researchers who collect data will not get a reasonable return from their investment of skill, time, and money. Although this is a legitimate concern, maintaining the status quo may not be preferable. The problem with the status quo transcends the idea that unless research findings are replicated, some errors will go uncorrected. Rather, the status quo provides a strong incentive for researchers to hold onto their data sets for as long as possible, thus not only stifling research but also creating an atmosphere of ill will more dangerous than that generated from forcing researchers to relinquish their data. Perhaps the worst case of this occurred not in political science or economics but in the comparatively more gentle field of religion.

The small group of internationally based scholars who were given control of the then-recently discovered Dead Sea Scrolls in the 1950s by Jordan and then by Israel, held on to their treasure for more than 40 years, providing access only to a handful of their own graduate students. These scholars, including John Strugnall, a Harvard University professor who served as chair of this cartel, maintained control by keeping the scrolls from the public, but, even more outrageously, delaying publication of their translation of the scrolls. Their monopoly was finally broken when a small private museum in California announced that it would allow scholars access to its microfilm copies of the scrolls.

But the controversy did not end there. Scholars who had about a year's time to review the scrolls swiftly published their own translations before the group of scholars who for the past 40 years had sole access. One of these original scholars, Dr. Elisha Qimron, is now suing an author of these new publications on the grounds that his copyright translation of one of the scrolls had been violated. Copies of his "work-in-progress" translations of the scrolls existed widely, which Qimron maintained the author had relied on, and even duplicated. Qimron's lawyer put it this way: "This is a poor guy. He opens a book and sees his life work there, without any mention being given to him. They stole his thunder, his fire, and his work" (Groner 1993, 2). The defendant-author sees it differently, arguing that the lawsuit will have a "chilling effect on research—by effectively narrowing the circle of people who can publish material about ancient texts without fearing lawsuits."

In response to these developments, the Society of Biblical Literature has established its own data access policy, recommending that "those who own or control ancient written materials should allow all scholars to have access to them," and, furthermore, that such scholars should not "hinder other scholars from publishing their own studies' translations, or editions of the written materials."

Is there any material in political science as priceless and substantial as the Dead Sea Scrolls? Probably not. But it seems safe to say that the egos and vanities of political scientists are no less large than those of biblical scholars. Formalizing a data accessibility policy before data disputes occur would be preferable to issuing one afterward.

Although many professional norms in political science seem clear and are widely shared, they are not codified or formalized. In contrast, the American Association of Public Opinion Researchers (AAPOR) has a formal ethics policy, which all members must accept as a precondition of membership. AAPOR revised its code of professional ethics in 1976 from a statement of maintaining high standards of scientific competence and integrity in public opinion research to one that specifically outlined standards that were in place by 1986. Why formalize their standards and make them a condition of membership? AAPOR members were concerned that "pseudo surveys" engaged by anyone within their organization would harm severely the scientific credibility of the profession—a profession that in recent times has been as greatly maligned as the press. At the same time, the move toward specifying a code of conduct touched off a fierce debate (Sheatsley and Mitofsky 1992). Some thought it was impossible to reach agreement on what constitutes unethical behavior, and others feared the imposition of "authoritarian standards." Yet AAPOR members could agree on establishing a Standards Committee to investigate charges of unethical practices by its members. Things quickly became ugly. When in 1974 the Standards Committee found that a firm had violated AAPOR's standards on reporting (among other things, this firm had not identified the sponsor of the survey), the firm threatened to sue because AAPOR did not have established procedures. Then AAPOR established its standards, including the range of actions it could take against those judged to have violated its code of professional behavior.

There are several reasons AAPOR has defined as part of its mission maintaining its professional standards. However, it is not clear that there is a need for APSA to establish a data accessibility policy as great as AAPOR's need to maintain its professional standards, even though such a policy would facilitate the growth of knowledge. Nor do we think that an APSA policy needs to carry sanctions. Nevertheless, APSA is in a better position to enforce a standard more broadly and effectively than the assortment of editors, departments, and funding organizations that King identifies in his article. Moreover, APSA can develop a policy that incorporates the concerns of a broader universe of researchers engaged in empirical research. Last, given that the trend does favor the adoption of a data accessibility policy, perhaps APSA should formulate its own, before conflict over the norms and rules of data accessibility escalates.

Without a formal policy adopted by APSA, incentives exist to hang on to one's data not only under the status quo, but even if King's policy recommendations were implemented on a wide scale. As

Herrnson points out, a policy aimed at new scholars and carried out by certain professional journals may not be the best solution to the problem. First, new scholars who need to publish their work to achieve tenure might see the fruit of their labor go to established senior members of the profession and those with superior research facilities and lighter teaching loads. Second, senior and better established scholars can bypass journals that enforce a data accessibility policy and therefore hold on to their data for longer periods than less established political scientists.

King (1995) suggests that five years may be the appropriate length for proprietorship. While this period appears reasonable to us, the issue of how long a data set can be kept needs to be discussed. In addition, *when* the clock starts ticking is important precisely because of Herrnson's (1995) supporting arguments, such as the large amount of time it takes to collect and organize a data set. Deciding when to "start the clock" is tricky. Many time points would involve the researcher's discretion and may favor scholars with ample resources; for example, starting the clock when data collection begins. Instead, the time point needs to be public. Thus when the work is first presented publicly, i.e., a conference presentation or a press release, may be a good starting point. If the work is published before the five-year limit, the data set should be available at that time.

Ideally the entire data set would be made available for secondary analysis, but because there are valid reasons for wanting to keep the data, only the subset used would be expected. Of course, because of confidentiality, some data sets would not be released at all. Hopefully, Herrnson's (1995) emphasis on collegiality will be the rule rather than the exception should someone request additional parts of the data set.

We recognize that archiving data sets takes time and money. Although it may not be easy at this time for everyone to archive data, efforts are being made to clarify and simplify the process of archiving—for example, Inter-University Consortium on Political and Social Research (ICPSR's) new electronic service called the Publication-Related Archive. Nagler (1995) provides useful guidelines for scholars that can ease the burden of archiving by taking certain steps at the data collection and analysis stages.

Currently little credit is given to those who produce data sets, i.e., recognition from peers that you have archived 10 data sets. The work involved in data collection and writing grants to collect data, and for scientific progress due to the cumulative nature of research, demands that proper credit be given. For data accessibility and replication standards to be met, recognition must be given to those whose work we depend on. We advocate establishing a policy of recognition to the original scholars, which is often not given. Specifically, proper citation of the person or persons who collected the data and their scholarly work is essential in secondary data analysis and publication. Often, the theoretical and empirical starting point of one's secondary research is the work by prior scholars who should, therefore, be cited. The names of scholars who make replication data sets available could be published in APSA section newsletters or *PS* as an additional incentive to help establish the norms. The potential payoffs from such norms are significant.

We are grateful to King and Herrnson for engaging the discipline in this debate, especially because the growth of data sets and personal computers has made it inevitable that we would find ourselves confronting these issues. And especially for those who receive scarce public funding resources, archiving their data should be part of their professional obligation. This debate makes it clear that a data policy will be difficult to formulate. Our contribution is simply that if we wish to enhance scholarship and the flow and exchange of ideas through a data accessibility policy, it should be formalized.

References

Herrnson, Paul. 1995. "Replication, Verification, Secondary Analysis, and Data Collection in Political Science." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 28(3):452–455.

King, Gary. 1995. "Replication, Replication." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 28(3):444–452.

Groner, Jonathan. 1993. "Dispute Over Sacred Scrolls Lands in U.S. Court: Who Owns Text About the Torah?" *Legal Times* (September 20):2.

Nagler, Jonathan. 1995. "Coding Style and Good Computing Practices." *The Political Methodologist* 6(2):2–8.

Sheatsley, Paul B. and Warren J. Mitofsky. 1992. *A Meeting Place*. New York: American Association for Public Opinion Research.

About the Authors

Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier is assistant professor of political science at Ohio State University. Her research interests focus on legislative politics; her publications include those published in *Political Analysis*, and the *American Journal of Political Science*.

Katherine Tate is associate professor of political science and is the principal investigator of the 1996 National Black Election Study to be conducted at Ohio State University.