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COLLABORATORS WITH DIVERSE PERSPECTIVES
## CHANGING FACE OF POLITICAL SCIENCE: NEW METHODS*

### Average Rate of Publication*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Laboratory</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980*</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000s</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010+</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>19.25</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CASE 1: CORRUPTION IN BRAZILIAN ELECTIONS

American researchers, using US research dollars, are conducting illegal research sending illegal campaign messages to unconsenting subjects in Brazil.
CASE 2: CORRUPTION IN MEXICAN POLICE

US scholars, using US money, are committing crimes and bribing police officers in foreign nations.

Figure 1: Crossroad Schematic
Note: Authors’ illustration; depicts one of the traffic patterns commonly encountered.

CHANGING FACE OF POLITICAL SCIENCE: NEW ETHICAL PROBLEMS

- Informed consent
- Deception
- Harm
- Exploitation
- Third party standing
- Sacred rituals
- Internationally sponsored studies

- Regulatory mechanisms
- Risk to researchers and staff
- Professional standards and codes
- RCR education
LOCAL REVIEW AND PERMITS

• Many countries regulate research and require:
  • Local review and approval of studies
  • A permit for the researcher
• National laws that apply to all research
• Anecdotal evidence indicates that political scientists are ignoring these laws
(LACK OF) ACCOUNTABILITY

Compliance with local permit and review laws is not required by:

- Most funding agencies
- Most institutional IRBs
- Most journals in the discipline
- Professional code of ethics (APSA)
Disclosure of compliance with local review and permit laws:

- Not required by journals
- Not happening voluntarily
- Not discussed
Many political scientists justify skipping local review and permits because:

- Not required by funding agencies or IRBS
- Foreign IRBs might be corrupt or incompetent
- Permits sometimes appear to be bribes
- Perceptions of peer behavior and leveling the playing field
THREE EXAMPLES

- China
  - May not approve pro-democracy or threatening research
  - Only research that is compatible with the regime’s interests is likely to be allowed

- Brazil
  - Clear but very slow IRB procedures
  - Almost no one is following Brazil’s rules

- Malawi
  - Clear and straightforward procedures
  - Hire their staff and pay 10% of your research budget
PROBLEMS

Why skipping local review and permits might be problematic:

- Risks to subjects
- Risks to other stakeholders
- Double standards and hypocrisy
MOVING FORWARD

- American political science association ad hoc committee on human subjects research
- Rewriting the human subjects research section of the “code of ethics”
- Phillips and Desposato, chairs
- Very specific charge
- Hoping to start broader conversation
QUESTIONS?
CASE 3: MONTANA STUDY

Stanford and Dartmouth scholars conducted illegal research during an election in Montana.
2014 Montana General Election
Voter Information Guide
Election Date: November 4, 2014

Nonpartisan Supreme Court
Justice #1 Race

More Liberal
Barack Obama
Jim Rice
W. David Herbert

More Conservative
Mitt Romney

Nonpartisan Supreme Court
Justice #2 Race

More Liberal
Barack Obama
Mike Wheat

More Conservative
Mitt Romney
Lawrence VanDyke

For more information on how these figures were created, please see http://data.stanford.edu/dime. Please note that this guide is non-partisan and does not endorse a candidate or party. This guide was created as part of a joint research project at Stanford and Dartmouth.

Take this to the polls!