# Positionality and Bias Template

General guidance:

* Use these questions to guide reflections
* Reflection should be iterative and on-going, rather than post-hoc
* Consider stakeholder positionality
* Use these questions to develop a positionality and bias document. Primarily use this document to guide internal reflections. For additional transparency, publish (components of) the document in academic articles.
* Ensure that reflections do not become perfunctory

| **Theme** | **Reflection prompts** | **Reflections** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Positionality | * What are the **backgrounds and identities** of the modeler(s) and stakeholders? (e.g., race, ethnicity, class, gender, education, upbringing, political beliefs)
* How might these identities have influenced how the modeler(s) and stakeholders **approach research**? (e.g., worldview, epistemology, objectives)
* **How do these identities relate** to the participants and/or context of the research? (e.g., in what ways are the modelers/stakeholders insiders or outsiders? Are there power imbalances?)
 |  |
| 2. Framing | * What **narratives** underlie the formulation of the problem or research questions? What kinds of **solutions** do these narratives invite? What are the principal entities and **actors** in these narratives?
* What might be **missing** from this framing? Which groups might be **(dis)advantaged** by this framing? **Who has decided** about this framing?
* What **theories** and/or relationships is the conceptual model predicated on? If relevant, are there alternative understandings?
 |  |
| 3. Inputs | * Who has decided about **which information is relevant** for the simulation? If information was excluded, why?
* How could data (e.g., for model inputs, calibration, or validation) represent or mask **historical patterns or drivers of inequity**?
* If relevant, how could the **process of data collection** have perpetuated inequity?
 |  |
| 4. Quantification | * What model variables are **subjective or latent constructs**? What alternative interpretations of these exist?
* Could the **inclusion/exclusion of model processes** misrepresent or lead to bias against certain groups?
 |  |
| 5. Interpretation | * Who **interpreted** the model outputs? How could **pre-conceived understandings or objectives** have biased model interpretations or conclusions?
* How does the interpretation relate to the original **model purpose**?
* Considering any limitations revealed in the above reflections, could there be **alternative interpretations** of model outputs?
* How are model outputs **communicated**, and to whom? Can key stakeholders access and understand the modeling results?
 |  |