

PH.D. SEMINAR: THEORIES AND METHODS OF QUALITATIVE POLITICAL RESEARCH

This seminar has five objectives: 1) to familiarize you with the philosophical and epistemological dimensions of qualitative research, 2) to deepen your knowledge of qualitative research methods, 3) to strengthen your ability to map the content of unfamiliar intellectual domains, 4) to explore the application of these insights to the preparation of a dissertation prospectus in your field of specialization, and 5) to illustrate the value of scholarly exchange in advancing your work and the work of your colleagues.

Requirements.

- 1) Do each week's required reading and come to class prepared to discuss it. This includes the papers and propositions written by other members of the seminar.
- 2) For each class except those at which you present a paper, write two propositions based on the readings for the week.
 - Each proposition should be one sentence long and should present an idea that you personally regard as both true and important.
 - Each proposition should be formulated in response to the readings and should cite the author(s) and page(s) to which it refers. You are free to agree or disagree with an author's point of view. Be prepared to answer follow-up questions about the author's central ideas.
 - Email your propositions to me, the other members of the seminar, and Elena Gerasimov by 9:00 AM on the day of the class. Make the subject line of your email "QRS Propositions," followed by the date (mm/dd) and your family name.
- 3) For a class centering on concepts (class 6 or 7), prepare a short paper based on the assigned readings and at least one "concept book" chosen with my approval from the list of supplementary readings for that week.
 - Choose a concept that you anticipate will be relevant to your dissertation research, and clear your choice with me in advance. (You may also wish to discuss this choice with your faculty adviser in your primary field of study.)
 - The paper should set out what you regard as the key issues concerning the concept, the different ways in which it has been applied, contradictions or omissions in the relevant readings, and your own views of the concept's intellectual utility.
 - The paper should be 6-8 double-spaced pages long and should be emailed in Word to me, the other seminar members, and Elena Gerasimov by 9:00 AM on the day preceding the class at which it will be discussed.
 - Before Sep. 25 (class 4) email me a list of your four preferred concept-books, rank-ordered from most to least preferred.

4) Prepare a short paper evaluating a recently published scholarly book. These evaluations will be discussed on Nov. 13 (class 11).

- The books to be evaluated are: Paul Collier, *The Bottom Billion: Why the Poorest Countries Are Failing and What Can Be Done about It* (2007); Edward D. Mansfield and Jack Snyder, *Electing to Fight: Why Emerging Democracies Go to War* (2005); Jose Antonio Cheibub, *Presidentialism, Parliamentarism, and Democracy* (2007); and Philip G. Roeder, *Where Nation-States Come From: Institutional Change in the Age of Nationalism* (2007). By Oct. 9 (class 6) send me your first, second, and third picks from this list.
- Your central task in the paper is to identify and assess the scholarly choices made by the book's author. Briefly summarize the book's main ideas. Then analyze its research design, the sources on which it is based, the coherence of its overall argument, its contribution to scholarship, and other noteworthy strengths and weaknesses.
- Your paper should be 6-8 double-spaced pages long. It should be emailed in Word to me, the other seminar members, and Elena Gerasimov by Noon on Friday, Nov. 9.
- Write your evaluation without consulting any other reviews of the book.
- The objective of this assignment is to consider how to organize and carry out a large research project. Juxtaposing multiple evaluations of each book will sharpen our discussion of research design and methodology.

5) Meet with a Library of Congress bibliographer knowledgeable about the academic field in which you plan to write your dissertation.

- Contact information for pertinent LC bibliographers will be distributed on Oct. 23 (class 8).
- On the basis of this meeting, write and distribute a one-page report and review it with the members of the seminar on Dec. 4 (class 15).
- The report should itemize and describe the specific bibliographic tools that you learned about in your field of specialization; it may also include relevant general information about how to use the LC.

6) Write a "mock" dissertation prospectus.

- This is an exercise; the subject you choose need not be the one on which you will write your dissertation.
- Follow the guidelines at the end of this syllabus. Remember that a prospectus is a work plan for a future research project; it is not an academic paper.
- Discuss your choice of subject with your field director and email a short outline of the prospectus to me, the other seminar members, and Elena Gerasimov by 5:00 PM on Monday, Nov. 27.
- Email your prospectus in Word to me, the other seminar members, and Elena Gerasimov by 9:00 AM on Tuesday, January 22. We will discuss these prospectuses at the wrap-up class on January 25.

Readings. All the required readings are on reserve in the SAIS library or ERes. Articles that are available on-line are marked as ERes; ask me for the password at our first class. I will distribute a separate list of supplementary readings.

The following books are available for purchase in the book store: Andrew Abbott, *Methods of Discovery: Heuristics for the Social Sciences* (2004); Terence Ball, James Farr, and Russell Hanson, eds., *Political Innovation and Conceptual Change* (1989); Alexander George and Andrew Bennett, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences* (2005); Nils Gilman, *Mandarins of the Future: Modernization Theory in Cold War America* (2003); Charles E. Lindblom, *Inquiry and Change: The Troubled Attempt to Understand and Shape Society* (1990); Robert E. Goodin and Hans-Dieter Klingemann, eds., *A New Handbook of Political Science* (1996); Ira Katznelson and Helen Milner, eds., *Political Science: The State of the Discipline III* (2002); Gary King, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research* (1994); Thomas Mann, *The Oxford Guide to Library Research*, 3rd edition (2005); and Stephen Van Evera, *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science* (1997).

Reference Works. Reference works are indispensable tools for charting unfamiliar intellectual domains. As you proceed through the course, you should make frequent use of such tools as *The International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, *The International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *The Annual Review of Political Science*, *The Encyclopedia of World History*, and *The International Encyclopedia of Nationalism*. Further details are given below under Class 8 and in the list of supplementary readings. To identify other specialized reference works, peruse the list in Mann, *The Oxford Guide to Library Research*, ch. 1. For a more extensive listing of reference works published through the mid-1990s, see Robert Balay et al., eds., *Guide to Reference Books*, 11th ed. (1996), and Alan Day and Michael Walsh, eds., *Walford's Guide to Reference Materials, Vol. 2: Social and Historical Sciences, Philosophy and Religion*, 7th ed. (1998).

Writing Aids. Good scholarship requires not only careful research but also clear writing. The most useful short guide to effective writing is William Strunk and E. B. White, *The Elements of Style*, 4th ed. (2000). For a detailed guide to style and grammar organized by topic, see "Guide to Grammar and Writing" at <http://grammar.ccc.commnet.edu/grammar/> (note that the link includes a space after the final slash). A broader-gauged guide to effective writing is Wayne C. Booth et al., *The Craft of Research*, 2nd ed. (2003).

Participation by Other SAIS Faculty Members, Advanced Doctoral Students, and Ph.D. Alumni. In sessions 12-14, we will be joined by other faculty members, advanced doctoral students, and Ph.D. program alumni who will discuss the development of their own research interests and their career choices.

Grades. Course grades will be determined as follows: propositions and general class participation, 30 percent; concept paper and book evaluation, 20 percent each; mock prospectus, 30 percent.

Individual Meetings. I will be happy meet with you outside of class to discuss any issues that present special interest or difficulty for you. My office hours are Mondays and Wednesdays, 11:00-12:00. If you need to meet me at another time, arrange it with me directly, email me at bparrott@jhu.edu, or contact Elena Gerasimov, the coordinator of the Russian and Eurasian Studies program, at egerasimov@jhu.edu or 202.663.5795.

SCHEDULE OF CLASS SESSIONS

1. Introduction to the Course; History as Memory and Knowledge (Sep. 11)

Ernst Breisach, *Historiography: Ancient, Medieval, and Modern*, 2nd ed. (1993), 268-327.
Ronald Suny, "History," in Alexander Motyl, ed., *Encyclopedia of Nationalism* (2000), vol. 1, 335-58.
Eric Hobsbawm, "Mass-Producing Traditions: Europe, 1870-1914," in Hobsbawm and Ranger, eds., *The Invention of Tradition* (1983), 263-307.
Ian Lustick, "History, Historiography, and Political Science: Multiple Historical Records and the Problem of Selection Bias," *American Political Science Review (APSR)* 90, no. 3 (September 1996), 605-618. ERes

2. The Idea of Social Science and the Emergence of Scholarly Disciplines (Thursday, Sep. 13, 8:15-10:15 PM, in the regular room)

Charles E. Lindblom, *Inquiry and Change: The Troubled Attempt to Understand and Shape Society* (1990), chs. 1-8 (ca. 135 pp.)
Ronald G. Walters, "Introduction: Uncertainty, Science, and Reform in Twentieth-Century America," in Walters, ed., *Scientific Authority in Twentieth-Century America* (1997), 1-10.
Dorothy Ross, "Changing Contours of the Social Science Disciplines," in Theodore M. Porter and Dorothy Ross, eds., *The Modern Social Sciences* (2003), 205-37 (vol. 7 of David C. Lindberg and Ronald L. Numbers, eds., *The Cambridge History of Science*).
Gabriel Almond and Stephen Genco, "Clouds, Clocks and the Study of Politics," *World Politics* 29 (1977), 489-522. ERes
Gary King, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research* (1994), 3-33.
Immanuel Wallerstein et al., *Open the Social Sciences: Report of the Gulbenkian Commission on the Restructuring of the Social Sciences* (1996), 1-32.

3. Scholarship as Social Process and as Politics (Sep. 18)

Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 3rd edition (1996), chs. 2 and 4 (ca. 20 pp.)
Albert O. Hirschman, "The Search for Paradigms as a Hindrance to Understanding," in Paul Rabinow and William M. Sullivan, eds., *Interpretive Social Science: A Second Look*, rev. ed. (1987), 177-94.

Lindblom, *Inquiry and Change*, chs. 9-12 (ca. 80 pp.).

Thomas L. Haskell, "Justifying the Rights of Academic Freedom in the Era of Power/Knowledge," in Louis Menand, ed., *The Future of Academic Freedom* (1996), 43-90.

Nils Gilman, *Mandarins of the Future: Modernization Theory in Cold War America* (2003), chs. 3-6 (ca. 170 pp.)

4. Dimensions of Political Science: Comparative Politics and International Relations (Sep. 25)

Robert E. Goodin and Hans-Dieter Klingemann, eds., *A New Handbook of Political Science* (1996), ch. 2, 15, 19 (ca. 90 pp.)

Chapters by Katznelson/Milner, Kahler, Geddes, and Thelen in Ira Katznelson and Helen Milner, eds., *Political Science: The State of the Discipline III* (2002), (ca. 110 pp.)

Robert Jervis, "International History and International Politics: Why Are They Studied So Differently?" in Colin and Miriam Elman, eds., *Bridges and Boundaries: Historians, Political Scientists, and the Study of International Relations* (2001), 385-402.

Symposium: "The Qualitative-Quantitative Disputation: Gary King, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba's *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*," *American Political Science Review* 89, no. 2 (June 1995), 454-81. ERes

Gregory Kaska, "Perestroika: For An Ecumenical Science of Politics," *PS: Political Science and Politics* 34, no. 3 (September 2001). ERes

Stephen Bennett, "'Perestroika' Lost: Why the Latest 'Reform' Movement in Political Science Should Fail," *PS: Political Science & Politics* 35, no. 2 (2002), 177-79. ERes

Gilman, *Mandarins of the Future*, ch. 7 (ca. 35 pp.) OR Susanne Hoerber Rudolph, "The Imperialism of Categories: Situating Knowledge in a Globalizing World," *Perspectives on Politics* 3, No. 1 (March 2005), 5-14.

5. Dimensions of Political Science: Political Economy, Public Administration, and Political Institutions (Oct. 2)

Chapters by Alt, Frieden/Martin, Weingast, and Pierson/Skocpol in Katznelson and Milner, eds., *Political Science: The State of the Discipline*, (ca. 115 pp.)

Goodin and Klingemann, eds., *A New Handbook of Political Science*, chs. 7 and 27 (ca. 35 pp.)

Francis Fukuyama, *Statebuilding: Governance and World Order in the 21st Century* (2004), chs. 1-2 (ca. 80 pp.)

6. Concepts and Concept Formation (Oct. 9)

- Discussion papers are due via email by 9:00 AM, Oct. 8.
- List of preferences for book evaluations is due via email.

Terence Ball, James Farr, and Russell Hanson, eds., *Political Innovation and Conceptual Change* (1989), chs. 1-2, and two other chapters selected according to your interests.

Ernest Gellner, "Concepts and Society," in Dorothy Emmet and Alasdair MacIntyre, eds., *Sociological Theory and Philosophical Analysis* (1970), 115-149.

David Collier and James E. Mahon, Jr., "Conceptual 'Stretching' Revisited: Adapting Categories in Comparative Analysis," *APSR* 87 (December 1993), 845-855. ERes

Giovanni Sartori, "Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics," *American Political Science Review* 64 (December 1970), 1033-1053. ERes

Gary Goertz, *Social Science Concepts: A User's Guide* (2006), chs. 3-4 (ca. 60 pp.)

David Hackett Fischer, *Historians' Fallacies: Toward a Logic of Historical Thought* (1970), ch. 8 (ca. 25 pp.)

7. Concepts and Concept Formation, Cont'd (Oct. 16)

- Discussion papers are due via email by 9:00 AM, Oct. 15.

Ball et al., *Political Innovation and Conceptual Change*, three additional chapters selected according to your interests.

David Collier and Steven Levitsky, "Democracy with Adjectives: Conceptual Innovation in Comparative Research," *World Politics* 49 no. 3 (April 1997), 430-51. ERes

David J. Elkins and Richard E. B. Simeon, "A Cause in Search of Its Effect, or What Does Political Culture Explain?" *Comparative Politics* 11 (January 1979), 127-145. ERes

Lowell W. Barrington, "'Nation' and 'Nationalism': The Misuse of Key Concepts in Political Science," *PS: Political Science and Politics* (December 1997), 712-716. ERes

Robert Jervis, "A Political Science Perspective on the Balance of Power and the Concert," *American Historical Review* 97 (1992), 716-724. ERes

8. Identifying Scholarly Problems and Weighing Ethical Issues (Oct. 23)

Andrew Abbott, *Methods of Discovery: Heuristics for the Social Sciences* (2004), xi-xii, 13-27, 80-161, 211-48. [redistribute with week 14]

Lindblom, *Inquiry and Change*, chs. 15-16 (ca. 45 pp.)

Wayne C. Booth, Gregory G. Colomb, and Joseph M. Williams, *The Craft of Research*, 2nd edition (2003), 35-109.

Bert Useem, "Choosing a Dissertation Topic," *PS: Political Science and Politics* (June 1997), 213-16. ERes

Marshall Poe, "The 'List': On the Coming Reorganization of Historical Study," *Perspectives: Newsmagazine of the American Historical Association* 40, no. 5 (May 2002), 44-46, 50. ERes

Aarne Vesilind, "The Responsible Conduct of Academic Research," in A. Leigh DeNeef, and Craufurd D. W. Goodwin, *The Academic's Handbook*, 3rd ed. (2007), 112-19.

9. Formulating and Testing Hypotheses (Oct. 30)

Stephen Van Evera, *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science* (1997), 1-48.

King et al., *Designing Social Inquiry*, 34-230.

Philip E. Tetlock, "Theory Driven Reasoning about Plausible Pasts and Probable Futures in World Politics: Are We Prisoners of Our Preconceptions?" *American Journal of Political Science* 43, No. 2 (April 1999). ERes

10. Mapping Research Resources (Friday, Nov. 2; Library of Congress Jefferson Building, European Reading Room, 2:30-5:00)

Thomas Mann, *The Oxford Guide to Library Research*, 3rd edition (2005), chs. 2-4, 8.

Selected Reference Works (See also the Supplementary Readings List)

Encyclopaedia Britannica Online. Includes valuable links to related web sites. Accessible via the SAIS library homepage.

Encyclopedia of Economic Sociology. Ed. Neil Smelser and Richard Swedberg. 2nd ed. (2005).

Encyclopedia of Historians and Historical Writing. Ed. Kelly Boyd. 2 vols. (1999). Eisenhower Reference

Encyclopedia of Political Economy. Ed. Phillip A. O'Hara. 2 volumes. (1998). SAIS

Encyclopedia of Nationalism. Ed. Alexander Motyl. 2 volumes. (2001). SAIS

Encyclopedia of Nationalism. Ed. Louis Snyder. (1990). SAIS

Encyclopedia of World History. Ed. Peter N. Stearns. (2001). An indispensable source for checking the chronology and features of major historical events. The published version comes with a CD that is searchable by keyword. Ask for it at the SAIS library circulation desk.

A Global Encyclopedia of Historical Writing. Ed. D. R. Woolf. 2 vols. (1998). Eisenhower Reference.

The History Highway 3.0: A Guide to Internet Resources, 3rd ed. Ed. Dennis A. Trinkle and Scott A. Merriman (2002). (The accompanying CD-Rom is kept at the SAIS Circulation Desk in the "Library" section of the Reserve Files.)

International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences. Ed. Neil Smelser and Paul B. Baltes. 26 volumes (2001). Accessible online via the SAIS library homepage.

International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. Ed. David Sills. 19 volumes (1968). SAIS Reference

McGraw-Hill Encyclopedia of Economics. Ed. Douglas Greenwald. 2nd ed. (1994). SAIS

New Perspectives on Historical Writing. Ed. Peter Burke. 2nd ed. (2001). Institute of History of Medicine

11. The Comparative Method and Case Studies (Nov. 6)

Stephen Van Evera, *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science* (1997), 49-88.

Alexander George and Andrew Bennett, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences* (2005), 1-36, 61-126.

Stanley Lieberson, "Small N's and Big Conclusions: An Examination of the Reasoning in Comparative Studies Based on a Small Number of Cases," *Social Forces* 70 (December 1991), 307-20. ERes

Barbara Geddes, "How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics," *Political Analysis* 2 (1990), 131-150.

- Clifford Geertz, "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture," in Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (1973), 3-32.
- Charles Ragin, "Turning the Tables: How Case-Oriented Research Challenges Variable-Oriented Research," *Comparative Social Research* 16 (1997), 27-42.
- Giovanni Sartori, "Comparing and Miscomparing," *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 3, no. 3 (1991), 243-257.
- Immanuel Wallerstein, "The Unintended Consequences of Cold War Area Studies," in Noam Chomsky, ed., *The Cold War and the University* (1997), 195-232.
- "Symposium: 'Area Studies' and the Discipline," *PS: Political Science & Politics* 34, no. 4 (December 2001), 787-812.

12. The Logic of Explanation (Nov. 13)

- Email your book evaluations in Word to me, the other seminar members, and Elena Gerasimov by 5:00 PM, Monday, Nov. 12.

- Robert Jervis, "Complexity and the Analysis of Political and Social Life," *Political Science Quarterly*, 112 (1997-98), 569-593. ERes
- Arthur Stinchcombe, "The Conditions of Fruitfulness of Theorizing about Mechanisms in Social Science," *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 21 (1991), 367-88.
- George and Bennett, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*, 127-50.
- Paul Collier, *The Bottom Billion: Why the Poorest Countries Are Failing and What Can Be Done about It* (2007) OR
- Edward D. Mansfield and Jack Snyder, *Electing to Fight: Why Emerging Democracies Go to War* (2005) OR
- Philip Roeder, *Where Nation-States Come From: Institutional Change in the Age of Nationalism* (2007).

13. Conducting Field Research (Nov. 20)

- Visiting Class Speakers: Mary Habek and Bridget Welsh (unconfirmed)
- "Symposium: Interview Methods in Political Science," *PS: Political Science & Politics* 35, No. 4 (December 2002), 663-88.
- Michael Patton, *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods*, 2nd ed. (1990), 143-368.
- Robert Trotter, "Friends, Relatives and Relevant Others: Conducting Ethnographic Network Studies," in Jean Schensul et al., *Mapping Social Networks, Spatial Data, and Hidden Populations* (1999), 1-50.
- Matthew Miles and A. Michael Huberman, *Qualitative Data Analysis*, 2nd ed. (1994), 5-39.
- Philip C. Brooks, *Research in Archives: The Use of Unpublished Primary Sources* (1969), 1-48.

14. Framing Your Dissertation Subject and Thinking about Your Career (Nov. 27)

- Prospectus outlines are due via email by 5:00 PM, Monday, Nov. 26.
- Visiting Class Speakers: One dissertation student plus one young faculty member (unconfirmed)

Van Evera, *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*, 89-116.

Abbott, *Methods of Discovery*, 41-80, 162-210. [redistribute with week 9]

“On Writing a Dissertation: Advice from Five Award Winners,” *PS: Political Science and Politics* (1986), 61-70. ERes

Marie desJardins, "How to Be a Good Graduate Student," at <http://www.cs.indiana.edu/how.2b/how.2b.html>

Read the SAIS mock dissertation prospectus by Bo Kong in ERes and the full prospectuses by Gabriel Goodliffe, Sara Konoe, and Jeff Macris on the SAIS Ph.D. website (http://www.sais-jhu.edu/saisphd/protected/model_prospectuses/index.html--ask Ellen Psychas or me for the password).

Skim one SAIS dissertation recommended by your dissertation advisor.

Read the abstracts of two or three dissertations relevant to your interests in *Digital Dissertations*, accessible via the library home page.

15. Writing a Prospectus and Applying for Research Support (Dec. 4)

- Meet with me this week during office hours to discuss your prospectus outline.
- Library reports due in class (bring copies for all class members).
- Visiting Class Speakers: (unconfirmed)

“Symposium: Advisors and the Dissertation Proposal,” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 34, no. 4 (December 2001), 841-855.

Read the SSRC guidelines to proposal-writing (http://www.ssrc.org/programs/publications_editors/publications/art_of_writing_proposals.page).

Peruse the Dissertation Proposal Workshop of UC Berkeley’s Institute of International Studies (<http://globetrotter.berkeley.edu/DissPropWorkshop>)

Review the dissertation prospectuses assigned for last week.

16. Presentation and Discussion of Mock Prospectuses (Friday, January 25)

- Make sure that your prospectus follows an accepted format for citations and bibliographies. See Charles Lipson, *Cite Right: A Quick Guide to Citation Styles--MLA, APA, Chicago, the Sciences, Professions, and More* (2006), and the other sources in the list of supplementary course readings.
- Email your prospectuses in Word to me, the other seminar members, and Elena Gerasimov by Noon, Tuesday, Jan. 23.

GUIDELINES FOR MOCK PROSPECTUSES

Your mock prospectus should be 8-10 pages long. Consult your field director and follow any special requirements for a prospectus in your dissertation field. In the absence of such requirements, use the guidelines below (which have been designed for doctoral candidates in Russian and Eurasian Studies), with the understanding that your mock prospectus will not be as detailed as a full prospectus.

A prospectus should include the following parts:

- 1) A one-paragraph abstract that summarizes the prospectus.
- 2) The rationale for writing the dissertation (1-2 pp.) This section should explain the central intellectual problem that the dissertation will examine, and spell out the two or three central questions that the dissertation will answer. It should briefly summarize the state of relevant works by other scholars and be framed in terms of prior scholarly writing on or around the topic. In this respect, two basic justifications are possible: (a) relevant primary sources on the topic exist but have not been examined by other scholars; or (b) relevant primary sources exist but have been misinterpreted by other scholars.
- 3) A description of the research design and working hypotheses (2-3 pp.) This section should spell out the time period to be covered in the dissertation, summarize the analytical methods to be used, and flag any special problems these methods may entail. It should present working hypotheses that indicate tentative answers to the questions posed in section 2. It should also categorize the varieties of source material that will be analyzed (e.g., secondary sources providing intellectual or historical background; archival sources; contemporaneous books and periodicals; contemporaneous government documents; contemporaneous interviews of participants; and retrospective interviews of participants.)
- 4) A systematic list of relevant documentary sources (4-5 pp.) Although some annotations may be included for each category of material, this section should be primarily a thorough list of relevant sources broken down by the categories listed above, supplemented as necessary with additional categories.
- 5) An outline of the dissertation chapters as currently planned (1-2 pp.) This is an important tool for sorting out and organizing your material and themes. Naturally, the outline will change as your research proceeds.
- 6) A schedule for researching the dissertation, broken down by types of research material, and a schedule for writing it, broken down by chapters (1-2 pp.)

ON THE MEANING OF EDUCATION

*A man is marked as educated
not by his complicated answers
but by his clear, simple questions.*

Teachers, being generally knowledgeable, serve as rich sources of useful information. To secure it, however, you must be prepared always to ask questions without the slightest hesitation. In my experience, the quality and excitement of the answer are in direct proportion to the thoughtfulness, simplicity, and daring of the question...

A few teachers, if you are lucky, will also be for you examples of the inquiring mind at work....But the ordinary teacher can be expected to school you in a subject; if you wish to be truly educated, you must depend on yourself. If you complain that school is uninteresting or irrelevant, or that it teaches conformity and merely trains you to fill a place in society, it is because you let it do so...

It is an unhappy truth that anyone who depends solely on others for the test of his achievements will end life feeling he has accomplished nothing: there are so many to please and someone is always dissatisfied. So set your own sights and, provided you give your best effort, you can feel free to demand that your teachers teach you what you want to know...

No matter how skilled your teachers, they will never substitute for sitting down with a book and digging in. As a strategy for reading intelligently, I recommend that you always begin with a question, if no more than to ask what you expect to learn from the book and what is the perspective from which the author presents his ideas. For myself, I always write profusely in the margins. This saves me much exclaiming and swearing aloud (which librarians seem not to care for, no matter the enthusiasm for learning it may display). It also leaves me in the end with not one book, but two. By this means you will discover that every book starts with an idea, an implied question, the quest for a personal answer...

If you come to books in this manner, you will end up an educated man, no matter how meager your classroom opportunities or how poor the official reports. On the other hand, if your intelligence and industry lead you to the heights of academic achievement, you will still retain an essential humility and tolerance for the views of others. If you respect the diversity of possible answers, you will perceive how another, in good faith, can find his way to a conflicting result without being thought a dullard or a nincompoop.

Then you can understand that he simply began with a different question than yours, viewed his subject from a different perspective, and consequently sees, in truth, something new. At best, you can appreciate that learning is not a lonely or a competitive enterprise, but an essentially

cooperative one. Such cooperation will encourage creative conflict, preserve the dialectic of question and answer, and teach you that Truth is better illuminated by shedding more light on the subject than can come from your own little candle.

From *FATHER TO SON: THOUGHTS TO LIVE BY*,

by GORDON CLARK SCHLOMING (1944-1994)