and will have a larger demonstration effect. The repository will also be epistemically neutral—viewed broadly as a means of increasing the transparency of the evidentiary basis for interpretive, descriptive, or explanatory work based on qualitative data—and designed to be visible to, and open to communication and interaction with, a wide audience. And of course, as an electronic resource, the repository will be linked to the broad range of existing institution-specific and specialized archives that already exist.

Qualitative research makes vital contributions to political science, and qualitative data archiving holds the key to making qualitative and multi-method research more transparent and more replicable. Moreover, sharing allows data to be used as a basis for further research, and encourages scholars to engage in secondary data analysis, opening up a range of new research possibilities, including cross-temporal and cross-context comparison. Of course, as occurs whenever new practices may be adopted, the challenges and risks of sharing and reusing qualitative data must be carefully considered and addressed. Nonetheless, those challenges may prove to be relatively minor in comparison with the tremendous utility that sharing and reusing qualitative data can provide.

Notes

[1] This piece draws extensively on an article that appeared in the January 2010 issue of *PS*, co-authored with Colin Elman and Lorena Vinuela. I would also like to thank the broader set of scholars who participated in a workshop convened to explore the idea of building a qualitative data repository held March 28–29, 2009, at Syracuse University (funded by NSF Grant SES 0838716).

[2] For instance, funding agencies in several OECD countries adopted a mandatory sharing policy for grant holders in the 1990s, and the repositories constructed as a result receive regular deposits on a national scale and hold a wide range of qualitative materials. Some examples include QUALIDATA in the UK, WISDOM in Austria, SDA of the Czech Republic, DDA of Denmark, FSD in Finland, Réseau Quetelet in France, GSDB-EKKE in Greece, GESIS in Germany, ADPSS Sociodata in Italy, CEPS in Luxembourg, DANS in the Netherlands, NSD in Norway, ARCES/CIS in Spain, and SND in Sweden.

[3] To be sure, several university libraries and research institutions have archives for data collected by their affiliated researchers and the facilities to archive digitalized text and audio material. Nevertheless, in the American academy the overwhelming focus is on archiving quantitative data, or on quantitative redactions of qualitative data.

[4] The project has been funded by NSF Grant SES 1061292.

[5] For example, some data may be made available for online use by any registered scholar while other data may be kept in non-networked storage to be accessed only in person at the repository with the depositor's (and if need be, the original source's) permission and in accordance with explicit data-sharing agreements.

[6] The American Political Science Association's *A Guide to Professional Ethics in Political Science* (2008) envisions non-release as the default—except when funder mandates or challenges to findings trigger release. Although the guide establishes a general heuristic requirement to disclose non-confidential sources for replication and testing, it does not specify whether "sources" refers to the identity of interviewees or to data.

[7] Most political science journals that have data-release policies either explicitly or implicitly limit those mandates to statistical data.

References

American Political Science Association. 2008. *A Guide to Professional Ethics in Political Science*, 2nd ed. Washington: American Political Science Association.

Brady, Henry and David Collier, eds. 2010. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*, 2nd ed. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

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.

Corti, Louise, Janet Foster, and Paul Thompson. 1995. "Archiving Qualitative Research Data." *Social Research Update* 10 (Autumn), http://sru.soc.surrey.ac.uk/SRU10.html.

Elman, Colin, Diana Kapiszewski, and Lorena Vinuela. 2010. "Qualitative Data Archiving: Rewards and Challenges." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 43:1 (January), 23–27.

Heaton, Janet. 2004. *Reworking Qualitative Data*. London: Sage Publications.

Mauthner, Natasha S., Odette Parry, and Kathryn Backett-Milburn. 1998. "The Data Are Out There, or Are They? Implications for Archiving and Revisiting Qualitative Data." *Sociology* 32 (November), 733–745.

Moravcsik, Andrew. 2010. "Active Citation: A Precondition for Replicable Qualitative Research." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 43:1 (January), 29–35.

Parry, Odette and Natasha S. Mauthner. 2004. "Whose Data Are They Anyway? Practical, Legal and Ethical Issues in Archiving Qualitative Research Data." *Sociology* 38 (February): 139–152.

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-%20final.pdf.

Active Citation and Qualitative Political Science

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.917652

Andrew Moravcsik
Princeton University
amoravcs@princeton.edu

This article presents a proposal for the adoption of "active citation," together with a discussion of why it is necessary, its possible advantages, and some potential concerns.[1] Active citation envisages the use of rigorous, annotated citations hyperlinked to the sources themselves. The goal is to provide opportunities for scholars to be rewarded not just for more rigorous but also for richer and more diverse qualitative scholarship.

The Problem: The Evidence in Qualitative Research Remains Invisible

Qualitative research dominates political science. While the use of statistical and formal methods is spreading, historical, qualitative, or textual research remains strong. In the field

of international relations, for example, roughly 70% of scholars still primarily conduct qualitative research, compared with 21% chiefly favoring formal or statistical analysis.[2] Hardly any major political science debate remains untouched by important qualitative contributions. Yet this underestimates the impact. Since nearly all quantitative scholars make secondary use of textual methods, overall *over 90% of scholars* employ qualitative analysis, whereas only 48% use any statistical and only 12% any formal methods. And still this understates the impact, because many statistical data sets rest ultimately on historical and textual analysis.[3] Were that not enough, when we look to academia's impact on the world, qualitative case studies are reported to be more relevant for policy than quantitative or formal work.[4]

Despite the importance of qualitative case studies to political science, the textual evidence on which they rest remains largely invisible.[5] To be sure, footnoting practices formally require that authors specify where they found documentary support for controversial empirical claims. Yet the resulting citations would only frustrate most readers who seek to track the evidence. Some scholars may simply seek to trace the causal process in order to better understand it. Others may want to criticize or challenge the argument. Still others may wish to know whether well-known standards of unbiased qualitative causal inference (e.g., process-tracing, case selection, primary source selection, etc.) were adhered to. Some may seek to improve and supersede the empirical findings. Others may seek to do secondary analysis, pooling the data into larger sets. Access to the textual evidence may serve unrelated scholarly purposes. More interpretive scholars less concerned with causality may seek more direct and unmediated appreciation for the subjective experiences and the plurality of voices in the past and present.

Nearly all scholars, no matter what their preferred method or epistemology, believe that the ability of scholars to engage in the activities above is essential to healthy scholarship. Yet none is likely to be possible with contemporary qualitative political science, because of the way it presents and manipulates textual evidence. This is so for three basic reasons.

First, citations in political science are sometimes frustratingly imprecise. It is not uncommon for scholars in political science to back a claim with a simple citation to an article, chapter, or book, without page numbers or other specific reference. This would not be permitted in other, more textually self-conscious disciplines, since it effectively precludes the reader from linking concrete evidence to a general claim.

Second, citations often lack a specific quotation or annotation illustrating exactly how and why the citation supports the textual point. This is in part due to the fact that political science has never developed such practices, which are common in academic history and mandatory in legal academia. This tendency toward vagueness has been exacerbated recently in articles and books by ever tighter word limits and the spread of "scientific" citation forms designed for fields in which every citation is to another secondary social scientific article. These are manifestly inappropriate for qualitative research, because they preclude minimally rigorous explanation of primary textual evidence and its relationship to interpretations of events.

Third and even more important, even when political science citations are precise and elaborated, readers often find it prohibitively expensive (in time and money) to view the evidence underlying interpretations and empirical claims. In theory, of course, the reader can simply "check the source." Yet, in practice, this is possible only a small percentage of the time.[6] If the reader is lucky, the claim can be checked using an online source, such as an electronic newspaper and journal collection, government document archive, or a secondary source reproduced in Google Scholar. Yet original points in almost all major works of empirical consequence rest primarily on other sources. At best, such sources might be published secondary books. Locating and reading these is likely to require that the reader access numerous libraries. For international work, this could well be in several jurisdictions, various countries or more than one language. More likely, serious qualitative research in political science rests, to a substantial extent, on collections of informal publications, archival material, interviews, participant-observation or ethnographic observation notes, that are available only locally. These may be subject to human subject and proprietary concerns, may also be in a foreign language, or make take the form of notes, tapes, scans, or photocopies.

Any scholar who seeks to understand, replicate, criticize, or build on an article or book by following its evidence is, more often than not, effectively precluded from doing so. Simply reassembling the sources cited in an article about politics could well require a research commitment that resembles in scale that of the original author. Alternatively, one could ask the author for the evidence—but it is unclear why or how most authors could comply with such requests. The result: It is extremely rare for the quality or veracity of textual evidence, or its connection to argument, to be challenged, let alone for political scientists to replicate, improve, extend, or reuse qualitative evidence.

This stifles opportunities for debate, diversity, and progress in qualitative political science. To see why, compare this to the situation prevailing in quantitative (statistical) political science. Much work rests on publicly available datasets, and a norm exists whereby new datasets are made public. To be sure, many scholars believe quantitative work might also benefit by improving transparency. Yet it has advanced far enough that findings can and are often replicated and extended, and data is used for secondary purposes. Indeed, a common first-semester exercise in political science statistics courses is to replicate a major article and then extend it by adding data from another source. Such an exercise is unheard of in historical and qualitative areas of political science. Indeed, because of its lack of transparency, unclear standards, and resulting insulation from challenge, qualitative political science (despite its lower technical and training demands) has gained an aura of aloofness and elitism among many graduate students.

Good reasons exist to believe that the quality, rigor, richness and future attractiveness of non-quantitative political science within political science rests in large part on improving the management of textual evidence in such a way as to make

it more easily and broadly available to the research community of qualitative scholars.

The Proposal: Active Citation

One way to overcome the prohibitive cost of accessing qualitative information is to establish a universal standard that assures transparency and replicability in selection, presentation, and preservation of textual evidence. The standard proposed here is *active citation*: the use of *rigorous, annotated citations hyperlinked to the sources themselves*. This proposal seeks to exploit new technologies to generalize to political science the best practices in history, law, sociology, and the natural sciences with regard to the presentation of evidence. The proposal rests on three general principles.

1. Precision: Any critical and contested substantive empirical claim in a qualitative case study must be backed by a citation to one or more concrete sources. The citation should be precise enough to unambiguously identify the page(s) and passage(s) of the source that backs the claim. Such sources may be unpublished primary sources, published primary sources, primary sources cited in secondary sources, secondary sources, research materials, or other evidence. While normally textual sources are envisaged, there is no reason—modern technology being as it is—why visual, graphical, photographic, audio and other materials could not be inserted.

2. Annotation: The citation should be annotated to explain precisely how the source supports the textual claim, and informing the reader of any contextual information essential to an interpretation of the source text.

3. Transparency: Each citation to a controversial empirical claim would contain a hypertext link (within the document) to a reproduction or transcript of the source material in context. This will appear (in order of citation) in an Appendix, which would appear in electronic versions of journal articles, in unpublished papers, and in parallel electronic versions of the notes of scholarly books that only appear in hard copy. Normally this contextual source material will comprise a presumptive minimum one to two paragraphs, or around 100 words, but this total may vary by circumstance.

How would active citation appear in practice? The footnote, endnote, or in-text note would contain a precise citation. It would appear much as citations do currently, though there would be a firm expectation that it be complete. On the hard-copy version of most political science articles, where that is all one sees, the article would thus appear unchanged from what appears today. On an electronic version, however, that citation would be hyperlinked to an excerpt from the corresponding source, which would be found in an appendix to the document, listed with other sources in order of citation. The third element, the annotation, could appear in the appendix with (immediately preceding) the corresponding source material, or in the footnote, if that is compatible with the format of the journal or book. The latter is preferable, common in historical journals, and almost universal in legal journals—but journal and book editors would be free to retain current practices in this regard.[7] Whatever the precise formatting choices, the common result would be that, when reading the electronic version, a reader could:

(a) access and read the source in real time with one click, and return to the text with one click;

(b) procure a complete list of all the cited sources (on controversial empirical points), in order of citation, by simply copying the appendix.

This format can be approximated by manipulating existing commands in commonly-employed word processing programs (e.g., Word, Latex), but within a relatively short period a team of us working on the issue expect to develop specific software that will streamline the process.

By adopting active citation, political science would approximate the standards normally expected in academic disciplines where textual analysis and interpretation, and research transparency, are more refined and rigorous than in political science. Legal scholars who publish in law reviews and journals are accustomed to reading articles with precise and complete footnotes, with annotation and quotations to specify why they support the claim, and hyperlinks to any available sources.[8] One difference here—largely for intellectual property and human subject protection reasons, as well as logistical ones—is that the presumptive standard will be that linked sources are excerpted and included in an appendix to the article, rather than cited extensively, included in long footnotes, or left as hyperlinks. In history, similarly, footnotes are precise and often more extensively annotated, including quotations. By actively employing the appendix to reveal data and analysis, the criteria proposed here also resemble standard practice in natural science journals today, where relatively short articles are followed by often extensive "Supplementary Materials" sections containing data, experimental results, charts, further analysis, background, video, spreadsheets, etc.[9]

The Advantages: Promoting and Rewarding Qualitative Research

Active citation promises to improve qualitative political science in four main ways. Most obviously, it would encourage and reward higher-quality scholarship. Researchers who face an immediate requirement of precise, annotated transparency will be motivated to carry out data collection and analysis in a more careful, systematic, and replicable way, and to report the precise empirical basis of empirical claims they advance. Greater transparency and replicability would help unleash the full potential of analytic narratives, fine-grained process-tracing methods, and strategic case selection. Scholars will face greater incentives to improve their qualitative methodological skills. When proper adherence to such methodological standards becomes a transparent act that others can observe and evaluate, expert use of the method and superior qualitative data collection can be properly recognized and rewarded within the profession—which does not occur often today. In addition, virtues such 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, may well increase in importance.

While active citation encourages more careful research, it will also empower critics. By revealing evidence at a single click, active citation would democratize the field, letting new and critical voices be heard. Any potential critic could make an immediate assessment of the evidence for empirical claims and its relationship to the research design, theory, and method. A graduate student anywhere in the world would require but an afternoon to decide if a published qualitative argument is *prima facie* plausible. Flaws like selective citation, poor use of sources, or contextually inappropriate interpretation would become far easier to document. Livelier and more engaged scholarly debate—in the form of criticism, replication ("research auditing"), and review essays—would be encouraged.

Active citation would likely also encourage more "secondary" analysis of qualitative evidence, that is, the use of textual evidence for alternative purposes. Today most qualitative political scientists start essentially from scratch.[10] This stands in striking contrast to quantitative studies, where each scholar can build on previous data-collection efforts, and the pool of data expands over time. Active citation would erase this imbalance. Much of the evidence of existing scholars, in electronic form, would already be available to fresh students and scholars entering a field, who would have a greater incentive to collect new evidence—since secondary analysis would only need to provide a *marginal* increment of new evidence to make an original contribution. The mark of a healthy scientific research tradition is precisely that over time debate encourages *ever increasing amounts of data* to be revealed in this way.[11] The expanding network of available data could also facilitate meta-analysis, in which comparative analysis of similar situations in various settings (e.g., countries, issues, time periods) could be conducted using different evidence/data, perhaps with addition of new sources provided by the investigator. Declining start-up costs for each new scholar working on a topic would encourage new scholars to join the "club" by contributing new data, just as combining pre-existing statistical data sets with new data reduces the costs of doing quantitative work on existing topics.

Finally, active citation may well encourage more intensive interdisciplinary interaction. Placing qualitative political science on a more transparent foundation would open debates to a wider range of voices, interpretations, and perspectives, including an expansion of opportunities for interdisciplinary interaction. Certain branches of law, history, and sociology, we have seen, employ higher qualitative research standards with regard to citing, documenting, and presenting evidence than those that currently prevail in political science. Creating incentives for political scientists to engage legal and historical scholars may encourage the formation of an interdisciplinary critical mass employing similar methods, standards, and evidence.

The Concerns: A Word to Potential Critics

Some may worry that active citation places an excessive logistical burden on scholars, journal editors, or publishers; that it is inconsistent with appropriate intellectual property rights for scholars to exploit evidence they have uncovered; that it would lead to free riding by those who do not actually collect evidence. I have answered these criticisms elsewhere.[12] For the most part, I find them without much substance—in part because other disciplines have adopted similar practices without ill consequences. Where there are legitimate costs and concerns involved in adopting this proposal, they are almost certainly outweighed by the individual and collective advantages for qualitative scholars of all types, and the profession as a whole.

In an earlier proposal, I took special care to engage colleagues concerned that active citation may, by its very nature, encourage research that does violence to the specific historical ideological, cultural, personal, and gendered context in which researchers and research subjects interact. Some among historians, ethnographers, and non-positivist political scientists view the interpretation of sources as a fundamentally reflexive or hermeneutical process, with much "local knowledge," contextual understanding, deep expertise, creativity, and hermeneutical interaction required to grasp meaning. They may believe that the proliferation of one to two paragraph snippets, even with annotation, would encourage a superficial, even positivistic, understanding of textual evidence. For this reason, one can imagine some preferring that scholarly debates remain restricted to a small number of insiders, as they are today, even with the resulting costs in scholarly quality and anti-democratic hierarchy. Others may believe that the notion of transparency, replication, and rigor that underlie some of the advantages of active citation are too positivistic in spirit for their taste. These are important consideration for many, and they should be taken seriously.[13]

Still, on balance, I believe active citation is likely to constitute an improvement over current practices, not just for those who view qualitative methods as a way of evaluating causal claims, but for those who view such methods as a way to describe, interpret, critique, or engage the past—whether in a traditional historical, area studies, interpretivist, constructivist or post-modern vein. Indeed, such scholars may well benefit the most from a broadening of professional norms foreseen by active citation. This is true in part simply because active citation aims to strengthen qualitative social science across the board, which is the method most such scholars employ. Moreover, active citation promises to validate scholarly virtues of hermeneutical subtlety, contextual understanding, and (inter-) cultural literacy in which such scholars excel—and ultimately expand the community of those who practice them.

In these ways, active citation does not promise simply to improve the rigor of research, but also its richness. It can help expand the range of evidence being considered; increase the number of plural, multiple, and conflicting voices qualitative social science can capture; extend the depth and intensify the immediacy of engagement with new cultural and textual materials; enlarge the contextual variety of descriptions and interpretations scholars can advance; and multiply the voices in the scholarly community empowered to engage in scholarly debates. In all these ways, active citation can be understood as a way of transforming traditional hierarchies of control and

publication into an open virtual network, in which new and plural streams of evidence and interpretation, narratives, and debates can emerge—while still imposing discursive rules that require some substantial commitment from serious participants in the scholarly debate, and permit others to voice their objections. Hence all qualitative scholars concerned with texts—whether committed to causality in a conventional sense, traditional historians, and ethnographers, or interpretivist, constructivist, or post-modern in inclination—should welcome such a trend.

Notes

[1] This discussion builds on a previous article. Andrew Moravcsik, "Active Citation: A Precondition for Replicable Qualitative Research," *PS: Political Science and Politics* 43:1 (January 2010), 29–35.

[2] Richard Jordan, Daniel Maliniak, Amy Oakes, Susan Peterson, and Michael J. Tierney. 2009. "One Discipline or Many? TRIP Survey of International Relations Faculty in Ten Countries." Teaching, Research, and International Policy (TRIP) Project, Institute for the Theory and Practice of International Relations, The College of William and Mary, http://irtheoryandpractice.wm.edu/projects/trip/Final_Trip_Report2009.pdf.

[3] See, for example, the MIDipedia project led by Michael Tomz and Jessica Weeks, which aims to use historical research to overcome persistent coding problems in the widely-used COW (Correlates of War) dataset.

[4] Jordan et al. (2009).

[5] I have written this essay using "textual" evidence as the standard example, which it remains in the field. However, all the arguments apply equally to visual, audio, graphical, and any other multi-media materials that can be stored electronically.

[6] The exceptions tend to be work within regional studies defined by particular geographical areas. There small communities of scholars exploit local interpretive knowledge, linguistic skills, and a more familiar body of sources, functioning similarly to historians. Another exceptional category contains work in which political scientists recapitulate positions and sources from preexisting historical literature—as in the debate in security studies over the causes of World War I. Keir A. Lieber, "The New History of World War I and What It Means for International Relations Theory." *International Security* 32:2 (2007), 155–191.

[7] An example and a protocol can be found on line at www.princeton.edu/~amoravcs.

[8] See, for example, the *Yale Law Journal* online, accessible through http://yalelawjournal.org/.

[9] See, for example, articles in *Nature* (http://www.nature.com/) or *Science* (http://www.sciencemag.org).

[10] "Most data generated by American qualitative and multi-method social science are used only once." Colin Elman, Diana Kapiszewski and Lorena Vinuela, "Qualitative Data Archiving: Rewards and Challenges." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 43:1 (January 2010), 23.

[11] For healthy examples in international relations, against the odds, see, e.g., Jack S. Levy, Thomas J. Christensen, and Marc Trachtenberg, "Correspondence: Mobilization and Inadvertence in the July Crisis." *International Security* 16:1 (1991), 189–203.

[12] Moravcsik, "Active Citation," 33–34.

[13] This is of particular concern to me, since I am trained as a historian and work across several academic disciplines, conduct area studies research requiring local cultural knowledge, have served as a policy-maker in very diverse cultural contexts, and would like to see a broader range of views expressed in academic debates.

Undergraduate Scope and Methods Courses: Is There Room for Qualitative Methods?

Cameron G. Thies
University of Iowa
cameron-thies@uiowa.edu

The debate over methodology in the discipline has shifted in remarkable ways within the last decade. Qualitative analysis, which used to be perceived as representative of old-fashioned or even empirically sloppy work by its detractors, has now regained a respected role in causal and interpretive political science. Mixed method research that combines formal or statistical models with small-N studies is almost expected of graduate students producing dissertations in many departments. Advances in qualitative methodologies have furthered the goal of identifying causal mechanisms for those pursuing this type of work. The foundations of political inquiry in general have been strengthened by renewed attention to qualitative methods, much of which has been fostered by the Consortium for Qualitative Research Methods (CQRM) and the faculty and graduate students that have come to create such a vibrant community of scholars.

It is very apparent that rigorous qualitative methods courses are increasingly taught in the graduate curriculum of departments around the world, as well as through summer training institutes like IQRM. But, has any of this renewed rigor and systematization of qualitative methods reached our undergraduates? Let me review the results of some of my work documenting our profession's practice in Scope and Methods courses to help us assess the current state of qualitative methods training for undergraduates. I find that while qualitative methods are taught with some regularity, there is still much work to do to incorporate them into the undergraduate Scope and Methods course. I conclude with some practical suggestions toward that end.

What Do We Know about Scope and Methods Courses?

When I was an assistant professor at Louisiana State University, my colleagues and I were involved in discussions about requiring a Scope and Methods course for our undergraduates. The assistant professors all thought we should absolutely have such a course, while many (though not all) of our senior colleagues were adamantly opposed to such a curricular intervention. Each side in the debate had plenty of anecdotal evidence to support its position, which led fellow assistant professor Robert Hogan and me to design and field a survey of Political Science departments in 2003. We wanted to know how many, and what types of, departments required Scope and Methods courses. The results of this survey were published in an article in *PS: Political Science and Politics* in 2005.[1]

As soon as we had compiled the results, we recognized the source of our competing anecdotal claims about the preva-