

Department of Anthropology and Sociology (ANSO)

Academic year 2022 - 2023

Doctoral Seminar I

ANSO107 – Fall 2022- 6 ECTS

Course Description

This seminar introduces PhD students to central concepts and practices, as well as themes and debates, in contemporary anthropology and sociology. Through class readings, discussions, and assignments, we will explore how research problems and questions are defined and articulated, how theory is constructed as well as its relation to empirically-grounded research. Students will have the opportunity to connect these inquiries to further the development of their own particular research interests. In doing so, we will take into account the ways that the current pandemic may affect research, and work together to explore research methodologies and design that enable rigorous and responsible research during these times. In addition to grappling with key themes and debates, the seminar seeks to foster a strong sense of social and intellectual community and peer learning amongst doctoral candidates, who will be an integral part of the ANSO community over the coming four years.

MONDAY 12h15-14h, Room S2

> PROFESSORS

Anna-Riikka Kauppinen
annariikka.kauppinen@graduateinstitute.ch

Grégoire Mallard
gregoire.mallard@graduateinstitute.ch

Office hours
Monday 14h-16h

> ASSISTANT

Office hours

Syllabus

OBJECTIVES OF DOCTORAL SEMINAR 1

The class will pursue two related objectives: first, to design a group project (with 3 students each) that will be relevant to contemporary debates in anthropology and sociology, in particular, those subfields that are concerned with the study of transnational and/or global processes; second, to experiment with various techniques of data collection in order to expand their methodological curiosity and abilities so as to approach their own personal doctoral research with fresh eyes during the second semester.

ORGANIZATION OF THE CLASS

The class will be divided into 2 parts: the first 7 weeks are devoted to discussing how researchers anticipate to contribute to theoretical debates in their disciplines, and designing a group project (with 3 students each) to

contribute to the study of transnational/global anthropology/sociology. The purpose of the group project is to enable students to experiment with proposal writing and research as a practice, including thinking about the variety of methods they can employ for their PhD projects.

The second part will be devoted to experimenting with various methods of data collection. Each group will make use of various empirical sources (historical, observational, interview-based, online research, etc.) relevant for their group project.

ASSESSMENT

This course requires active participation from all members during class and every week. Students are required to read various book chapters and/or articles per week, and/or each other's assignments. The assessment of students' performance will be broken down into three criteria: participation in class (20% of the grade), many short assignments (30%), and a final collective research project that will clearly spell out which academic debates the proposed study contributes to, and which methodologies will be employed to collect data to answer the research question (50%). The grade will reflect the quality of the submitted work, regular participation, and respect for deadlines. The final collective research proposal will not be longer than 20 double-spaced pages.

PART 1: SHOWING THE RELEVANCE OF A RESEARCH IDEA TO AN ACADEMIC FIELD

WEEK 1 Introduction: What is (good) research? Evaluative cultures of proposals (Sept. 26)

In the first week, we get to know about each other's research interests and discuss the expert process of evaluating what counts as a 'solid' contribution in academia. Come to the first class having read the two key readings, and prepare to answer the question: what kind of contribution do you envision to make through your PhD research? Where do you think your main intervention will lie (academia, policy, social activism...)? Why do you want to embark in a doctoral journey?

Lamont, Michèle. 2009. Chapter 3. *How Professors Think: Inside the curious world of academic judgment*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ Press, pp. 53-106

Grégoire Mallard, Michèle Lamont and Joshua Guetzkow. 2009. "Fairness as Appropriateness: Managing Epistemological Differences in Peer Review." *Science, Technology and Human Values* 34(5): 573-606.

Recommended readings:

Besnier, Niko & Morales, Pablo. 2018. "Tell the story: How to write for American Ethnologist." *American Ethnologist* 45(2): 163-172.

Guetzkow, Joshua, Michèle Lamont, and Grégoire Mallard. 2004. "What is Originality in the Humanities and the Social Sciences?." *American Sociological Review* 69(2): 190-212.

Vora, Neha & Boellstorff, Tom. 2012. "Anatomy of an article: The peer-review process as method." *American Anthropologist* 114(4): 578-583.

Weber, Max. 2004 [1958]. *The Vocation Lectures*, "Science as a Vocation" and "Politics as a Vocation." Hackett Publishing Company.

WEEK 2 Constructing the Object of Research: How Theory Informs Research (Oct 3)

Writing a successful research proposal involves harnessing theory and concepts for constructing a clear, persuasive object of research. Read the FNS research proposals posted on Moodle, reflect on how researchers make use of theory, and prepare questions to:

Gina Wirtz, who will present her FNS doc.ch proposal and how to write a successful application

Livio Silva-Müller, who will present on how to be a RA for a successful FNS proposal, in this case, the one obtained by Graziella Moraes Dias da Silva

Till Mostowlansky, who will present his FNS Eccellenza proposal

And read the ERC/FNS proposal by Grégoire Mallard on *Bombs, Banks and Sanctions: A Sociology of the Transnational Legal Field of Sanctions*.

WEEK 3 From Research Idea to Research Object (Oct 10)

Come to class with a research idea, a research question and a research object which could be the main focus of your experimental group research. Your research proposal should be related to the international or the transnational and should seek to address a contemporary issue of theoretical relevance to debates in the social sciences. You will present your idea to the class and receive feedback from your peers. After the class, we will decide on the composition of groups (3 students each) for the design of a collective project, based on the research affinities that will be revealed during this collective exercise.

Recommended readings:

Becker, Howard S. 1998. *Tricks of the Trade: How to Think About Your Research While Doing It*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Chapter 2: "Imagery." Pp. 10-66.

Fabian, Johannes. 2012. "Cultural anthropology and the question of knowledge." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 18(2): 439-453.

Ulibarri, Nicola & al. 2019. *Creativity in Research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

WEEK 4 Social sciences and theory: Discussing the critical turn in anthropology/sociology (Oct 17)

The 'critical turn' in social theory has taken many forms and emphases in the past forty years. For this session, please choose at least two key readings and one recommended reading on key debates in anthropological and sociological theory and come to class prepared to discuss the meaning of 'critical' for your own research topic.

Abend, G. (2008). "The meaning of 'theory'." *Sociological Theory*, 26(2), 173-199.

Allen, J. S., & Jobson, R. C. (2016). The decolonizing generation:(Race and) theory in anthropology since the eighties. *Current Anthropology*, 57(2), 129-148.

Fassin, Didier. "The endurance of critique." *Anthropological Theory* 17.1 (2017): 4-29.

Graeber, David, and Giovanni Da Col. "The return of ethnographic theory." *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 1.1 (2011).

Besbris, M., & Khan, S. 2017. Less Theory. More Description. *Sociological Theory*, 35(2): 147-153.

Ortner, Sherry B. 2016. "Dark anthropology and its others: Theory since the eighties." *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 6.1: 47-73. And reactions to it (from Appadurai, Graeber, Greenhouse, Laidlaw and Rutherford) on the following HAU issue (6.2: 1-39)

Burawoy, Michael. 2021. "Living in Sociology: On Being in the World One Studies." *Annual Review of Sociology*. <https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev-soc-072320-101856>

Global Challenges, Issue 10, "Decolonization: A Past that Keeps Questioning Us."
<https://globalchallenges.ch/issue/10/> Watch the interview of Shalini Randeria by Grégoire Mallard:
<https://globalchallenges.ch/issue/10/decolonisation-the-many-facets-of-an-ongoing-struggle/>

Recommended readings:

Buchanan, Ian. 2015. "Assemblage Theory and its Discontents." *Deleuze Studies* 9(3): 382-392.

Charmaz, Kathy and Belgrave, Linda Liska. 2007. "Grounded theory." *The Blackwell encyclopedia of sociology*, 2007

Cerwonka, Allaine, and Liisa H. Malkki. 2008. "Improvising theory." *Improvising Theory*. University of Chicago Press.

Harrison, Faye. 2011 [1991]. *Decolonizing Anthropology. Moving Further Towards an Anthropology of Liberation*. American Anthropological Association monographs.

Mogstad, H., & Tse, L. S. 2018. "Decolonizing Anthropology: Reflections from Cambridge." *The Cambridge Journal of Anthropology* 36(2): 53-72.

Healy, Kieran. 2017. "Fuck nuance." *Sociological Theory* 35(2): 118-127.

WEEK 5 How to write a literature review

(Oct 24)

Literature review is a key aspect of both proposal writing and academic knowledge production – you need to be able to persuasively argue how your research builds on and advances existing theoretical debates. In this session, we read several examples of literature reviews and hear from colleagues about the process of writing one.

Seshia Galvin, Shaila. 2018. "Interspecies relations and agrarian worlds." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 47: 233-249.

Monsutti, Alessandro. 2013. "Anthropologizing Afghanistan: Colonial and postcolonial encounters." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 42.1: 269-285.

Gil Eyal, and Larissa Buchholz. 2010. "From the Sociology of Intellectuals to the Sociology of Interventions." *Annual Review of Sociology* 36: 117-137.

During this session, Shaila Seshia Galvin and Alessandro Monsutti will come to discuss the literatures reviews they wrote for the *Annual Review of Anthropology*.

Additionally, Nina Kiderlin and Shirin Barol will come to class to discuss how they write a literature review with Grégoire Mallard for the *Annual Review of Sociology*.

Recommended reading:

Grégoire Mallard, Shirin Barol, and Nina Kiderlin. Forthcoming in 2023. "The United States in the World: How Sociologists Think About It and Why It Matters." *Annual Review of Sociology*.

Filipe Calvao; 2016. "Unfree Labor," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 45: 451-467.

WEEK 6 No Class, instead Group Work

(Oct. 31)

Find some articles either from the Annual Review of Sociology, the Annual Review of Anthropology, or another Annual Review journal (in Law and Society for instance), which reviews a field to which you may want to contribute with your group project, and analyze how it is written. What do you like about it? Read (again) the literature reviews sections in the proposals that were uploaded in Week 2. Each one has its own style. Some of them try to contextualize debates within the academic field – with some references to institutionalization strategies pursued by academics – while others focus mostly on conceptual divides. Take inspiration from these essays to write your own literature review for your own group project.

During this week, each group (3 students) shall convene separately to prepare a short literature review of about 2-3 pages, starting with your research question (3 lines), which announces which subfields of anthropology/sociology your question belongs to (legal anthropology, urban sociology, etc.), and which broad set of theories have debated this question for the last 10-20-30 years.

Then, each literature review shall discuss at least 2 theories/literatures to which your group project will contribute (2 pages). For each theory/literature, present the list of concepts/authors/solutions to the puzzle you identified that belong to a first approach, and then to the second approach. You can tell us what are the limits of their approach (lack of reflexivity? A theoretical one? Etc.).

Each group shall send their 2-3 pages of literature review relevant to their group project to the rest of the class by the end of the week, meaning Friday Nov. 4 at noon.

Recommended reading:

Machi, Lawrence A. and Brenda T. McEvoy. 2009. *The Literature Review: Six Steps to Success*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin.

WEEK 7: Theory and Literature Review

(Nov. 7)

Discussion of the literature reviews sent on Friday Nov. 4 in class. There will be 3 literature reviews, and each one will be discussed by a professor.

Group 1: presentation (10 min), followed by discussion by professor (10 minutes), followed by class discussion (10 min)

Group 2: same

Group 3: same

In conclusion, we reflect on the strengths and challenges of each literature review and think about measures that could improve them, thinking forward to the literature review you do as part of PhD proposal writing.

PART 2: EXPERIMENTING WITH A VARIETY OF DATA COLLECTION TECHNIQUES

WEEK 8 Data Collection Methods: Experimenting with observational research

(Nov 14)

Come to class with an idea of a place or several sites where you could carry out fieldwork or collect data for your group project. Why did you choose such sites? What is potentially interesting about them and how could empirical research in such sites help you answer your research questions? What are the main reasons for and against prolonged fieldwork and full immersion in such sites? What is your positionality as a researcher immersed in such sites? What additional information and data could you collect using that method compared to others such as interviews?

Read 3 articles in the following list:

Geertz, Clifford. 1988. "Being There: Anthropology and the Scene of Writing." in *Works and Lives: The Anthropologist as Author*. Stanford: Stanford University Press. Chapter 1, pp. 1-24.

Faubion, James D., and George E. Marcus. 2009. "*Fieldwork is not what it used to be.*" *Learning Anthropology's Method in a Time of Transition*. Cornell University Press. Ithaca and London (2009).

McGranahan, Carole. 2018. "Ethnography beyond method: The importance of an ethnographic sensibility." *Sites: a journal of social anthropology and cultural studies* 15.1.

Ingold, Tim. 2014. "That's enough about ethnography!" *Hau: journal of ethnographic theory* 4.1: 383-395.

Marcus, George E. 1995. "Ethnography in/of the world system: The emergence of multi-sited ethnography." *Annual review of anthropology* 24: 95-117.

Andrea Ballesterio and B. R. Winthereik. 2021. *Experimenting with ethnography: a companion to analysis*. Durham: Duke University Press. Please read Introduction and two other chapters of your choice.

Holmes, Douglas R., and George E. Marcus. 2008. "Collaboration today and the re-imagination of the classic scene of fieldwork encounter." *Collaborative anthropologies* 1.1: 81-101.

Mosse, David. 2006. Anti-social anthropology? Objectivity, objection, and the ethnography of public policy and professional communities. *Journal of the royal anthropological institute* 12(4): 935-956.

Deeb, Hadi Nicholas, and George E. Marcus. 2011. "In the green room: An experiment in ethnographic method at the WTO." *PoLAR: Political and Legal Anthropology Review* 34.1: 51-76.

Davies, C. A. 1999. *Reflexive Ethnography: A Guide to Researching Selves and Others*. London: Routledge. (Chapter 4: Observing, Participating)

Ntarangwi, Mwenda. 2010. *Reversed gaze: An African ethnography of American anthropology*. University of Illinois Press. Especially Introduction: Imagining Anthropology, Encountering America and Chapter 5: Mega-Anthropology: the AAA Annual Meetings.

Shah, Alpa. 2017. "Ethnography? Participant observation, a potentially revolutionary praxis." *Hau: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 7.1: 45-59.

Brown, Hannah, Adam Reed, and Thomas Yarrow. 2017. "Introduction: towards an ethnography of meeting." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 23.S1: 10-26.

Sandler, Jen, and Renita Thedvall. *Meeting ethnography: Meetings as key technologies of contemporary governance, development, and resistance*. Taylor & Francis, 2017.

Julie Billaud will present on the issues she dealt with while doing participant observation at the ICRC

WEEK 9 Data Collection Methods : Experimenting with interview-based research (Nov 21)

Identify informants you could interview for your group project. Prepare interview protocol. Test your protocol on someone from your group. Prepare pitch explaining your research and its aims and how the information collected during the interview will be handled. Draft informed consent form.

Read the following:

Weller, Susan C. 1998. "Structured interviewing and questionnaire construction." *Handbook of methods in cultural anthropology*, pp. 365-409.

Kvale, Steinar. 1994. *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Sage Publications, Inc.

Marjorie L. Devault. 1990. "Talking and Listening from Women's Standpoint: Feminist Strategies for Interviewing and Analysis" *Social Problems* 37(1): 96-116

Gubrium, Jaber F., and James A. Holstein (eds.) 2003. *Postmodern interviewing*. Sage.

Hockey, Jenny, and Martin Forsey. 2020. "Ethnography is not participant observation: Reflections on the interview as participatory qualitative research." *The Interview*. Routledge, 2020. 69-87.

Oakley, Ann. 2016. "Interviewing women again: Power, time and the gift." *Sociology* 50.1: 195-213.

Rudnyckyj, Daromir. 2019. "Appendix A: Methodological Notes. *Beyond Debt: Islamic Experiments in Global Finance*, pp. 225-230.

In this session, Isable Pike will speak about conducting interviews among youth and children.

WEEK 10 Data Collection Methods: Experimenting with open source searches/archives (Nov 28)

Moore, Niamh, et al. 2016. *The archive project: Archival research in the social sciences*. Routledge.

Stoler, Ann Laura. 2002. "Colonial archives and the arts of governance: on the content in the form." *Refiguring the archive*, pp. 83-102.

Derrida, Jacques. 2002. "Archive fever." *Refiguring the Archive*, pp. 38-80.

Pink, Sarah. 2016. "Digital ethnography." *Innovative methods in media and communication research*, pp. 161-165.

Moravec, Michelle. 2020. "Feminist research practices and digital archives." *Archives and New Modes of Feminist Research*, pp. 186-201.

Sheridan, Dorothy. 1993. "Writing to the archive: Mass-observation as autobiography." *Sociology* 27.1: 27-40.

Recommended

Mallard, Grégoire. 2019. *Gift Exchange: The Transnational History of a Political Idea*. Cambridge University Press (Chapter 2: The Cast).

Shayegh, Cyrus. 2017. *The Middle East and the Making of the Modern World*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Guest speaker: Cyrus Shayegh on how historians use archives.

In this session, Nina Kiderlin and Shirin Barol will also speak about using the Web as an archive and conducting research on LinkedIn

WEEK 11 Data Collection Methods: Surveys, experiments and mixed methods (Dec 5)

Doering, L. and K. McNeill. 2020. "Elaborating on the Abstract: Group Meaning-Making in a Colombian Microsavings Program." *American Sociological Review* 83(3): 417-450.

Pager, Devah. 2003. "The Mark of a Criminal Record." *The American Journal of Sociology*. 108: 937-75.

Somville, V. and Vandewalle, Lore. 2018. "Saving by Default: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Rural India," *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 10(3): 39-66.

Valeria Insaratau, Isabel Boni-Le Goff, Grégoire Mallard, Elénore Lépinard, Nicky Le Feuvre and Sandrine Morel. Forthcoming "Dissatisfied, but not discouraged: The effects of perceiving gender discrimination on job satisfaction and quitting intentions of French female lawyers." *Journal of professions and organizations*.

Kristen McNeill and Lore Vandewalle will present their work on micro-finance and loan allocation

WEEK 12 For or Against Mixed Methods Approaches? (Dec 12)

Guidelines for the groups:

Write 3-4 pages that outline which research methods you intend to use and present in class the problems associated with your methodology (10 minutes per group, followed by 20 minutes of discussion). Drawn on your reflections on the various methods you experimented with during your group project or you could use in your project. Think about the type of data you will be able to/were able to collect using each method. How do these different methods complement each other and in which ways do they help you answer your research question?

In your class presentation, discuss which methods would be best to use— whether qualitative or quantitative, historical or ethnographic, or a mixture of the two. Note any specific difficulties that you may encounter using such methods – sampling, reliability, numbers of respondents, access to fieldwork or archives, etc. - and explain how they might be resolved. Discuss the ethical issues, if any, associated with the methods used, and how you propose to get round any material or ethical difficulties identified. Pay attention to your positionality when you write about methods: is your gender/race/class/nationality important to co-construct 1) the type of data collected, or 2) your interpretation of your data, or 3) the reception of your interpretation of the data.

WEEK 13 Discussion of Final Group Proposals

(Dec 19)

Circulate a first draft of a proposal in which you summarize your proposed research question, contribution to identified academic literatures, and data collection methods.

END OF CLASS



—
INSTITUT DE HAUTES
ÉTUDES INTERNATIONALES
ET DU DÉVELOPPEMENT
GRADUATE INSTITUTE
OF INTERNATIONAL AND
DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

Department of Anthropology and Sociology (ANSO)

Academic year 2022 - 2023

Doctoral Seminar II

ANSO114 – Spring 2022- 6 ECTS

Course Description

This course pursues two inter-related goals: to help students theoretically construct a problem of sociological and/or anthropological importance; to help students develop a coherent research design for their future PhD research. Students are encouraged to come to class with a research idea in mind, or better, a draft of a research proposal. Throughout the class, students will write small assignments that will allow them to produce a research proposal by the end of the class.

Date and place

> PROFESSOR

Julie Billaud

Office hours

> ASSISTANT

Office hours

Syllabus

OBJECTIVES

This course pursues two inter-related goals: to help students theoretically construct a problem of sociological and/or anthropological importance for their doctoral research; to help students develop a theoretical justification of their selection of a case for their PhD. Students are encouraged to come to class with a research idea in mind, or better, a draft of a research proposal. Throughout the class, students will write small assignments that will allow them to produce a research proposal by the end of the class.

ASSESSMENT

Students are required to read about 3-4 book chapters and articles per week. This course requires active participation from all members during class and every week. The assessment of students' performance will be broken down into three criteria: participation in class (20% of the grade), many short memoranda (30% each), and a final research proposal (50%). Many short memoranda are required throughout the semester, and the grade will reflect as much quality as regularity and the ability to respect deadlines. The final research proposal will not be longer than 25 double-spaced pages.

Organization of the Class

Some classes are entirely devoted to the discussion of articles, and other classes are entirely devoted to the discussion of students' writing assignments. When students are asked to write a new piece of their research proposal, the assignment is due by **XXX at noon BEFORE the class**. Students are required to send their writing exercise **to the TA** who will make a compilation that will be shared with all the other students of the class. Therefore, every student can (and must) read her colleagues' writing exercises prior to class. In addition, when a writing assignment is due, students will be asked to focus on ONE particular piece of writing (by one of their colleagues), and discuss it in class. This student will be referred to below as your 'commentator'. Commentators may vary for each week. This exercise is meant to nurture your commenting (e.g. analytical) skills, which means that you should not only do the work of 'commentator' for the one paper you are assigned to comment upon (and for which you need to read a little more), but for ALL the proposals. So in class, we should gather a lot of comments, almost by everybody for each paper. That means that everyone needs to learn to express herself very briefly, and go immediately to the core of the problems you have identified and also propose a solution to solve the problem (all in one-minute max).

PART 1: IDENTIFYING A SUB-SPECIALIZATION AND TOPIC IN ANTHROPOLOGY/SOCIOLOGY

WEEK 1 – Introduction: Students' PhD projects introduction

During this session, you will discuss how your research idea, object, questions have evolved since last term. What did you learn during doctoral seminar I and how do the new insights you gained inform the way you apprehend your research. The chair of the ANSO department, Aditya Bharadwaj will also come to introduce the ANSO seminar series and explain how you are expected to participate and why your attendance is important.

WEEK 2 – Constructing an object of study

Discussion of assignments

Guidelines for the writer:

Identify your topic of research, and then find an article in the daily press (NYT, Le Monde, The Guardian, etc.) or magazines (New Yorker, etc.) that deals with some of the issues at stake in your future research. Send the article to your commentator. Then, write what could be an introductory paragraph (half a page) to your future proposal based on that article.

Then, start thinking about the research question that you want to raise about this topic. To help you do so, find two articles: *one* article published in a major generalist journal (e.g. a top generalist Anthropology or Sociology journal, etc.); and choose *one* article from a speciality journal (i.e. from the specific topic or region, from recent issues) in which you are likely to publish in the future.

Use both articles to identify: The broad general question the author seeks to answer; and how the author answers her question.

Identify whether the contribution is framed as a contribution to the literature, whether she brings in wealth of new data and disconfirms old theory/frame, whether she challenges existing theory; or adjudicates an ongoing debate in the field; etc.

Then, write one page (or half a page) to formulate your research question, and frame how your future research on the topic can contribute to the field. Please keep in mind this is a preliminary exercise to help you think about how to formulate a research question. It does not mean you will have to stick to it through the entire semester. In fact, your question will likely change as the semester unfolds.

Guidelines for the commentator:

You need to comment on the choices made by the writer with respect to the choice of anecdote and research question. Having a look at the academic and popular article will help you think of alternative ways that the introduction writer could have used to start his/her proposal. So try to think of alternatives, and the pros and cons of each alternative. If you know the topic, and want to refer to other sources than the academic article that you've been sent, please, do so.

Readings:

Becker, Howard S. 1998. *Tricks of the Trade: How to Think About Your Research While Doing It*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Chapter 2: "Imagery." Pp. 10-66.

Fabian, Johannes. "Cultural anthropology and the question of knowledge." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 18.2 (2012): 439-453.

WEEK 3 – Identifying a research question or puzzle

Assignment:

Revise week 2 assignment based on the comments you received, the readings suggested for this week and the discussions we had last week. Pay specific attention to your research puzzle, question and object. Think about how your research will contribute to ongoing debates in the social sciences. What makes your research timely, relevant and interesting in your field?

Readings:

Alvesson, Mats, and Jorgen Sandberg. *Constructing research questions: Doing interesting research*. Sage, 2013.

Fontein, Joost. "Doing research: Anthropology and ethnographic fieldwork." *Doing Anthropological Research*. Routledge, 2013. 55-69.

Schmidt, Mario. "Godfrey Lienhardt as a skeptic; or, Anthropology as conceptual puzzle-solving." *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 7.2 (2017): 351-375.

Guest speakers: Prof Anna Leander and Vinh-Kim Nguyen on how to construct a research object

WEEK 4 – Literature review

Discussion of assignments

Guidelines for the writer:

You need to write 2-3 pages, starting with your research question (2 lines). Then, you announce which subfields of anthropology/sociology your question belongs to (legal anthropology, urban sociology, etc.), and which broad set of theories have debated this question for the last 10-20-30 years. This is one paragraph.

Then, draft the preliminary literature review of your research proposal. To do so, find at least 3 articles (send ONE of these to your commentator) on your general topic (but not your case specifically) and list the research questions asked by each author. Identify the research question that is most similar to the one you want to ask.

Then, list at least 2 (possibly 3) different approaches to answer your research question, which you have identified in the literature. After that, you present the list of concepts/authors/solutions to the puzzle you identified that belong to a first approach (3 paragraphs max). You can tell us what are the limits of their approach (lack of reflexivity? A theoretical one? Etc.). Then, you do the same with the second approach by listing how the concepts/authors/theoretical claims lead to a different answer to your initial research question. You can and present some limits (3 paragraphs max).

Please note the goal of this exercise is not to summarize the articles but to place your own research within a conversation in the (sub)discipline.

Guidelines for the commentator:

You need to pay close attention to the 2 pages of literature review that your fellow student will send you. Your comments should be focused on these 2 pages, and not on the article that your fellow will have sent you, as this other article is just here to allow you to learn a bit more about the kind of literature that will be discussed by your colleague (and that you may not know at all).

Paying close attention to the 2 pages of literature does not necessarily mean that in class, you have to discuss every sentence of the proposal. Please, try to sum up your comments along 3 dimensions, asking: First, do you think the concepts/theories identify will allow your colleague to answer his/her question? Second, can you think of another answer that is not debated in the literature review (and that belongs to another literature)? Third, do you think the debate is well rendered by the draft? (for instance, would you change the order between the first and second set of answers, etc.).

Please, keep your comments to a maximum of 4-5 minutes.

PART 2: CHOOSING/JUSTIFYING A CASE

WEEK 5 – Choosing a case: What is it a case of or how many cases do you need to prove your point

Guest speakers: Grégoire Mallard and Vinh-Kim Nguyen

Lund, Christian. 2004. "Of what is this a case?: analytical movements in qualitative social science research." *Human organization* 73.3: : 224-234.

Small, Mario Luis. 2009. "How many cases do I need?" On science and the logic of case selection in field- based research." *Ethnography* 10.1: 5-3

Luker, Kristin. 2008. *Salsa Dancing into the Social Sciences: Research in an Age of Info-Glut*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press Chapter 4: "What is This a Case of, Anyway?" Chapter 5: "Reviewing the Literature".

Read the research proposal by Eléonore Lépinard, Grégoire Mallard and Nicky Le Feuvre on gendered careers of lawyers after globalization in France, Germany and Switzerland.

Read the research proposal by Graziella Moraes Silva, on "how elites shape unequal democracies and perceptions of redistribution in Brazil and South Africa"

How do they justify the selection of cases?

Recommended readings:

Sidney Tarrow. 2010. "The Strategy of Paired Comparison. Toward a Theory of Practice." *Comparative Political Studies*. 43(2): 230-259.

Michael Burawoy. 2009. *The Extended Case Methods: Four Countries, Four Decades, Four Great Transformations, and One Theoretical Tradition*. Pp. 143-192. Chapter 3: "Trotsky vs Skocpol."

Charles C. Ragin, 1989. *The Comparative Method: Moving beyond qualitative and quantitative strategies*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, (Chapters 3 and 4.)

Theda Skocpol and Margaret Somers. 1980. "The Uses of Comparative History in Macrosocial Inquiry." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* Vol. 22, No. 2, pp. 174-197.

Moraes Silva, Graziella. 2020. "Race and Racisms: why and how to compare," In: Solomos, John (ed) [The Routledge International Handbook of Contemporary Racisms](#). New York: Routledge, 2020: 67-77.

Graziela Moraes Dias da Silva will speak about using mixed methods in a comparative research project on elites, inequality and redistribution in Brazil.

Yvan Droz will speak on comparative research on religion.

WEEK 6 – Reading/writing week – No class, instead work on your justification of case selection

Read all Case selection sections sent by your class mates the week before. In addition, prepare more detailed comment on the case selection section of the student you've been assigned to comment.

Guidelines for the commentator:

You need to pay close attention to the 2-3 pages of case description that your fellow student will have sent you. Your comments should be focused on these 2-3 pages, and not on the ONE article that your fellow will have sent you, as this other article is just here to allow you to learn a bit more about the kind of literature that will be discussed by your colleague.

About the case(s), think of the following question: 1) is it a good case to answer the research question (think about micro-macro problems)? 2) If it is a comparison, do you think a comparison is needed? And is it the right comparison to choose? 3) whether the empirical material that will be used is the right one to answer the kind of question raised, and whether you think it will be difficult to get this “data” (and whether another “data” may not be better and more readily available).

Discuss whether the author convincingly argues that these are 'cases' of the same thing, and if they are not, whether some conceptual clarification is needed from the author about what her/his case is really a case of.

Assess whether the author convincingly argues that the case under study (described in the last assignment) is similar to those other cases (all are the average cases) or whether the inclusion of these other cases shows that in fact, the case under study is chosen because it is an interesting outlier. Then, you should discuss what are the merits of choosing an average vs. an outlier as the main case of your study.

You need to write 2-3 pages, starting with your research question (2 lines), and the one or two literatures that you think you will address (2 lines). This is normally already included in a proposal, but here, please, just write down as your thinking is evolving, and this is just for your readers to know what you will be talking about.

Find 5 articles that deal with the empirical case(s) you want to study. They may overlap with the articles you used for your literature review, but they may not. Indeed, you will look for articles which deal with the specifics of your case(s), and not all of them do have a good literature review (especially among the more historically/empirically-based articles, or among articles that deal with your case but that do not ask the same question about it). These case-specific articles will allow you to learn something about your case, When you send your Case selection section to the class, also send one article in this subset of articles to your commentator.

Based on a subset of these readings, provide an in-depth description of the case(s) you intend to study. Then, write down 3-4 pages: describe your case(s) and explain why choosing your case(s) is the best way to approach your research question. The point is not to say everything you know about the topic, but to justify why it is a good idea to choose this case 1) to answer your research question; 2) why choosing your case(s) is the best way to investigate the dimensions you are interested at; 3) why choosing this case is a good idea in terms of “data” available (because you will know what has already been used to investigate that case, and you need to tell us what kind of new “data” (new interviews, new fieldwork, new surveys, new historical research, etc.) you intend on building upon; 4) why you think that investigating these specific new “data” with these new theoretical lenses that are yours is better than what has been said about this case before by other authors. Try to find some criteria which make these cases and your case(s) comparable and not comparable at the same time. Then, write down 3-4 pages: describe these case(s) and explain why choosing your case as opposed to these other case(s) is better to verify or disconfirm your hypotheses.

Send your Case selection section by the end of the week to the whole class and prepare to discuss all Case selection sections with your class mates next week. Also send one article that you’ve found inspiring for your research only to your commentator.

WEEK 7 – Case selection

Do the same exercise, but this time, focus on a case that you DO NOT intend to study in depth but that is a case of the same kind you are interest at. Restructure your proposal around this other case.

WEEK 8 – Entering, positioning and reflecting about your field

Haraway, Donna. 2020. "Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective." *Feminist theory reader*. Routledge, pp. 303-310.

Hekman, Susan. 1997. "Truth and Method: Feminist Standpoint Theory Revisited." *Signs* 22(2): 341-365.

Khan, S. 2005. "Reconfiguring the Native Informant: Positionality in the Global Age." *Signs* 30(4), *New Feminist Approaches to Social Sciences*.

Rosaldo, Michelle Z. 1980. "The use and abuse of anthropology: reflections on feminism and cross-cultural understanding." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 5.3: 389-417.

Recommended

Adebayo, Kudus O., & Njoku, Emeka T. 2022. "Local and transnational identity, positionality and knowledge production in Africa and the African diaspora." *Field Methods*, published online 4 January 2022.

Clifford, James, and George E. Marcus, eds. 1986. *Writing culture: the poetics and politics of ethnography*. Univ of California Press. (Introduction: Partial truths)

Deshoulliere, G. A., Buitron, N., & Astuti, R. 2019. "Exchange and co-production of knowledges: reflections from Amazonia." *Anthropology of this Century* 24. URL: <http://aotcpres.com/articles/exchange-coproduction-knowledges-reflections-amazonia/>

Holden, Livia. 2022. "Anthropologists as Experts: Cultural Expertise, Colonialism, and Positionality." *Law & Social Inquiry* 47(2): 669-690.

Guest speaker: Umut Yilderim

PART 3: ENTERING THE FIELD: DEFINING A STRATEGY

WEEK 9: Ethics and Field Research

Read and compare the AAA and ASA codes of ethics.

Read the Graduate Institute Guideline on Ethics

Read Jorgensen, Joseph G. 1971. "On ethics and anthropology." *Current anthropology* 12.3: 321-334.

Guest speaker: Filipe Calvao will talk about his ERC project and ethics. Aditya Bharadwaj will discuss the ethical issues he encountered when researching biotechnologies in India for his ERC project.

WEEK 10 - Field strategies / ethics

Assignment

Guidelines for the writer:

Write 3-4 pages that outline which field strategies you intend to use and the problems associated with your methodology. Discuss which field strategies would be best to use— whether statistical, historical or ethnographic, or a mixture of the two. Note any specific difficulties that you may encounter using such methods – numbers of respondents, access to fieldwork or archives, etc. - and explain how they might be resolved. Discuss the ethical issues, if any, associated with the methods used, and how you propose to get round any material or ethical difficulties identified. Pay attention to your positionality when you write about methods: is your gender/race/class/nationality important to co-construct 1) the type of information you find, or 2) your interpretation, or 3) the reception of your interpretation.

Guidelines for the commentator:

Is the empirical approach fit to answer the theoretical question? If there is a problem of validity, should the author change the research question so that we do not run into the same problems? (criteria of theoretical fit)
Has the author said something about how the the analysis will allow him/her to produce new knowledge? Is the author reflexive enough about the limits of his or her research?

WEEK 11: Writing Week – No class

Try to structure everything that you've written into a first draft of a proposal

WEEKS 12 and 13– Presentations of final proposals (with advisors)

Each PhD student will have 10 minutes to present her draft proposal in the presence of the advisors. Then, a group discussion will follow for 15 minutes.