

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL
DISSERTATION PROPOSAL DEVELOPMENT FELLOWSHIP
Oak Ridge Conference Center, Chaska, Minnesota
May 30th to June 3rd, 2012
SPRING 2012 WORKSHOP AGENDA

GOVERNING GLOBAL PRODUCTION

Research Director: Layna Mosley [mosley@unc.edu]
Research Director: Tim Bartley [BartleyT@indiana.edu]

This is the first of two workshops designed to help students prepare cogent and fundable dissertation proposals in their chosen field. The two goals of the first workshop are 1) to map the research field with respect to contributing disciplines, methods, sources, and area knowledge; and 2) to help prepare Fellows for their pre-dissertation summer research. (The goal of the second workshop will be to focus on the mechanics and methods of writing a dissertation proposal, as well as proposals for external funding).

We are interested in social control of global production, especially in consumer products, raw materials, and agricultural industries. Specifically, this research field considers the extent to which increasingly globalized forms of production have been, or will be, accompanied by new forms of governance, as well as the material and distributional consequences of these new forms of governance. Some scholars have argued that the globalization of production directly undermines the role of nation-states and the capacity of citizens for democratic governance. But many other scholars have found that global production also spawns new types of rule-making projects and notions of accountability, and sometimes even upward trajectories of regulation. Political scientists, sociologists, geographers, anthropologists, legal scholars, historians, and business scholars have all contributed to a growing literature on the causes, character and consequences of these rule-making projects and regulatory trajectories.

These new forms of rule-making are varied: firms, industry associations and NGOs have taken on regulatory roles. Retailers and branded firms have adopted codes of conduct and sustainable sourcing policies, some of which have evolved into elaborate systems of reporting, auditing, or certification organized through multi-stakeholder associations that include NGOs. In addition, the expansion of supply chains has created new openings for activism and diffusion. Trade and investment flows have carried norms about labor rights, environmental protection, and equal opportunity to a variety of locations. In some circumstances, globalization has brought about an expansion of regulatory agendas, through experimentation with new modes of governance, networking across national regulatory systems, or the emergence of more vigorous domestic contention and reform efforts.

At the same time, these new governance processes often are highly uneven, contested, and ambiguous in their ultimate results. Moreover, recent scholarship suggests that these processes often act as complements to, rather than substitutes for, traditional state-centered forms of regulation. Public authority has been reconfigured, rather than simply retrenched. And in the midst of economic liberalization, one sometimes observes a resurgence of state intervention through import restrictions in safety and environmental domains and enhanced government regulation and inspection of labor.

While existing research on private governance and on public regulatory reform addresses some of the consequences of global production chains, many questions remain. The Governing Global Production research field attempts to grapple with many of these questions. For instance, what factors make different types of public or private efforts effective? How is the potential for governance shaped by variations among sectors or supply chains, issue and policy domains, national settings, as well as by the strategic choices of key actors? How do private and public forms of governance coevolve or intersect? And how can we understand not only the proximate consequences of new rule-making projects but also their subtle and slow-moving effects?

To answer these questions, scholars must both read across disciplines and craft work that can speak to interdisciplinary audiences. This workshop seeks to strengthen the foundations for research that is cross-fertilized, rigorous, and broadly compelling.

WORKSHOP READINGS AND RESOURCES

Readings and other resources will be placed on the section of the DPDF online workspace devoted to this field. Students will receive separate explanations and detailed instructions about the access and use of the DPDF digital platform.

WORKSHOP ASSIGNMENTS

All assignments should be uploaded on the DPDF online workspace unless otherwise noted:

- **Due May 23:** Submit a five page summary of the dissertation project. Feel free to draw from your original DPDF proposal, updating where necessary to reflect any changes that you've made. This proposal should develop your research question and also discuss your fieldwork plans and strategy. We will use these proposals as a basis for much of our workshop discussion.
- **Due May 28:** Look at the field bibliography that we have posted and suggest four or five additional readings that could be added to an expanded version of this bibliography. Post your citations to the Discussion area and indicate in which section of the bibliography you would place each.
- **By the beginning of the workshop:**
 1. Read the other Fellows' project summaries (available by May 23, in the Discussion area) and be prepared to discuss them.
 2. Read the three articles we have posted and be prepared to discuss them:
 - Brian Greenhill, Layna Mosley and Aseem Prakash. 2009. "Trade-based Diffusion of Labor Rights: A Panel Study, 1986-2002." *American Political Science Review* 103(4): 169-190.
 - Bartley, Tim. 2011. "Transnational Governance as the Layering of Rules: Intersections of Public and Private Standards." *Theoretical Inquiries in Law* 12(2):25-51.
 - Hughes, Caroline. 2007. "Transnational Networks, International Organizations and Political Participation in Cambodia: Human Rights, Labour Rights and Common Rights." *Democratization* 14(5):834-52.

Two of these articles (Bartley; Greenhill, Mosley and Prakash) will give you a sense of our recent work (and if you want to know more, you can look at our other published work, but you are not required to). The third (Hughes) offers another set of arguments regarding the interaction between the transnational and the local.

- **By the beginning of the workshop:** Prepare to introduce and discuss another Fellow's project. (See below for assignments. The proposals should all be available online by May 23.) While we will spend a good deal of time discussing individual projects as well as the broader issues that relate to the projects, Fellows will not make formal presentations of their own projects. Rather, everyone will have read the project descriptions prior to the workshop, and each Fellow will be responsible for presenting one other Fellow's project, and for initiating a short discussion focused on that project. These presentations should last 8-10 minutes, which will allow 10-12 additional minutes for discussion. Do spend a couple of minutes introducing the project, but assume that everyone has read the project descriptions already. The bulk of your presentation should be devoted to making comments and suggestions and raising questions for discussion. We would like you to start your comments by describing one important thing that you learned by reading the project description. In order to clarify any questions and get a better feel for the project before presenting it, we suggest that you chat with the author at dinner on Wednesday or breakfast on Thursday.
- **By the middle of the workshop:** Read chapters 2 and 12 (by Andrew Schrank) and chapter 10 (by Michael Watts) in *A Handbook for Social Science Field Research*, edited by Perecman and Curran. Please see the schedule for descriptions of when and how these will be used. Please also browse the other chapters in this book and read those that best speak to your project.
- **Due at 8 a.m. on Sun., June 3:** Write and distribute a one page description of a "big question" in the Governing Global Production field and how your project is linked to it. You might start with a paragraph that discusses what you see as a key question that scholars ought to grapple with or investigate. Ideally, this should be a question that resonates across disciplines and takes advantage of new ideas you have had during this workshop. You might then write a second paragraph that discusses how your project speaks to this question (or could be extended or revised to do so). These paragraphs will be shared and used to structure our final discussion on Sunday.

WORKSHOP SCHEDULE

Wednesday, May 30th

6 p.m.:

Registration and welcome reception

Workshop materials will be distributed at registration.

Dinner to follow

Thursday, May 31st

9 a.m. to 12 p.m.: Workshop Session #1: Mapping Fields, Asking Questions, pt. 1

This session will begin to map the research field. We will start with our introduction to the types of questions that have already been asked and the ways they have been answered by different sets of scholars. While this introduction (as well as the assigned readings) will provide points of reference for our discussion, we are also interested in allowing common themes and arguments to emerge more inductively from Fellows' projects. The latter portion of this session will begin presentations and discussions of those projects. Throughout these activities, we will seek to develop a shared language for thinking about the field, highlight theoretical agendas in different disciplines, and identify research opportunities and challenges.

Presentations/discussions:

Fox-Hodess presenting Tampe's project

Blair presenting Gaikwad's

Starobin presenting Rey's

M. Greenleaf presenting Steinert-Threlkeld's

2 to 5 p.m.:

Workshop Session #2: Mapping Fields, Asking Questions, pt. 2

This session will continue the work of the first, starting with presentations and discussions of Fellows' projects. We will conclude with a discussion of common themes and challenges.

Presentations/discussions:

Kenney-Lazar presenting Fox-Hodess's project

A. Greenleaf presenting Bennett's

Gaikwad presenting M. Greenleaf's

Vortherms presenting Starobin's

Rey presenting A. Greenleaf's

Steinert-Threlkeld presenting Blair's

Bennett presenting Vortherms's

Tampe presenting Kenney-Lazar's

Friday, June 1st

9 a.m. to 12 p.m.: Workshop Session #3: Methods and the Research Field

This session will use the assigned readings to explore different methodological approaches in this field and to interrogate the connections among theory, question, argument, and evidence. A good fit between your research question and hypotheses, on the one hand, and method and empirical material, on the other, is crucial to doing sound social science. Yet the process of developing theory, specifying causal or descriptive claims, and designing an empirical strategy can vary substantially across different types of projects and methodological approaches. In addition, different disciplines may have different norms about what constitutes a good question and a convincing argument. Working at the intersection of disciplines therefore requires an understanding not only of the expectations and norms of one's own discipline, but of those in adjacent disciplines as well. We will seek to explore these issues by drawing not only on the assigned readings (the three articles noted above), but also on Fellows' projects and the additional citations you have added to the field bibliography (via comments in the Workspace discussion area).

1 to 3:30 p.m.: Individual meetings about your projects

We will set up appointments for each of you to meet with Layna and Tim (together). Some will occur during this time slot and others will be scheduled later in the workshop. While not in individual meetings, Fellows will participate in the small group discussions described below.

2 to 3:30 p.m.: Small group discussions

This session has two goals. First, use the initial part of this session to complete your reading of chapters 2 and 10 (by Andrew Schrank) in *A Handbook for Social Science Field Research*. Second, we will ask small groups to identify work from the set of suggested additions to our field bibliography that is worth highlighting in our discussion of methods and data sources. Each group will be charged with identifying one or more pieces of work, discussing what group members like (or disliked) about its methodological approach, and then reporting on this to the full group, perhaps also relating this to Schrank's discussion of cases and comparisons.

3:30 to 5 p.m.: Workshop Session #4: Sources and the Research Field

The goal here is to consider various sources of data and types of data analysis that are important in this research field. Drawing from our own research and disciplines, we will introduce what we see as promising sources of data, promising avenues for collecting new data, and core strategies for organizing and analyzing various types of data. We also will ask Fellows to discuss the types of data and analytic strategies that they see as most (or least) promising in their own disciplines. In addition, we will explore how different data sources might be relevant to Fellows' projects, seeking to re-imagine each Fellow's project being done with a different type of data than what has already been proposed. Our goal is not to push you away from your summer plans but rather to consider the extent to which different types of data could produce complementary (or competing) arguments and findings.

5 to 6 p.m.: Individual meetings about your projects

Saturday, June 2nd

9 a.m. to 12 p.m.: Workshop Session #5: Strategies for Collecting Data

We will be joined by Andrew Schrank (Sociology, University of New Mexico) to both extend our discussion of promising perspectives in this field and explore the practical side of data collection. Much of this discussion will be driven by the specific tasks that you intend to carry out in your summer research. Andrew also will have read your revised project descriptions.

2 to 4:30 p.m.: Workshop Session #6: From Preliminary Research to Proposal

The goal of this session is to consider how to integrate your preliminary research into a dissertation proposal and how to write grant proposals that maximize your chances of funding. We will look beyond the summer field experience to begin to think about how to put the pre-dissertation work to theoretical and practice use. Andrew Schrank will join part of this session as well. We will reflect on our experiences as reviewers for university- and national-level funding bodies. Fellows should have read Michael Watts's chapter in the *Handbook for Social Science Field Research* prior to this session.

4:30 to 6 p.m.: Individual meetings about your projects

Sunday, June 3rd

9 a.m. to 12 p.m.: Workshop Session #7: Looking Forward

Having built from both our perspectives on the field and more inductively from Fellows' projects over the course of the workshop, we will seek to collectively define the big questions in this research field. Your one page documents (to be submitted by 8 am that morning) will help to shape this discussion, both in terms of identifying key questions and mapping your contributions. In addition, we will discuss ideas for the September workshop, make plans for communication over the summer, and review assignments for the summer. This session will also be a chance to address any remaining questions or add new ideas to the collective agenda.

**SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL
DISSERTATION PROPOSAL DEVELOPMENT FELLOWSHIP
Radisson Warwick Hotel, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Wednesday, September 12th to Sunday, September 16th, 2012
FALL 2012 WORKSHOP AGENDA**

GOVERNING GLOBAL PRODUCTION

Research Director: Layna Mosley [mosley@unc.edu]
Research Director: Tim Bartley [bartley.83@osu.edu]

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 develop revised drafts of dissertation proposals, either for committee or funding purposes. The workshop challenges fellows to consider their summer research and proposal development within the context of contributions to their research fields. In this, the goals of the fall workshop are closely related to the project of mapping a research field that began during the spring workshop in Minnesota.

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 READINGS AND RESOURCES

Any new readings and other resources will be placed on the section of the DPDF online workspace devoted to this field.

WORKSHOP ASSIGNMENTS

All assignments should be uploaded on the DPDF online workspace unless otherwise noted:

- **Deadline Sept. 6:** Proposal draft due. As outlined on the workspace, this should be a roughly 10 page, double-spaced proposal. (Something slightly longer is permissible if necessary for an upcoming deadline.) Please indicate who you see as the main audience for your proposal (e.g., NSF Anthropology program, SSRC IDRf committee, dissertation committee, etc.).
- **Deadline Sept. 7:** Upload to the workspace either a couple of photos from your fieldwork or a brief anecdote (just something short—a paragraph or less) about your time in the field. The purpose of this is simply to give the other participants a glimpse of what your life was like this summer.
- **Deadline Sept. 12:** Look at the fieldwork-related uploads from other Fellows in the workspace. These will provide some context for our discussions during the workshop.
- **Deadline Sept. 12:** Carefully read your two assigned proposals (see schedule) and prepare comments for presentation during the workshop. Two fellows are assigned as discussants for each proposal. We will start each session with comments from one of the Field Directors, then comments from each discussant, then a wrap-up by the other Field Director. Each discussant's comments should be no more than 6-8 minutes, so that we will have

plenty of time for others (including the proposal's author) to join the conversation. In preparing comments, we would like discussants to focus on three main issues: (1) the proposal's research question: is the research question clearly articulated? Does the author situate the question in a broader literature or set of issues, so that the reader is convinced of its importance to the scholarly (and perhaps policy) community? (2) theoretical ideas and logic: does the proposal offer a theoretical argument about the research question? Assuming that it does, are the proposal's theoretical claims coherent? To what extent does the theoretical logic engage with relevant ideas and literatures? (3) empirical strategy and methods: does the proposal provide a clear discussion of how the project will be carried out at the empirical level – what sorts of information will be collected and how will this be used to assess the theoretical claims advanced? Does the proposal convince you that the project is “do-able” in the allotted time?

- **Deadline Sept. 12:** Read the remainder of the proposals (ten, not including the two for which each Fellow is discussant) and be ready to discuss them during the workshop.
- **Deadline Sept. 16, 8am:** (Sunday morning of the workshop) Using feedback from the workshop – from the discussion of your proposal, as well as the group meetings and the meeting with field directors -- submit a short project summary (no more than 1 page, single-spaced). At a minimum, this should discuss the questions, research plan, and contributions of your research. (We envision this as an extended abstract of your dissertation proposal or as the kind of project summary you would need to provide in an NSF proposal. Here is how the NSF describes its required summary: “The proposal must contain a summary of the proposed activity suitable for publication, not more than one page in length. It should not be an abstract of the proposal, but rather a self-contained description of the activity that would result if the proposal were funded. The summary should be written in the third person and include a statement of objectives and methods to be employed. It must clearly address in separate statements (within the one-page summary): the intellectual merit of the proposed activity; and the broader impacts resulting from the proposed activity.” Slightly different short summary statements may be substituted if needed for a specific funding opportunity.)

WORKSHOP SCHEDULE

Wednesday, September 12th

6 p.m.: **Registration and welcome reception**
Workshop materials will be distributed at registration.
Dinner on your own

Thursday, September 13th

9 a.m. to 12 p.m.: **Plenary Session on Funding and DPDF Alumni Experiences**

This session, in which all 2012 fellows will attend, includes a roundtable discussion with representatives from major funding sources in the humanities and social sciences. The discussion will involve trends in dissertation funding, best practices in preparing proposals for various funders, and making the transition from dissertation to postdoc opportunities. The plenary will also include a discussion with DPDF alumni about career trajectories following the DPDF fellowship.

2 to 2:50 p.m.: Workshop Session #1: Opening Reflections

In this session, we will reflect on the plenary session, discuss how big questions in this field might be viewed by different disciplines and audiences, and discuss the process of moving from preliminary research to a full project.

3:00 to 5 p.m. Workshop Session #2: Reviewing Proposals

This will be the first of several sessions devoted to reviewing and discussing your proposals. Please do not present your proposal; everyone will read these proposals prior to the workshop. We would, however, like you to start with around 5-7 minutes of reporting back on how your project has evolved over the summer. Consider issues like the following: (1) What did you expect to spend most of your time in the field doing, and what did you actually spend time doing? (2) What did you expect to *find* (in terms of answering your research questions), and what have you actually started to find? (3) How have your research questions or research designs changed over this period, and what implications does this have for the literatures or audiences with which you will need to engage?

After your introductory remarks, we will proceed with comments from the directors and discussants. In total, we will spend 50 minutes per proposal, plus short breaks in between.

<u>Proposal</u>	<u>Discussants</u>
Vortherms	Gaikwad, Rey
Kenney-Lazar	M. Greenleaf, Fox-Hodess

Friday, September 14th

9 a.m. to 12 p.m.: Workshop Session #3: Reviewing Proposals

<u>Proposal</u>	<u>Discussants</u>
A. Greenleaf	Tampe, Blair
Starobin	Steinert-Threlkeld, Bennett
Blair	Kenney-Lazar, Vortherms

12:10 to 1:50 p.m.: Individual meetings over lunch (20 min each)

Vortherms 12:10; Kenney-Lazar 12:30; A. Greenleaf 12:50; Starobin 1:10; Blair 1:30

2 to 4 p.m.: Workshop Session #4: Reviewing Proposals

<u>Proposal</u>	<u>Discussants</u>
M. Greenleaf	Starobin, A. Greenleaf
Bennett	Tampe, Gaikwad

4 to 5 p.m.: Topical Small Group Meetings

In this session, you will meet in topically-defined groups to talk about what you see as the most pressing questions for scholars in this area, the theoretical perspectives (within or across disciplines) that ought to be central to inquiry in this area, and the ways in which different theoretical perspectives might compete with or complement each other. As a group, develop a 1-page outline

of this research field (as you might do in writing an Annual Review article, for instance). We will distribute these to the group and revisit them in our final session.

Land (and sea): (a) M. Greenleaf, Kenney-Lazar, Blair; (b) Bennett, Tampe, Starobin

Labor (and citizenship): A. Greenleaf, Fox-Hodess, Vortherms

Capital (and the state): Steinert-Threlkeld, Rey, Gaikwad

We encourage you to use lunches and dinners to also meet by discipline to talk about promising literatures and research strategies within your discipline.

5 to 6 p.m.: Individual meetings (20 min each)

M. Greenleaf (5:00), Bennett (5:20); Tampe (5:40)

Dinner on your own

Saturday, September 15th

9 a.m. to 12 p.m.: Workshop Session #5: Reviewing Proposals

<u>Proposal</u>	<u>Discussants</u>
Fox-Hodess	Steinert-Threlkeld, Vortherms
Rey	Bennett, Kenney-Lazar
Steinert-Threlkeld	Blair, Starobin

2 to 4 p.m.: Workshop Session #6: Reviewing Proposals

<u>Proposal</u>	<u>Discussants</u>
Tampe	A. Greenleaf, M. Greenleaf
Gaikwad	Rey, Fox-Hodess

4 to 5 p.m.: “Processing” Small Group Meetings

In this session, you will meet in pairs to talk about the feedback you’ve received, the evolution of your project, and how you might be able to incorporate feedback into the next stage of your work. This will be a chance to talk through the difficult process of taking others’ feedback seriously while also staying focused on the main tasks that are ahead of you.

The pairings for these meetings are:

- Bennett and M. Greenleaf
- Blair and Fox-Hodess
- Gaikwad and Starobin
- A. Greenleaf and Rey
- Steinert-Threlkeld and Tampe
- Vortherms and Kenney-Lazar

Taking notes on the group’s discussion of your partner’s would be useful, as that person may be more focused on answering questions and responding to comments than on noting specific suggestions. Such notes might be a good basis for your conversation during this session.

4:50 to 6:10 p.m.: Individual meetings (20 min each)

Fox-Hodess (4:50), Rey (5:10), Steinert-Threlkeld (5:30), Gaikwad (5:50)

Group Dinner, Meritage Restaurant and Wine Bar

Sunday, September 16th

9 a.m. to 11:45 a.m.: Workshop Session #7: Wrapping Up and Next Steps

In this session, we will discuss your short project summaries (submitted by that morning), the ways in which they have incorporated feedback, what they imply about your next steps, and where we see this research field going. We will also discuss practical issues related to managing different sets of advice, seeking funding, working within and across disciplines, and preparing for qualifying exams. We will also share thoughts on the topical field outlines created in your groups on Saturday. Finally, we will consider how to continue discussion and connection in the future.