

**SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL  
DISSERTATION PROPOSAL DEVELOPMENT FELLOWSHIP  
SPRING 2010 WORKSHOP AGENDA**

**SPACES OF INQUIRY**

Research Director: Stuart W. Leslie [swleslie@jhu.edu]  
Research Director: Carla Yanni [cyanni@rutgers.edu]

**Hilton San Diego, Gaslamp Quarter, San Diego, CA  
Wednesday June 2-6, 2010**

**Workshop Assignments**

Prepare a short grant proposal to an appropriate funding agency (but only one), seeking support for your dissertation research. Do a little research on who potentially funds what. For instance, the National Science Foundation will not generally support research in the history of medicine, leaving that to the National Institutes of Health. Fulbright-Hays supports dissertation research abroad, but not in the US. The Spencer Foundation funds dissertation fellowships focused on the history, theory or practice of education. Identify particular programs and program officers if you can, and pitch the proposal accordingly. Keep the narrative to 5 pp. Explain the ‘so what’ of your proposal in a way that someone who’s not an expert in the field can easily understand. Be sure that your thesis is clear and concise. What’s novel about your project, theoretically or empirically? How does your topic fit within a larger literature? To what extent does it draw on more than one disciplinary tradition, and so bring together different fields in a new way? Given the subject of the workshop, how does your dissertation contribute to the understanding of ‘spaces of inquiry’, broadly defined? Most important of all, what makes your proposal worthy of attention and funding? Do not worry about such matters as budget, though a brief discussion of sources, methods, field or archival work, and a timeline might make sense. Remember that to this point, only the research directors have read your SSRC proposals (and probably forgotten most of what they read!) so this will be your opportunity to showcase your project for the group. We will post your grant proposals on the workshop website. The original proposal you submitted to the SSRC can provide a template, but rework it with a broader audience in mind.

Each of you will then prepare a brief written commentary on two other proposals, highlighting their strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and challenges. Is the project sufficiently ambitious and yet manageable? Has the author missed any important literature? What might be done to sharpen the proposal? The point here is constructive feedback. Unlike a real foundation, we aren’t interested in rejecting proposals. Everyone in our group will essentially get what is called ‘revise and resubmit.’ No more than 1 p. That means that each of you will be reviewing two proposals. (We will post the assignments for these one-page reviews on the site soon.) This technique will give us a chance for an informed, collective discussion of every one of your topics, with each of you receiving 30-40 minutes of attention. As an added benefit, this approach will provide some variety for our San Diego sessions, because we will discuss two proposals during each of the sessions, creating a balanced between the consideration of general topics and

individual projects. This may sound like a lot of work up front, but should pay off when we get to San Diego. The proposals will be due May 20, and the reviews on May 27.

**ARRIVAL, Wednesday, June 2:** Reading handouts / packets will be distributed at registration along with other materials.

### **Reception 7-9pm**

#### **Session 1: Big Questions**

**Thursday June 4, 2010 9AM to 12noon**

**Discussion of Christopher Heaney's topic**  
**Discussion of Roberto Chauca-Tapia's topic**

Reading: David Livingstone, Putting Science in Its Place: Geographies of Scientific Knowledge (University of Chicago Press, 2003). Not on the Wrkspace, please procure your own copy.

Geographer Livingstone covers a lot of ground, so to speak, in this short volume. Wide-ranging thematically and theoretically, the book offers us a good introduction to many of the ideas we'll be discussing in the workshop. Pay careful attention not only to what Livingstone has to say, but also to what he seems to ignore. What other topics, literatures, or theoretical perspectives might he have engaged?

In-class Exercise: We will divide you into four groups of three. Each group will be given ten minutes to prepare to defend the field, 'Spaces of Inquiry,' to an audience that might include academic deans, architects, scientists, preservationists, and public historians. Why bring these fields together? Does it matter? Who cares? Why is interdisciplinary work important? How it is best accomplished? Five minutes each to present your case.

#### **Session 2: Methods (Held at the Salk Institute Fellows Room)**

**Thursday, June 4, 2010, 1:30PM to 5PM.**

**Meet in the hotel lobby at 1:30pm.**

**Discussion of Brittany Shields's topic**  
**Discussion of Phil Clements's topic**

Reading: Stuart W. Leslie, "A Different Kind of Beauty': Scientific and Architectural Style in I.M. Pei's Mesa Laboratory and Louis Kahn's Salk Institute" Historical Studies in the Natural Sciences 38:2 (2008): 173-221.

Fred Gage, "Neuroscience and Architecture," Lecture, American Institute of Architects, May 2003.

Tour of the Salk Institute and its grounds. Fellow Fred 'Rusty' Gage will share his research on neuroscience and architecture with the group.

After seeing the Salk Institute for yourself, and learning something of its history and ongoing research, are you convinced that its architecture really matters? Would Prof. Gage's work, say, be any different in direction and character if he spent all of his time at UCSD, where he holds a joint appointment? How might Leslie's article be enhanced by a broader engagement with architectural history, or visual culture, or some other literature?

**Session 3: Sources (Held at the Department of Special Collections, Geisel Library, UCSD)**

**Friday, June 5, 2010. 9AM to 12noon. Meet in Hotel lobby at 9AM.**

**Discussion of James Skee's topic**  
**Discussion of Majed Akhter's topic**

Lynda Claassen, head of Special Collections, will provide examples of typical and not-so-typical sources of particular relevance to our subject, including photographs, architectural plans, oral histories, and so forth.

Reading: David Gooding, "History in the Laboratory: Can We Tell What Really Went On?" in Frank James (ed.) The Development of the Laboratory (American Institute of Physics, 1989): 63-82.

How do we deal with places and spaces where relatively little documentary evidence survives? What strategies can we borrow from the study of material culture, visual culture, architectural and art history that might help us in analyzing 'spaces of inquiry'?

In-class Exercise: Bring with you a two-dimensional representation of a favorite place or space--a short film clip, a photograph, a web site--and visually analyze it in three minutes. What can it tell us and what other sources would we need to contextualize it? Be sure to let us know in advance about any special technical requirements you may have, such as a DVD player or Internet connection, so that UCSD will have the right equipment available. We will provide a digital projector.

**Session 4: Historiographies**

**Friday, June 4, 2010, 2PM to 5PM**

**Discussion of Aimi Hamraie's topic**  
**Discussion of Jennifer Kosmin's topic**

Readings: Thomas Gieryn, "What Buildings Do," Theory and Society 31:1 (2002), 35-75. Thomas Schlich, "Surgery, Science and Modernity: Operating Rooms and Laboratories as Spaces of Control" History of Science xlv. (2007): 231-256.

Compare and contrast the approach of a historically inclined sociologist (Gieryn) and a sociologically inclined historian of medicine (Schlich). Where do they overlap in terms of the literature they engage, theoretical and otherwise, and where do they diverge? This is also a good opportunity to consider issues of method and sources we have been discussing.

In-class Exercise: Choose an article that has been particularly influential in shaping your thinking about your dissertation. Be prepared to explain in less than five minutes why the rest of us should read it and what its take-home lessons might be. As a group, we'll choose a couple of our favorites to read over the summer and discuss when we reconvene in Philadelphia.

### **Session 5: Evidence and Strategies** **Saturday June 5, 2010**

**Discussion of Karen Robbins's topic**  
**Discussion of Sara Witty's topic**

Reading: Carla Yanni, Chapter 2, "Establishing the Type: The Development of Kirkbride Plan Hospitals and Hope for an Architectural Cure," in The Architecture of Madness (University of Minnesota, 2007) 51-78.

How does Yanni employ visual evidence such as hospital plans and photographs to make her argument? Does the architectural historian handle these sources differently than a historian of medicine or a sociologist? What are the essential questions she is asking and how does she use those questions to identify relevant sources and appropriate methodology and historiography?

### **Session 6: From the Archive and the Field to the New-and-Improved Proposal** **Saturday June 5, 2010 2PM to 4PM**

**Discussion of Jenna Tonn's topic**  
**Discussion of Kathleen Oberlin's topic**

General discussion: What are the new methods, sources, and approaches you intend to engage over the summer? Have we reached any consensus on what counts as a 'space of inquiry' and how it might be studied? What are common problems encountered in the archive or the field? Why is writing a dissertation different from writing five research papers? Or is it?

**Session 7. Next Steps**  
**Sunday June 6, 10:30 to noon**

In-class Exercise: Outline how you will reframe your dissertation proposal in light of our ongoing discussions here in San Diego? What have you learned that will be most helpful in pursuing your summer research?

What do you want to have accomplished by the end of the session in Philadelphia? We will—as a group--make a plan for how to keep in touch over the summer.

What can we (Carla and Bill) prepare for Philadelphia that you think will be most useful to you?

**SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL  
DISSERTATION PROPOSAL DEVELOPMENT FELLOWSHIP  
FALL 2010 WORKSHOP AGENDA**

**SPACES OF INQUIRY**

<https://workspace.ssrc.org/dpdf/spacesofinquiry/default.aspx>

Research Director: Carla Yanni [[cyanni@rutgers.edu](mailto:cyanni@rutgers.edu)]

Research Director: Bill Leslie [[swleslie@jhu.edu](mailto:swleslie@jhu.edu)]

**Radisson Plaza – Warwick Hotel, Philadelphia**

Wednesday, September 15 – Sunday, September 19

This is the second of two annual DPDF workshops designed to help graduate student fellows prepare cogent and fundable dissertation proposals in their chosen field. The two goals of the second workshop are 1) to help fellows synthesize their summer research; and 2) to draft proposals for dissertation funding. The fall workshop focuses on the mechanics and the philosophy of proposal writing. The workshop also aims to challenge fellows to reflect on their summer research in ways that link meaningfully to their research field. In this, the goals of the fall workshop are closely related to the project of mapping a research field that was started during the spring workshop in San Diego.

Fellows will come out of the second workshop with supportive networks, consisting of both mentors and cohorts of new scholars carrying out research in their fields, as well as intellectually mature dissertation proposals.

**Workshop Assignments**

- **September 5, 2010 Due on DPDF Workspace site:** Fellows are asked to upload a proposal to be examined during the workshop. Please follow the instructions in the assignment titled SSRC Fall Assignment Version one.
- **September 19, 2010 8AM Due on DPDF Workspace site:** Revised first paragraph.

ARRIVAL Wednesday, September 15: Registration packets will be distributed at check in.

Session 1: Plenary Session – The Dissertation Proposal: Strategies and Funding Sources  
Thursday, 9 AM – 12:00 PM, September 16

Welcome and Introductions

## Dissertation Funder Presentations

### Session 2:

Thursday, 2:00 PM – 5 PM, September 16

We have set aside just 20 minutes of seminar time for each fellow’s proposal. To keep the conversation moving, the “applicant” will not make any opening remarks, nor respond to the reviewer’s critique until open discussion. The reviewer’s job is to set the agenda for the discussion by posing a short number of pertinent questions or comments about the proposal’s strengths and weaknesses. The goal is to suggest strategies that can improve the proposal within the scope of the fall workshop. Specific advice on reworking the proposal for our Sunday morning session will be far more helpful than “here’s what I would have done with the subject.” Bear in mind the guidelines highlighted in the original assignment. As reviewer, pay strict attention to the time limit, ruthlessly if necessary. To assist you, the rest of us, including the research directors, will keep our comments short and to the point. Everyone will have a different role—applicant, reviewer, advisee--each day.

### **Critiques of Proposals, I: The Body, the Mind, Control, and Creativity**

#### **Applicant**

Brittany Shields

Karen Robbins

#### **Reviewer**

Christopher Heaney

James Skee

Short Break

#### **Applicant**

Jennifer Kosmin

Aimi Hamraie

#### **Reviewer**

Casey Oberlin

Jenna Tonn

### **Individual Advising sessions with Bill and Carla (20 minutes each)**

Majed Akhter

Roberto Chauca Tapia

Phil Clements

Sara Witty

### Session 3:

Friday, 8:40 AM – 12:00 PM, September 17

Meet in the hotel lobby at 8:40am; keep in mind that we might be a little late for lunch.

Research Trip to the Wagner Free Institute of Science and

Research Trip to the Architectural Archives of the University of Pennsylvania

This morning we will visit two very different sites of inquiry. In both cases, we will ponder how the space affects the knowledge produced there. We will meet experts on architecture and science, Sue Glassman at the Wagner and William Whitaker at Penn. These scholars approach their fields from divergent points-of-view, and they present their subjects to a range of audiences, from architects and preservationists, to historians and school-age children.

Session 4:

Friday, 2:00 PM – 5 PM, September 17

Same ground rules as before. Short critiques, concise suggestions we can put to work immediately.

Critiques of Proposals, II: Ascents and Descents: Landscapes of Science, Mapping Nature

<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Reviewer</b>
Majed Akhter	Karen Robbins
Roberto Chauca Tapia	Jennifer Kosmin

Short Break

Phil Clements	Aimi Hamraie
Sara Witty	Brittany Shields

**Individual Advising with Bill and Carla (20 minutes each)**

Jenna Tonn  
Casey Oberlin  
James Skee  
Christopher Heaney

Friday, 5:30 to 6:30, *Optional Activity*

**Have a Drink at the Pub to Discuss Science in the Pub!**

Read Anne Secord, “Science in the Pub: Artisan Botanists in Nineteenth-Century Lancashire,” *History of Science*, xxxii, 1994. This is the article we selected in June: it is posted on the SSRC workspace.

Meet at The Black Sheep Irish Pub  
247 S. 17th Street, 17th & Latimer, between Spruce and Locust  
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Session 5:

Saturday, 9 AM – 12:00 PM, September 18



Critiques of Proposals, III: Museums, Making Knowledge, and Modernisms

**Applicant**

**Reviewer**

Jenna Tonn  
Casey Oberlin

Sara Witty  
Phil Clements

Short Break

James Skee  
Christopher Heaney

Roberto Chauca Tapia  
Majed Akhter

Individual Advising sessions with Bill and Carla  
Brittany Shields  
Karen Robbins  
Jennifer Kosmin  
Aimi Hamraie

Session 6:

Saturday, 2:00 PM – 5 PM, September 18

**Joint Session for the "Virtual Worlds" and "Spaces of Inquiry" Groups**

In most cases, your proposal will be read by scholars who do not share your topical focus of inquiry, and in many cases will not share your disciplinary background. It is crucial that your proposals explain your research project and its significance in a manner that is broadly compelling. In this session, we will work in small groups with members of the "Virtual Worlds" group to provide "fresh eyes" for each others' proposals. To an "outsider," what appears most interesting, and most confusing, about your proposal? (Keep in mind that the students in the Virtual Worlds group face a particular challenge, in that online sites of sociality are novel domains of research.) The format of this spoken presentation will be announced later.

*Warning: There is an assignment due Sunday at 8AM!*

Session 7:

(Sunday, 9 AM – 12:30 PM) September 19, 2010

**The Introductory Paragraph**

Discussion of each person's revised introductory paragraph.

See the assignment posted on the workspace called SSRC Sunday Session assignment revise intro.doc