

**SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL
DISSERTATION PROPOSAL DEVELOPMENT FELLOWSHIP**

University of California

Berkeley, California

Wednesday June 4-Sunday June 8, 2014

SPRING 2014 WORKSHOP AGENDA

STATE BUILDING AND GOVERNANCE IN RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT

This is the first of two workshops designed to help students prepare successful dissertation proposals in the field of State Building and Governance. The primary goals of the workshop are to: 1) map the field vis-à-vis different disciplines, methods, sources, and regions; and 2) help prepare fellows for their pre-dissertation summer research. (The second workshop will devote more attention to the mechanics and methods of dissertation proposal writing). Insofar as our discussions of your proposals will help us map and build the field, and vice versa, the two goals are complementary.

Public officials do their jobs in different ways in different times and places. Some distribute resources and opportunities—including jobs, contracts, services, and subsidies—on the basis of broadly ‘rational’ criteria like demonstrated need and ability. Others allocate assets and access on the basis of more particularistic criteria including partisan loyalties, communal solidarity, family ties, and bribery. And many are unwilling or unable to do their jobs at all—with more or less predictable consequences for the well-being of their constituents. In fact, the World Bank holds that “one in four people on the planet, more than 1.5 billion, live in fragile and conflict-affected states or in countries with high levels of criminal violence.”

The field of State Building and Governance addresses the roots and manifestations of public authority in different agencies, countries, regions, and time periods. Specific questions to be addressed include: What are the origins and underpinnings of institutions like professional (or merit-based) bureaucracies, independent judiciaries, autonomous central banks, and military deference to civilian authority? Are corruption and cronyism products of colonialism, culture, commodity booms, or more contingent historical circumstances? Are war-making and state-making really complementary historical processes, or might they at times prove orthogonal or antagonistic to each other? What is the relationship between regime type and public sector performance? And how—if at all—can the rule of law be established in fragile states where the law itself is, by definition, a feeble instrument?

The answers to these and related questions are unlikely to be found within the narrow confines of a single discipline or method, and we will therefore address the possibilities and limits of state building and governance from different disciplinary (or interdisciplinary) perspectives and methodological starting points. Examples would include, but by no means be limited to, archival research, field experiments, survey research, ethnography, open-ended interviews, and the econometric analysis of observational data. Key actors to be studied include not only public officials but their private interlocutors (e.g., businesspeople, labor leaders, community activists, armed revolutionaries, party officials, and voters), and potential research sites include not only government agencies but the organizations and communities in which they make their marks.

WORKSHOP READINGS

The following abbreviated field bibliography will be found on the DPDF Workspace and constitutes required reading.

1. Charles Tilly, "War Making and State Making as Organized Crime," CRSO Working Paper 256, University of Michigan, 1982. Note the subtle differences between the working paper and the better known version published under the same title in P. Evans et al. *Bringing the State Back In* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).
2. Peter Evans, "Predatory, Developmental, and Other Apparatuses: A Comparative Political Economy Perspective on the Third World State." *Sociological Forum* Vol. 4:4 (Fall, 1989).
3. Catherine Boone, "Rural Interests and the Making of Modern African States." *African Economic History* No. 23 (1995).
4. Robert Putnam, "Democracy, Development, and the Civic Community: Evidence from an Italian Experiment." Pp. 33-73 in I. Serageldin and J. Taboroff, eds., *Culture and Development in Africa*. Washington: World Bank, 1994.
5. Christopher Clague, Philip Keefer, Stephen Knack, and Macur Olson, "Property and Contract Rights in Autocracies and Democracies," *Public Choice* Vol. 1:2 (June, 1996).
6. Elinor Ostrom, "Crossing the Great Divide: Coproduction, Synergy, and Development." Pp. 85-118 in Peter Evans, ed., *State-Society Synergy: Government and Social Capital in Development*. Berkeley: University of California, Berkeley: International and Area Studies, 1997.
7. James C. Scott et al., "The Production of Legal Identities Proper to States: The Case of the Permanent Family Surname," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* Vol. 44:1 (January, 2002).
8. Nayanika Mathur, "Transparent-making Documents and the Crisis of Implementation: A Rural Employment Law and Development Bureaucracy in India," *Political and Legal Anthropology Review* Vol. 35:2 (November, 2012).

WORKSHOP ASSIGNMENTS

1. **Research proposals.** Please post a draft dissertation/funding proposal of 10 double-spaced pages maximum to the DPDF workspace by May 19. All participants should read and prepare to discuss all 12 proposals. You should feel free to follow the guidelines provided by an established

funding organization (e.g., National Science Foundation, Social Science Research Council) in preparing your proposal.

2. **Research design memo.** Please choose a single reading from the abbreviated field bibliography on page 2 and write a memo of approximately two single spaced pages that “reverse engineers” its research design or method. These memos should address not the readings in general but the empirical strategies used by their authors to answer their questions and/or assess their hypotheses (e.g., case or site selection, choice of data sources, interpretive or analytical strategies, logics of comparison, etc.). N.B.: The best memos will pay attention not only to the merits of the methods in question but to their shortcomings, including ambiguity and confusion that could undercut their utility. Please post your “research design” memo to the DPDF workspace by May 26. All participants should read and prepare to discuss all 12 memos.

3. **Presentation of a fellow student’s proposal.** We will devote almost half of our time together— i.e., Sessions 3, 5, and 6—to discussions of your proposals. Each proposal will be introduced briefly by a discussant who will have *no more than three minutes* to summarize the author’s question(s), goals, hypotheses, methods, and/or expectations, and to add any suggestions of his or her own. By hearing your proposal presented by somebody else, you should gain a better understanding of its reception. What comes across? What doesn’t? And why? Following the introductions, we will allocate approximately 30 minutes to open discussion of each proposal. The schedule of presentations and discussions is below; discussants should prepare to make their remarks in a clear and concise manner.

Schedule of students proposals and presentations

<i>Session</i>	<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Presenter</i>
3	Mariano Sánchez Talanquer	Giancarlo Visconti
	Marianne Gonzalez le Saux	Jia Feng
	Julia Tierney	David Peyton
	Simeon Newman	Kyrstin Mallon Andrews
5	David Peyton	Michael Roll
	Jia Feng	James Erbaugh
	Kyrstin Mallon Andrews	Julia Tierney
	Juan Diego Prieto	Teresa Bornschlegl
6	Giancarlo Visconti	Juan Diego Prieto
	Teresa Bornschlegl	Simeon Newman
	Michael Roll	Marianne Gonzalez le Saux
	James Erbaugh	Mariano Sánchez Talanquer

WORKSHOP SCHEDULE

Wednesday June 4: Welcome Dinner

Thursday June 5

9:00-12:00: Session 1: Introduction to the Field and the Participants.

We will use this session to introduce the participants and the field. You should come prepared to briefly introduce yourself and your project and to engage in an open-ended discussion of state-building and governance that draws upon—but is not limited to—the readings in the field bibliography. Questions that might be addressed include: Is there an interdisciplinary field of state-building and governance? How would you know? Should there be such a field? Why or why not? And what does (or would) it include and exclude?

2:00-5:00: Session 2: Reverse Engineering a Research Design.

We will devote this session to the research design memos. Our goal is to try to get a sense for how authors in different fields or disciplines actually undertake empirical research. Issues to consider include the choice of cases and sites; conceptualization and measurement of key variables; whether data are used to generate hypotheses or to test them; how hypothesis testing occurs; what counts as evidence and how comparisons are used to evaluate empirical claims; whether evidence is 'demonstrative' (e.g., tracing a causal process) or more 'evaluative' (assessing a claim in light of alternatives); and the very conception of causation implicit in the argument (if any!). Other aspects of research design may matter as well. The point is to focus on what you see as a *key* area of the design either because it is exemplary or because it is particularly problematic. While your individual memos should address a single reading, you should be prepared to discuss the designs underlying all of the assigned readings as well as the memos of your peers.

Friday June 6

9:00-12:00: Session 3: Discussion of student proposals.

See description and assignments on p. 3.

2:00-5:00: Session 4: The Practicalities of Field Research.

This session will focus on the practical challenges posed by field research. Alison Post, Assistant Professor of Political Science at Berkeley, will join us to discuss her experience studying large scale public (and recently privatized) utilities in Argentina. Our goal is to help you make the most of your time in the field by encouraging you to anticipate and avoid practical pitfalls that tend to beset most fieldworkers. Examples would include, but by no means be limited to, logistical difficulties, corruption, limited access to important data, communications barriers including those rooted in cultural differences and identity, the potential political sensitivity of your research topics, and institutional review board and

human subjects concerns. You should read Professor Post's brief essay, "The Paradoxical Politics of Water Metering in Argentina" (*Poverty in Focus* No. 18 2009), which is posted to the DPDF Workspace, and come prepared with questions about any potential problems you anticipate in your own research.

Saturday June 7

9:00-12:00: Session 5: Discussion of student proposals.

See description and assignments on p. 3.

2:00-5:00: Session 6: Discussion of student proposals.

See description and assignments on p. 3.

Sunday June 8:

9:00-11:30: Session 7:

Wrap up discussion and summer plans. This session will address loose ends from the previous sessions—including ex post facto reflections on earlier discussions in particular—and summer plans. We will make every effort to draw practical lessons from the readings and discussion in an effort to help you make the very most of your summer research experience, and to come back in the fall ready to write fundable dissertation proposals.

Finally, the field directors will meet with the following students over lunch on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday respectively:

Thursday: Peyton, Roll, Tierney, Mallon Andreww

Friday: Sánchez Talanquer, Gonzalez le Saux, Visconti, Newman

Saturday: Feng, Prieto, Erbaugh, Bornschlegl

**SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL
DISSERTATION PROPOSAL DEVELOPMENT FELLOWSHIP
Hyatt Arlington, Arlington, Virginia
Wednesday, September 17th to Sunday, September 21st, 2014
FALL 2014 WORKSHOP AGENDA**

State Building and Governance in Retrospect and Prospect

Marcus Kurtz (kurtz.61@osu.edu)
Andrew Schrank (andrew_schrank@brown.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 sense, the goals of the fall workshop are closely related to the project of mapping a research field that began during the spring workshop.

Fellows will come out of the second workshop with clear courses of action to revise drafts into intellectually mature dissertation proposals, as well as supportive networks of mentors and cohorts of new scholars within the research field.

WORKSHOP READINGS AND RESOURCES

Please read the following (posted to DPDF workspace) before revising your proposals.

Adam Przeworski and Frank Salomon. "The Art of Writing Proposals." Unpublished manuscript. SSRC. 1995. http://www.ssrc.org/workspace/images/crm/new_publication_3/%7B7a9cb4f4-815f-de11-bd80-001cc477ec70%7D.pdf

Michael Watts. "In Search of the Holy Grail: Projects, Proposals, and Research Design, but Mostly About Why Writing a Dissertation Proposal Is So Difficult." Ch. 10 in S. Curran and E. Perelman, eds., *A Handbook for Social Science Field Research: Essays & Bibliographic Sources on Research Design and Methods* (Beverly Hills: Sage, 2006).

WORKSHOP ASSIGNMENTS

- **12 September: Proposals.** Upload a draft of your dissertation proposal to the DPDF workspace. Maximum length 10 pages double spaced or about 3,000 words. The format can follow the specific guidelines of one of the main funding agencies to which you will be applying or the general recommendations by your dissertation committee but please be explicit about the format you've used and the rationale for doing so.
- **16 September: Readings.** Read all posted proposals and review Przeworski and Salomon and Watts.

- 19-20 September. Presentations.** We will devote approximately half of our time together—i.e., Sessions 2, 3, 4, and 5—to discussions of your proposals. We still believe that you will gain more insight into your proposals and their receptions by hearing them presented by your colleagues than by presenting them yourselves, and we will therefore follow the same format we used in the spring. Each proposal will be introduced by a presenter who will have *no more than three minutes* to summarize the author’s question(s), goals, hypotheses, methods, and/or expectations, and to add any suggestions of his or her own before opening the door to group discussion. (We will enforce the three minute rule quite strictly.) But many of you will be applying to interdisciplinary (or multidisciplinary) funding competitions, and we have therefor paired you with presenters from different (and hopefully unfamiliar) disciplines in an effort to highlight the different disciplinary norms and customs in the room. You should thus pay particularly careful attention not only to what’s being said (or written) but by whom it’s being said or written, and to ask yourselves whether certain approaches have broader appeal than others. We hope to allocate approximately 40 minutes to each proposal and to schedule individual meetings with their authors in the last hour of sessions 2, 3, 4, and 5. If the group discussions run long, however, we will meet individually with the presenters over meals and/or during break times. The schedule of presentations and discussions is below; discussants should prepare to make their remarks in a clear and concise manner.

<i>Session</i>	<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Presenter</i>
2	James Erbaugh	Marianne Gonzalez le Saux
2	Teresa Bornschlegl	Mariano Sánchez Talanquer
2	Michael Roll	Julia Tierney
3	Kyrstin Mallon Andrews	David Peyton
3	Giancarlo Visconti	Jia Feng
3	Juan Diego Prieto	James Erbaugh
4	Jia Feng	Michael Roll
4	David Peyton	Teresa Bornschlegl
4	Julia Tierney	Giancarlo Visconti
5	Simeon Newman	Juan Diego Prieto
5	Mariano Sánchez Talanquer	Kyrstin Mallon Andrews
5	Marianne Gonzalez le Saux	Simeon Newman

- 20 September. Modules.** You wrote your proposal with a particular audience—disciplinary, interdisciplinary, or multidisciplinary—in mind. Re-write the opening paragraph or first page of your proposal with *different* audience in mind and post the new text—with a line telling us who the new audience is—to the DPDF workspace by 9:00 p.m. on September 20th. While you’re welcome to work or think about this before September 20, we’d like you to take the feedback you gained at the workshop into account before posting your *final* revised text to the workspace. We will use these revisions to motivate part of our wrap-up discussion September 21st. Please read everybody’s revised text before the session.

WORKSHOP SCHEDULE

Wednesday, September 17th

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

Thursday, September 18th

9 a.m. to 12 p.m.: **Workshop Session #1: Summer Research - Successes and Challenges**

This session will constitute an informal debriefing of sorts and will afford us the opportunity to acquaint ourselves with each other's projects. Be prepared to provide a brief (i.e., 5 minute) summary of your summer field experience and to answer the following questions in particular: What did you set out to learn? What was the most important thing you *did* learn? What was the most important thing you were *unable* to learn? Was the principal obstacle to doing so a lack of *access*, a lack of *knowledge*, a lack of *skill*, or something else? And what are the implications for your project going forward? You should also feel free to highlight other questions or themes you'd like us to address during the workshop, especially those that have general relevance. In preparing for this session, and for the workshop more generally, please reflect on the assigned readings by Przeworski and Salomon and Watts, and in particular on the former's "three questions" (1995, p. 1) and the latter's claim that "a research proposal presents a question or problem theorized in such a way that it generates a claim or argument (a hypothesis, if you wish), attached to which are evidentiary needs on the one side and a series of means (methods) for generating, locating, and assessing evidence on the other" (2006, p. 181).

2 to 5 p.m.: **Plenary Session on Proposal Writing and Applying for Dissertation Research Funding**

All fellows from the research fields at this workshop will attend this session. In this session, DPDF staff, in conjunction with some of the research directors, will discuss the genre of proposal writing for research funding. Topics to be discussed will include: writing for disciplinary v. interdisciplinary audiences • finding an appropriate tone and style • ways to write about your pre-dissertation research as preparation for long-term research • best practices for preparing a research budget • pulling back the curtain on general review processes.

In the second part of the plenary, students will break out into small groups to role play a review committee and discuss the merits of two short proposals that have been assigned to read prior to the workshop. Following the exercise, students will reconvene and debrief.

Friday, September 19th

9 a.m. to 12 p.m.: **Workshop Session #2: Reviewing Proposals**

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

Saturday, September 20th

9 a.m. to 12 p.m.: **Workshop Session #4: Reviewing Proposals**

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

Sunday, September 21st

9 a.m. to 12 p.m.: **Workshop Session #6: Wrapping Up and Next Steps**

We will use this session to tease out broader lessons from the workshop and to address any unanswered questions. In particular, we will ask whether and how the introductions to your proposals should vary depending upon their audiences and to what degree the answer to that question should inform the rest of your proposal. In thinking about this question, you may want to consider, once again, the readings by Przeworski and Salomon and Watts in light of the rest of the workshop discussion.

12 p.m. to 1:30 p.m. **Farewell lunch at hotel**