

Committee on Professional Ethics

The report of this committee consists of four Advisory Opinions.

Advisory Opinion No. 2 (October 11, 1969)

Open Access to Documentation and Data

The Committee considered a proposal by Milton Lodge: "that a condition of publication of quantitative articles in the *American Political Science Review* be that authors agree to make available to all interested scholars all the data directly related to the published study."

Though not endorsing the proposal as stated, the Committee recommended the following principles with regard to the obligations of authors:

"1. Authors are obliged to reveal the bases of any of their statements that are challenged specifically, except where confidentiality is involved.

"2. When statements that are challenged are based on reproducible data, authors are obliged to facilitate replication. They may expect the challenger to pay the costs of reproducing the relevant data.

"3. Challenges are to be sufficiently precise to indicate to the author what documentation or data are needed. Challengers are themselves in the status of authors in connection with the statements that they make."

The above constitutes Advisory Opinion No. 2 of the Committee.

In addition, the Committee recommended that funding agencies should hereafter include in grants a stipulation that data gathered under the grants be made available to scholars at cost after a specified time, e.g., after a year has passed following the completion of the data-gathering process, or after the first substantial research report by the chief researcher has been completed.

The Committee made no recommendation concerning sanctioning measures that might be applied to reinforce the principles contained in its advisory opinion.

Advisory Opinion No. 3 (October 11, 1969)

Permissions to Reprint

The Committee considered ethical principles relating to permissions to reprint copyrighted material. Herbert Jacob submitted the matter to the committee, and both Lewis J. Edinger and Herbert McClosky had raised questions concerning it in letters to the national office.

Specifically with regard to the reprinting of articles in books of readings published commercially, the Committee endorsed the following principles:

"1. The copyright holder should permit the inclusion of material in books of readings only if the author consents. The copyright holder should either obtain the consent of the author himself or require that this be done by the party seeking permission to reprint.

"2. The copyright holder and the author are each entitled to a flat fee or a share of royalties in connection with permissions to reprint, specific terms depending on agreement with the party seeking permission. Either the copyright holder or the author may waive his rights. Each may act on his own behalf, or by mutual consent one may act on behalf of both.

"3. Permissions must be renewed, and financial arrangements are subject to renegotiation, whenever a book goes into a new edition.

"4. Any work reprinted may be changed only with the specific consent of the author.

"5. An author is entitled to a complimentary copy of any publication in which his work is reprinted.

The above constitutes Advisory Opinion No. 3 of the Committee (October 11, 1969).

Advisory Opinion No. 4 (October 11, 1969)

The Academic Marketplace

The Committee considered several questions relating to the recruitment of faculty members, posed by a party who requested anonymity.

The Committee endorsed the following principles:

"1. Once an employing institution clearly indicates that it is giving serious consideration to an applicant for a faculty appointment, e.g., by interviewing him, it should inform him of the status of his application within a reasonable time.

"2. *Once an employing institution offers a faculty appointment, the individual to whom the offer is made should respond within a reasonable time either with his decision or with a statement concerning his situation.*

"3. *In connection with points 1 and 2 above, two weeks is to be considered a reasonable time unless the parties specifically agree to the contrary.*

"4. An employing institution that offers a faculty appointment orally should immediately communicate the offer in writing as well."

The above constitutes Advisory Opinion No. 4 of the Committee (October 11, 1969).

The Committee declined to endorse the view that it is improper for those interviewing an applicant to ask whether he is being considered elsewhere or whether he has received offers from other schools.

Advisory Opinion No. 5 (October 11, 1969)

Appraising Manuscripts and Reviewing Books

The Committee considered the problem of fairness and objectivity in connection with the appraisal of manuscripts and the reviewing of books. One aspect of the problem was submitted to the committee by Thomas Blau.

The Committee endorsed the following statement:

"Appraising manuscripts and reviewing books is a serious scholarly responsibility. Those invited to make appraisals or to write reviews should disqualify themselves if there is in their minds reasonable basis for doubt whether they can exercise the responsibility with scholarly detachment. Such doubt might be raised, for example, by an invitation to appraise the manuscript or review the book of a close personal friend or of a departmental colleague.

"In so far as possible, editors and book review editors should themselves act in conformity with the above principles. Moreover, in connection with the appraisal of manuscripts, editors should take all reasonable precautions to avoid revealing the names of the author and the reader to each other."

The above constitutes Advisory Opinion No. 5 of the Committee (October 11, 1969).