

RESEARCH COLLOQUIUM IN POLITICAL SCIENCE
 SPRING 2011

Gov. 391R, #39240
 T., 12:30-3:15
 Batts 1.104

Catherine Boone, Batts 3.128
 office hours: Th., 11-2
 or by appointment
 cboone@mail.utexas.edu

Course Description:

This course is targeted at graduate students in all empirical sub-fields of Political Science who are working on dissertation proposals, doctoral or post-doctoral grant proposals, and dissertation introductory chapters. It is designed to provide students with guidance, structure, and feedback that will help them to frame and execute well-specified and coherent research projects. The seminar offers its members an opportunity to work through their ideas and test their arguments in an informal and collegial setting.

The semester will involve three types of research-related activity. First, you will work on your own proposal by brainstorming and honing major elements of your project design. We'll walk you through a series of assigned readings and writing assignments designed to help you specify a good research problem, good hypotheses, and viable operationalizations of your problem. In these parts of the course, KKV and Brady and Collier et al. will not "lecture to you" (ie., you will not read their work passively); instead, they will be your critics and tutors -- you will expand upon and revise your work in response to their suggestions and critiques. Second, we discuss the logic and strategy of proposal/prospectus writing. This aspect of the course will center on assigned readings that highlight generic features of solid proposals, general principles of proposal writing, and some problems that are easy pitfalls in this endeavor. We will also review a collection of social-science research proposals that are available in the public domain. A third major activity is critical, constructive reflection upon the work of other seminar members. You will learn a lot about Political Science, research design, and social science epistemology by working through the proposals of your colleagues.

Your main product for this class will be a 10-12 page draft of a research proposal.

Students are encouraged to keep possible dissertation supervisors or key committee members in the loop. You need to confer regularly with these advisors about topic selection and research design. Plan to discuss the work you are doing in this class at least twice over the course of the semester with one or two key faculty members in your subfield.

Grading:

All members of the seminar will register on a CR/NC basis. You must complete all course requirements, including attending class meetings, to receive credit.

Texts: These books have been ordered for this class:

- Stephen van Evera, *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science* (Cornell, most recent ed.)
- Gary King, Robert Keohane, and Sidney Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry* (Princeton, 1994)
- Henry Brady and David Collier, *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards* (Rowen and Littlefield, 2004).
- Alexander George and Andrew Bennett, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences* (MIT Press, 2005)

Additional Readings:

Additional course readings is available on our course Bb site. These readings are marked by a star (*) on the syllabus.

Websites that we will use this semester include:

UT Intellectual Entrepreneurship Dissertation Resources:
<https://webpace.utexas.edu/cherwitz/www/ie/disslist.html>

Don Thackrey, *University of Michigan Proposal Writer's Guide (PWG)*, 2009, at "Research Administration: The University of Michigan," at <http://www.drda.umich.edu/proposals/pwg/pwgcontents.html>

Massachusetts Institute of Technology Artificial Intelligence Lab, "How to do research at the MIT AI Lab," AI Working Paper 316, Oct. 1988, at <http://www.cs.indiana.edu/mit.research.how.to/mit.research.how.to.html>.

NSF, SBE Sciences, SBE Doctoral Dissertation Research Improvement Grants, overview and guidelines: <http://www.nsf.gov/sbe/ses/polisci/ddripl.jsp>

Sample Dissertation Proposals are available at

APSA small grants webpage at http://www.apsanet.org/content_9224.cfm

University of California at Berkeley, Institute of International Studies, Dissertation Proposal Workshop, at <http://globetrotter.berkeley.edu/DissPropWorkshop/>. There are five proposals at <http://globetrotter.berkeley.edu/DissPropWorkshop/examples/>

The UT Intellectual Entrepreneurship Dissertation Resources site:
https://webpace.utexas.edu/cherwitz/www/ie/sample_diss.html.

NSF/SBE Sciences, Geography and Spatial Sciences Proposal Samples: Doctoral Dissertation Research, at <http://www.nsf.gov/sbe/bcs/grs/propsamples.jsp> (includes NSF Peluso Sample Proposal, "Washing Ashore: Offshore Oil Production and Corporate Sponsored Development in Angola," <http://www.nsf.gov/sbe/bcs/grs/Peluso-SampleProposal.htm>, and Grissino-Mayer proposal.)

NSF:SBE/BCS/Cultural Anthropology - Sample Proposal in cultural anthropology: Lockwood and Weinstein, "Temporary Male Outmigration and Changing Gender Roles in Yucatan, Mexico."

Course Requirements:

Everyone is expected to participate in seminar meetings. A special premium must be placed on participating in sessions devoted to the work of other students.

Your work for this class will consist of six assignments that involve brainstorming or drafting the project proposal, AND a series of weekly, written responses to readings or other prompts on the syllabus. You should show-up in class with these weekly written responses -- we will discuss and sometimes circulate them in class. The general rule is that you will be preparing *something* for class every week.

Here is the list of assignments that involve proposal brainstorming or drafting:

Assignment #1 is due on T., Feb. 1. See p. 6 of this syllabus, "Exercise #1: Empirical and Theoretical Questions."

Assignment #2 is due on T., March 1. See p. 7, "Exercise #2: Empirical Investigation of a Research Question."

Assignment #3 is the draft thesis proposal (10 pages). It is due on T., March 29.

Assignment #4 is a 500-word (one single-spaced page) Project Statement. Send this out to all seminar members via email on the Saturday before your presentation (three days before your presentation). Follow the template on p. 8 of the syllabus.

Assignment #5 (to be scheduled) is your oral presentation to our seminar. Plan to present your draft dissertation proposal in about 35 minutes. Your talk should follow a "job talk" format, in that you need to frame issues in general terms for a broad Political Science audience, and then lay out the guts of the research project (both in terms of research design and in terms of data-gathering and strategies of analysis). We will devote about 60 minutes to your presentation and the subsequent comment/question period.

Assignment #6 is the revised proposal, a week after the last class day of the semester (ie., May 12).

Students with disabilities. Students with disabilities may request appropriate academic accommodations from the Division of Diversity and Community Engagement, Services for Students with Disabilities, 471-6259, <http://www.utexas.edu/diversity/ddce/ssd/>

Accommodations for religious holidays. UT Austin policy stipulates that to make up work missed due to a religious holiday observance, the student must notify the prof. of the impending absence 14 days before the missed assignment. You will have an opportunity to complete the missed work within a reasonable time after the absence.

Emergency Evacuation Policy. In the event of a fire or other emergency, it may be necessary to evacuate a building rapidly. Upon the activation of a fire alarm or the announcement of an emergency in a university building, all occupants of the building are required to evacuate and assemble outside. Once evacuated, no one may re-enter the building without instruction to do so from the Austin Fire Department, University of Texas at Austin Police Department, or Fire Prevention Services office. Students should familiarize themselves with all the exit doors of each room and building they occupy at the university, and should remember that the nearest exit routes may not be the same as the way they typically enter buildings. Students requiring assistance in evacuation shall inform their instructors in writing during the first week of class.

Faculty members must then provide this information to the Fire Prevention Services office by fax (512-232-2759), with "Attn. Mr. Roosevelt Easley" written in the subject line. Information regarding emergency evacuation routes and emergency procedures can be found at <http://www.utexas.edu/emergency>.

Course Schedule

Jan. 18 Introduction and Overview

*Przeworski and Solomon, "On the Art of Writing Proposals," SSRC website.

http://fellowships.ssrc.org/art_of_writing_proposals/

Prepare a 5-minute presentation that describes your background and research interests. Tell us what you find most interesting about politics and Political Science. Describe your dissertation project.

Jan. 25 The Dissertation Process: Rumors, Tips, and Advice

Van Evera, *Guide to Methods for Students of PS*, chs. 4-6.

*Michael Watts, "In Search of the Holy Grail," included in course packet as part of the Berkeley Dissertation Proposal Workshop readings.

Berkeley Dissertation Proposal Workshop: Timeline, at <http://globetrotter.berkeley.edu/DissPropWorkshop/nuts&bolts/timeline.html>

"Tips from Faculty and Coaches," "Current and Former Graduate Deans Reflect on Dissertation Completion," and "Advice from UT Alumni" on the UT Intellectual Entrepreneurship homepage at <https://webspace.utexas.edu/cherwitz/www/ie/disslist.html>.

*Massachusetts Institute of Technology Artificial Intelligence Lab, "How to do research at the MIT AI Lab: Emotional Factors," AI Working Paper 316, Oct. 1988, also avail at <http://www.cs.indiana.edu/mit.research.how.to/mit.research.how.to.html>

In-class: We'll discuss your reaction to and assessment of the readings. The session will focus on strategic issues that arise in designing a dissertation project and managing the dissertation process. Are there trade-offs and dilemmas in the project-formation (proposal-writing) process that many or most students in Political Science have to deal with? Do the salient issues vary by sub-field? over time? across departments?

Feb. 1. Discussion of Assignment #1. Please bring 4 copies to class.

Feb. 8. Analysis of dissertation proposals

In-class. Select six research proposals (see webs sites above) and identify (1) structural attributes (organization, argumentation, presentation) they share, (2) some striking differences in structure or presentation, (3) strategies for linking empirical and theoretical research questions.

Feb. 15 Descriptive and Causal Inference.

Van Evera, Introduction and "Hypotheses, Laws, and Theories" (ch. 1).

King, Keohane, and Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry*, chs. 1, 2.

Brady, Collier, and Seawright, "Introduction: Refocusing the Discussion of Methodology," in Brady and Collier, eds., *Rethinking Social Inquiry*.

In-class: Using Van Evera's definition of theory, state the theory that is (could be) at the center of your own dissertation project. Present it as an arrow diagram. Also identify an aspect of your project that seeks to establish descriptive inference. In attempting these inferential leaps, what challenges or problems do you foresee? How can you address them?

Feb. 22. Research Design

KKV, "Determining What to Observe" (ch. 4).

Ronald Rogowski, "How Inference in the Social (but Not the Physical) Sciences Neglects Theoretical Anomaly," in Brady and Collier, *Rethinking* (ch. 5).

Collier et al., "Critiques, Responses, and Trade-Offs: Drawing Together the Debate," in Brady and Collier, *Rethinking Social Inquiry* (ch. 12).

In-class: How will you "determine what to observe" in your study and what principles of research design justify these choices?

Which parts of your research project take you "beyond" KKV (as per the arguments in the Brady and Collier selections)? Which of the trade-offs they identify will be important in shaping your project? For example, do you face a trade-off between "good causal inference" and "theory development," as described in Brady and Collier, pp. 200-1?

March 1. Discussion of Assignment #2. Another class member will present your project description, so he/she must have your 2.5 pages by Saturday, Feb. 26. The in-class presentation be followed by a short group discussion of your project. We will devote 20 min. to each project.

March 8. Case Studies and Case Selection

Van Evera, *Guide to Methods*, chapter 2.

KKV, *Designing Social Inquiry*, Ch. 6.

Alexander George and Andrew Bennett, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences* (MIT, 2004), Chs. 3-6 (pp. 67-124).

In-class: What principles of case analysis and case selection are at work in your project?

March 15. Spring Break

March 22. Proposals

*Peter A. Hall, "Helpful Hints for Writing Dissertations in Comparative Politics," *PS: Political Science and Politics*, December 1990, pp. 596-598. (avail. via JSTOR and on our Bb site)

*Philippe C. Schmitter, "The 'Ideal' Research Proposal," Sept. 2002

*Berkeley Dissertation Workshop: Nuts and Bolts, at <http://globetrotter.berkeley.edu/DissPropWorkshop/nuts&bolts/>

*Don Thackrey, Proposal Writer's Guide (PWG), 2007, at "Research: The University of Michigan," at <http://www.research.umich.edu/proposals/pwg/pwgcontents.HTML>

What do these sources tell you about the level of generality/specificity that you need to achieve in introducing your project and framing the research questions? What do they tell you about how detailed and specific you should be about the actual research activities you will undertake in pursuit of answers to your research question? What are options and strategies for explaining how you will "interpret findings"? What are strategies for dealing with the practical and logistical aspects of the project (eg. institutional affiliations, conducting survey research, etc)?

March 29. Assignment #3, Draft Proposals due. Presentations. (Circulate Assignment #4 via email on the Saturday before your presentation. See template on p. 8.)

April 5 Assignment #5: Presentations

April 12 Presentations

April 19 Presentations

April 26 Presentations

May 5 Presentations. Revised proposals (Assignment #6) due by May 12.

RESEARCH COLLOQUIUM IN POLITICAL SCIENCE
 SPRING 2011

Assignment #1: Empirical and Theoretical Questions

Write a one-page (single spaced) response. It is due on Tues., Feb. 1.

Think about your general area of research interest as a real-world political phenomenon (eg. effects of constitutional reform in new democracies; causes of rising levels of land-related conflict in Africa; determinants of cross-national variation in the nature of electoral campaigns) and write down 3-5 specific questions having to do with that phenomenon that the dissertation could seek to answer. Try to think in terms of "why" or "how" questions.

Then ask yourself: What theoretical interest do I have in these questions? Write out a couple of theoretical questions that underlie, or are raised by, the questions you have asked about empirical phenomena. Why, from a theoretical perspective, is this question interesting for Political Science?

Finally, write a paragraph that discusses the "fit" between your "empirical" and your theoretical questions: Have you specified questions about real-world political phenomena that will give you leverage on your theoretical questions? Might different real-world problems/questions be more appropriate, given your theoretical interests? Is your theoretical question really "answerable" through research, or is it rhetorical, ideological, non-answerable, or non-falsifiable?

Assignment #2: Empirical Investigation of a Research Question

This is a 2.5-page (double spaced) exercise due on T., March 1.

In the first part, frame an empirical question of interest to political scientists. Then pose the question again, this time in general (theoretical) terms. Here you are linking your empirical question to broader questions of theoretical (general) interest to Political Scientists.

In the second part, frame an *operational* research question and hypothetical answer (or tightly bounded set of hypothetical answers) to it. That is, frame a question about concrete aspects of observable reality that is answerable through research, and that requires research in order to generate an answer. The research question should contain or frame a falsifiable hypothesis. Make sure the hypothesis comes across clearly.

In part three, discuss in concrete terms the kind of research that you propose to conduct in order to gather systematic empirical information that will provide leverage on the questions/hypothesis you've posed. What primary materials will you use? What data can you collect and how would you use it? If you will use existing data sets, how will you obtain them? If you plan to do field work, where would you go, what would you do there, and how long would you stay? If you will conduct interviews or a survey, what sorts of questions could you ask, of whom, and how?

In part four, explain what you expect such research to yield. What do you expect your research tell us about the empirical and theoretical issues you framed in part one? And what kind of evidence would *confound* your expectations?

RESEARCH COLLOQUIUM IN POLITICAL SCIENCE

SPRING 2011

Assignment #4: Project Statement

The Saturday before your presentation to the seminar, email copies of your 500-word (one single-spaced page) "Project Statement" to all seminar members. (Bibliographic references should be listed on a separate page.) You are encouraged to give hard copies to other faculty and graduate students who may be interested in your project, and to invite these people to attend your presentation. Your statement should follow the following format.

Your statement should be divided into four sections of roughly equal length:

Project Title

- Part I: Statement of the Problem
- Part II: Summary of the Main Argument (vis-à-vis existing knowledge)
- Part III: Research Design and Methods
- Part IV: Theoretical Implications/ Relevance

The statement should make sense to a political scientist who is not a specialist in your sub-field.

Part I should identify the concrete research problem and locate it with respect to theoretical issues/literatures in social science.

Part II should lay out your main argument, tentative as it may be. Alternatively, sketch out some arguments that your research might be able to support or contradict. What might your research show, how will you interpret findings, and how could this answer/solve/address the research problem set out in Part I. (In effect, you are laying out hypotheses that have theoretical implications.)

Be as explicit in Part III as space will allow.

In Part IV, tell us what political scientists will (might be able to) learn from your research. Be sure to explain why they should read your work even if they have no interest in the empirical problem at hand.

Additional Reading

Proposals/ Dissertation Writing

D. Madsen, *Successful Dissertations and Theses: A guide to graduate student research from proposal to completion* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982). Available in PCL Reference Department (use in library only).

Lawrence F. Locke, Waneen Wyrick Spirduso, and Stephen J. Silverman, *Proposals That Work: A guide for Planning Dissertations and Grant Proposals*, Second Edition (Sage, 1987). Available in PCL Reference Department (use in library only). Useful guide written by professors in the behavioral sciences. Emphasizes experimental and quasi-experimental research designs. Includes chapters on preparing grant applications.

Kjell Erik Rudestam and Rae R. Newton, *Surviving Your Dissertation: A Comprehensive Guide to Content and Process*, 2nd Ed., Sage, 2001. avail. on-line via UTCAT

Joan Bolker, *Writing Your Dissertation in Fifteen Minutes a Day* (Henry Holt & Co., 1998).

Logics of Social Inquiry

Charles Ragin, *Constructing Social Research: The unity and diversity of method* (Pine Forge Press, 1994).

Daniel Little, *Understanding Peasant China: Case Studies in the Philosophy of Social Science* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989). See the series of concluding chapters: "Generalization and Theory," "Explanation," and "Empirical Reasoning." Little is particularly interested in the competition between three main theoretical frameworks: methodological individualism, historical materialism, and culturalist/interpretative approaches. On the latter, see pp. 202-6 and 230-38.

Arun Agrawal, *Greener Pastures: Politics, Markets, and Community among a Migrant Pastoral People* (Durham, NC: Duke, 1999).

Fred N. Kerlinger, *Foundations of Behavioral Research* (Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1964).

D.T. Campbell and J.C. Stanley, *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research* (Rand McNally, 1963).

Charles C. Ragin, *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of CA Press, 1987). Discusses differences between qualitative ("case oriented") and quantitative ("variable oriented") research strategies in order to transcend the divide. Proposes an algebraic approach which supposedly synthesizes the strengths of both strategies. Chapter 5, "Combined versus Synthetic Comparative Strategies" (pp. 69-84), describes the comparative methodology underlying three important works in the field (incl. Jeffrey Paige, *Agrarian Revolution*).

Adam Przeworski and Henry Teune, *The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry* (New York: Wiley-Interscience/John Wiley and Sons), 1970. See Chapter 2, "Research Designs," for a discussion of framing studies in terms of "most-similar-systems" or "most-different-systems" comparisons.

Charles Tilly, *Big Structures, Large Processes, Huge Comparisons* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1984). Makes the case for historically-grounded comparative analyses of social process. Chapter 4 ("Comparing") shows how one

can move between broad historical generalizations and specific research questions (pp. 74-6). This volume includes analyses of the comparative methods employed by Bendix, Skocpol, Braudel, Rokkan, Tilly, Wallerstein, and B. Moore, Jr. (among others).

James D. Fearon, "Counterfactuals and Hypothesis Testing in Political Science," *World Politics*, 43 (January 1991): 169-95. Discusses differences between two different strategies of testing causal hypotheses: the strategy of comparison of actual cases, and the strategy of counterfactual argument. Shows how the counterfactual strategy appears in practice by considering examples from work in international relations and comparative politics, and underscores the methodological risks that this strategy of argumentation entails. Draws on examples from the work of Al Stepan, Theda Skocpol, and Steve Van Evera among others.

Charles C. Ragin, *Fuzzy-Set Social Science* (Chicago, 2000).

Jon Elster, *Nuts and Bolts for the Social Sciences* (Cambridge, 1989). especially "Part One: Mechanisms" (pp. 3-12).

Daniel Little, *Understanding Peasant China: Case Studies in the Philosophy of Social Science* (New Haven: Yale, 1989).

Immanuel Wallerstein, *Unthinking Social Science* (Polity and Basil Blackwell, 1991).

Philip E. Tetlock and Aaron Belkin, *Counterfactual Thought Experiments in World Politics: Logical, Methodological, and Psychological Perspectives* (Princeton University Press, 1996).

Mahoney and Reuschmeyer, *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* (Cambridge, 2003).

Ian Shapiro, Rogers M. Smith, and Tarek E. Masoud, eds. *Problems and Methods in the Study of Politics* (Cambridge 2004).

Ian Shapiro, *The Flight from Reality in the Social Sciences* (Yale 2005).

Robert Adcock and David Collier, "Measurement Validity: A Shared Standard for Qualitative and Quantitative Research," *APSR*, 93/3, Sept. 2001. See wrt concept formation and operationalization.

Evan S. Lieberman, "Nested Analysis as a Mixed-Method Strategy for Comparative Research," *American Political Science Review*, 99/3, Aug. 2005.

Kristen R. Monroe, ed., *Contemporary Empirical Political Theory* (University of California, 1997).

Kristen R. Monroe, ed., *Perestroika! The Raucous Revolution in Political Science* (Yale, 2005).

Keith Topper, *The Disorder of Political Inquiry* (Harvard, 2005).

Gary Goertz, *Social Science Concepts: A User's Guide* (Princeton, 2006).

Gerardo L. Munck and Richard Snyder, *Passion, Craft, and Method in Comparative Politics* (Johns Hopkins, 2007).

James Mahoney and Gary Goertz, 2006. A Tale of Two Cultures: Contrasting Quantitative and Qualitative Research," *Political Analysis*, 14, 227-49.

Milja Kurki, "Causes of a Divided Discipline: Rethinking the Concept of Cause in IR Theory," *Review of International Studies* 32:2 (April) 2006:189-216.

James Mahoney, "Toward a unified theory of causality," *CPS*, 41:4/5 (April/May), 2008:412-36.

Case Methods

Harry Eckstein, "Case Study and Theory in Political Science," in F.I. Greenstein and N.W. Polsby, eds., *Handbook of Political Science*, Vol. 7 (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1975), pp. 79-137. Available in PCL Reference Department (use in library only).

Charles C. Ragin, *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of CA Press, 1987).

Alexander L. George, "Case Studies and Theory Development: The Method of Structured, Focused Comparison," in Paul Gordon Lauren, ed., *Diplomacy: New Approaches in History, Theory and Policy* (New York: Free Press, 1979). Maps out logical steps in designing case studies that can serve as building blocks for theory development (see pp. 54-57). Draws examples from the sub-field of international relations.

Alexander L. George and Timothy J. McKeown, "Case Studies and Theories of Organizational Decision Making," *Advances in Information Processing in Organizations*, Vol. 2 (1985): 21-58. Attempts to explain the "epistemological strategy" of case studies, to develop an explicit methodology for case studies, and "to codify the wisdom of practitioners." Compares case study and quasi-experimental methods. Overlaps with George (1979), cited above.

Arend Lijphart, "Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method," *American Political Science Review* 65 (Sept. 1971): 682-693. See also A. Lijphart, "The Comparable-Case Strategy in Comparative Research," *Comparative Political Studies* 8 (July 1975): 158-177. The first of these articles provides a comparison and discussion of three basic comparative methods.

Barbara Geddes, "How the cases you choose affect the answers you get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics," *Political Analysis*, 2 (1990): 131-49. This article develops the "don't-select-on-the-dependent-variable" idea.

Dietrich Rueschemeyer, "Can One or a Few Cases Yield Theoretical Gains?" in Mahoney and Rueschemeyer, *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* (Cambridge, 2003).

Jack Levy, "Case Studies: Types, Designs, and Logics of Inference," *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, 25:1 (March), 2008:1-18.

Interpretive Approaches

Paul Rabinow and William M. Sullivan, eds., *Interpretive social science: A second look* (Berkeley : University of California Press, 1987).

Charles Taylor, "Interpretation and the Sciences of Man," in C. Taylor, *Philosophy and the Human Sciences: Philosophical Papers 2* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

Pauline Marie Rosenau, *Post-Modernism and the Social Sciences: Insights, Inroads, and Intrusions* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1992). See chapter 5.2 ("...Objections to Modern Theory") and 5.5 ("Consequences... for the Social Sciences").

Melvin Richter, ed., *Political Theory and Political Education* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980).

Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays* (New York: Basic Books, 1973).

Clifford Geertz, *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretative Anthropology* (New York: Basic Books, 1983).

Jonathan Crush, ed., *Power of Development* (Routledge, 1995).

Robert Philip Weber, *Basic Content Analysis* (Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1990).

Ian Shapiro, Rogers M. Smith, and Tarek E. Masoud, eds. *Problems and Methods in the Study of Politics* (Cambridge 2004).

Analytic Narratives Issues of Historiography

Theda Skocpol, ed., *Vision and Method in Historical Sociology* (Cambridge University Press, 1984). Contributors analyze the historical sociology of Karl Polanyi, Barrington Moore, E.P. Thompson, Perry Anderson, Immanuel Wallerstein, and Charles Tilly (among others).

Andrew Abbot, "History and Sociology: The Lost Synthesis," *Social Science History*, 15, 2, 1991.

Victoria Bonnell, "The Uses of Theory, Concepts, and Comparison in Historical Sociology," *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 22, 2, 1990.

Christopher Lloyd, *Explanation in Social History* (Basil Blackwell, 1986).

Terrence J. McDonald, ed., *The Historic Turn in the Human Sciences* (Univ. of Michigan Press, 1996). See especially Craig Calhoun, "The Rise and Domestication of Historical Sociology," pp. 305-338.

Ira Katsnelson, "Periodization and Preferences: Reflections on Purposive Action in Comparative Historical Social Science," in Mahoney and Rueschemeyer, *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* (Cambridge, 2003).

Jon Elster "Analytic Narrative: A Review and a Response" *American Political Science Review* 94 (3) 2000 pp.685-702.

Robert H. Bates, Avner Greif, Margaret Levi, Jean-Laurent Rosenthal, Barry Weingast, eds., *Analytic Narratives* (Princeton 1998).

Giovanni Capoccia and R. Daniel Kelemen. The Study of Critical Junctures: Theory, Narrative, and Counterfactuals in Historical Institutionalism," *World Politics* 59:3 (April) 2007 341-69.

Symposium on Analytic Narratives and "Rational Choice History," *American Political Science Review* 94 (3) (September 2000): 685-702.

Fieldwork

Arun Agrawal, *Greener Pastures: Politics, markets, and community among a migrant pastoral people* (Durham, NC: Duke, 1999).

Carolyn Nordstrom and Antonius C.G.M. Robben, eds., *Fieldwork under Fire* (University of California Press, 1995).

Caroline B. Brettell, *When They Read What We Write: The Politics of Ethnography* (Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey, 1993).

Steven Devereux and John Hoddinott, *Fieldwork in Developing Countries* (Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1993). Discusses issues related to data

collection (surveys, interviewing), ethics, relationships between the researcher and "the subjects," preparing for the trip abroad, etc. Several chapters describe field research in particular kinds of circumstances (work in villages, interviewing merchants and traders, economic surveys of rural households surveys, etc.).

Marlene de Laine, *Fieldwork, Participation, and Practice: Ethics and Dilemmas in Qualitative Research* (Sage, 2000).

Norma J. Kriger, "Appendix: Field Research," in N. Kriger, *Zimbabwe's Guerrilla War: Peasant Voices* (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 243-248. Discusses challenges/logistics of field research in Zimbabwe in the 1980s (eg. choosing a study site, meeting people, finding places to stay, transportation, hiring interpreters, dealing with security forces, relations with informants, etc.). Is relevant to anyone planning field work.

Bierschenk, T. & Olivier de Sardan, J.P., 1997, "ECRIS: Rapid collective inquiry for the identification of conflicts and strategic groups," *Human Organization*, 56(2): 238-244

Organizing Your Qualitative Data

Kjell Erik Rudestan and Rae R. Newton, *Surviving Your Dissertation: A Comprehensive Guide to Content and Process*, 2nd Ed., Sage, 2001, Ch. 10.

Evan Lieberman, *Race and Regionalism in the Politics of Taxation in Brazil and South Africa* (Cambridge University Press 2003). See Appendix: Comparative Historical Analysis.

FYI: Some Fellowship Databases

Social Science Research Council Other Fellowships:
<http://www.ssrc.org/fellowships/overview.page>

APSA NET
http://www.apsanet.org/section_191.cfm

Cornell University Graduate School Fellowship Database
<http://www.gradschool.cornell.edu/?p=132>