

**Prospectus Seminar**  
Mandatory PhD Course, Winter 2011

Instructor: Gabor Toka  
Professor, Department of Political Science  
Central European University

*Note: Preliminary version as of September 2010. Final version will be posted in due course. The most recent version is available at: [http://www.personal.ceu.hu/departs/personal/Gabor\\_Toka/Courses\\_files/C-11Prospectus.pdf](http://www.personal.ceu.hu/departs/personal/Gabor_Toka/Courses_files/C-11Prospectus.pdf). Please email me if you have any comments or suggestions and I will give it a serious consideration.*

Classes: .....

Office hours: FT804, ..... and by appointment

Credits: 2 CEU credits, 4 ECTS credits

**Course Description**

The objective of this seminar is to help preparing PhD dissertation proposals and think through related issues of career choice, research strategy, planning, and methodology. The course is structured around the research interests of probationary doctoral students, who present their prospectus plans in class, work together in identifying key issues in developing viable research plans, and revise their prospectus plans to reflect any feedback and insight gained in this process. The in-class discussions are to focus on the choice and formulation of the research question; its justification in terms of relevance, timeliness, and tractability; its implications in terms of workload, schedule and resources required, as well as the side-benefits offered; the translation of the research question into a manageable research agenda via hypotheses or other means; the identification of appropriate research methods; concept formation and measurement; the use of productivity enhancing tools; and last but not least presentation and publication strategy issues. The classes will be supplemented with optional tutorials on a draft prospectus outline that you will submit four weeks before, or, if your presentation is scheduled for the first half of the semester, four weeks after your in-class presentation.

As the great A. Wuffle noted in his memorable reflections on the Wuffeauldian perspective on science, "Truth is like a truffle: 'First you have to figure out where to dig; then you have to dig around a lot, and then you have to get rid of all the clinging dirt that obscures what you really want.'" In other words, working in the academia (as in many other professions) requires patience, the acceptance of deferred gratification, and rather long time horizons. But most probably you just do not have enough years in your life to spend some of them merely with paying your entrance fee to the profession by producing a book-length manuscript that will then be forgotten and buried. Therefore we will also try to raise questions of planning a dissertation project as something that fits in and advances your life plans rather than straightjackets them in ways that you did not foresee.

You find further details about the presentations, outlines, grading, class schedule and readings below.

### **Learning outcome**

- Ability to conceive, elaborate and defend a research plan; think through its implications for career planning, work schedule and possible side projects
- Reason analytically, applying abstract models to complex empirical situations and engage with different intellectual traditions, subfields, research designs and methodologies in the social sciences
- Ability to design, implement and write up a high quality original academic or applied research in a rigorous and consistent manner, of a quality to merit publication in peer-reviewed journals
- Ability for effective oral presentation of scholarly thoughts, developing listening and discussion skills with initiative and autonomy in various professional contexts
- Ability to harmonize the research plan with the empirical findings, to foresee the difficulties of empirical research, to integrate unexpected results

### **Evaluation**

This course is merely meant to help developing your dissertation prospectus, and that will be separately graded anyway. Therefore in this course merely your class participation is assessed with a pass/fail grade. To earn a pass grade you need to prepare and deliver your own presentation thoughtfully and within the given time constraints; circulate a 500-word outline two days before your presentation; submit a max. 1,500-word revised outline by its due date; and participate actively and constructively in the discussions throughout the semester. Active participation means of course more than just not missing classes without prior notification and compelling justification; it also involves contributing to the creation of a stimulating, engaging, focused, supportive, and yet challenging learning environment for all participants in the class. Your continuous contribution to this is absolutely essential because this course is based almost exclusively on student presentations and subsequent discussions.

### **Your assignments**

Your assignments in this course aim at creating opportunities for you to improve your prospectus and its presentation and to receive feedback on it. Each of you will do an in-class presentation of your prospectus plan at some point and circulate a 500 word summary of this presentation (a highly structured handout, not a continuous text or the presentation itself) 48 hours before the event. This presentation should be professionally prepared with slides or other appropriate illustrations, only situate your work in current specialist debates very-very briefly, and then focus on what is new about your project and how you plan to do it, without getting into the kind of dry technical or logistical details that most of us will not be able to relate to anyway. Keep in mind that most of your audience will not be specialists in your specific field and yet you should be able to use the occasion as an opportunity to see how a broad range of IR scholars, political scientists and policy analysts from different fields sees the relevance, strength and possible weaknesses of your design. Since all scholars are preoccupied with their own work, there are not too many times in the life of an academic when intelligent peers pay attention to your half-cooked ideas. So start to make the most of these – usually very-very brief – opportunities, and explore whether your ideas can expect resonance among a broad range of people or are so esoteric that you cannot reach with them beyond a very narrow circle of colleagues. If the latter is the case, maybe you should think again: is it really such a good idea to

spend time with pursuing an idea that even your classmates do not get excited about? After all, ideas that most people in the discipline find uninteresting rarely lead to notable publications. Or maybe you should just devote more attention to improving your ability to engage a broader audience? This might be a valuable lesson from this seminar, because if you do not have that skill, your works will never receive the attention that they deserve. That said, chances are that what you learn from this presentation is more about specific strengths that actually have, apparently, though you probably had not known about them - or at least did not have that much trust in - before we told you, and therefore you may better take advantage of them consciously and confidently after you did this presentation.

As for the content of your presentation, details will of course depend on whether you work in political theory or on empirical research, and to what epistemology you adhere to. But in any case, make sure that you highlight what is specific about your questions, what possible answers you count with, and how your research aims at adjudicating between the truth claims of the various possible answers in a way that should look intelligible, sound and compelling for your fellow academics. Explain too why you think that this project is doable with reasonable effort and the resources at your disposal, and how your professional development can benefit from it.

I expect about 20 students enrolled in the class, which will leave about 50 minutes for the in-class presentation and discussion of each draft proposal that we would then allocate like: appr. 8 minutes for the presentation, appr. 40 minutes for the discussion, and 2 minutes for everything else. During week one, we will schedule the individual in-class presentations that will take place across weeks 3 and 12. Those who present before 19 February will submit a *revised* outline four weeks *after*, and those who present after 19 February will submit a *preliminary* outline four weeks *before* their presentation. The rationale is that the four-week interval should help you to shop around for feedback with two somewhat different outlines of your ideas and to maintain continuous work on the project.

The outline must be a max. 1,500 words summary of what you intend to do, as prepared for a fictitious or real scholarly reader – e.g., a prospective thesis advisor – who does not yet know what you are interested in but whom you would genuinely like to consult on how to develop and argue your dissertation plan. So write this as a text with proper sentences and paragraphs, but with appropriate useful questions inserted (and then highlighted) to this imagined or real reader. I will be available for a tutorial session to help the refinement of this product that should then be useful for turning to scholars closer to your specific field.

## **Course outline**

### **Week 1:**

General introduction to the goals and norms of the course. Scheduling presentations and miscellaneous organizational matters. The place and role of the dissertation in a career. Dissertation topics, attrition rates, placement stats in different doctoral schools. The composition and role of dissertation committees. Managing relations with supervisors. Conference presentations, professional associations, summer schools, soliciting feedback: which one could be useful and why? Criteria for choosing a dissertation topic: what can we get out of our dissertation project and what is to be avoided. Career types, the assets that can advance them, and what you can do to help yourself

## Week 2:

Structuring a dissertation and structuring a proposal. The importance of reversing the textbook order of things on two points. Publishing in academic outlets and the central role of journals in regulating the attention and other rewards that your work will receive. Choosing outlets and titles for your papers, writing abstracts. The review process. Journal rankings, impact factors, tracking citations, and why all this matter. Bibliographic performance indicators and their increasing use in administrative decisions. Anticipating publication targets in dissertation, paper and grant proposals

## Weeks 3-12:

Presentation and discussion of draft dissertation proposals

## Readings

It is expected that the in-class discussions will result in recommendations as for further readings for each presenter, and these recommendations will be posted on the e-learning site of the course. Below you find a set of recommended introductory readings on various topics that we will get to in class at one point or another. To save you time with the library search, I entered the Dewey shelf numbers in front of some entries. You will also find some otherwise hard-to-trace readings uploaded to the e-learning site and should feel free to add to the collection for the benefit of your class mates.

## Epistemology

- 300./1 Martin, Michael, and Lee C. McIntyre, eds. 1994. *Readings in the Philosophy of Social Science*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. (Especially Carl Hempel's "The Function of General Laws in History", Clifford Geertz's "Thick Description: Towards an Interpretive Theory of Culture", Charles Taylor's "Interpretation and the Sciences of Man," and Jon Elster's "The Nature and Scope of Rational Choice Explanation" and "Functional Explanations in the Social Sciences".)
- 300./1 HOL Hollis, Martin. 1994. *The Philosophy of Social Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 501 KUH Kuhn, Thomas S. (1962) 1970. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. 2nd enlarged ed. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- 501 LAK Lakatos, Imre. 1970. "Falsification and the Methodology of Scientific Research Programs." in *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*, ed. Imre Lakatos and Alan Musgrave. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Available at <http://www.philosophy.ru/edu/ref/sci/lakatos.html>
- 501 LAK Motterlini, Matteo, ed. 1999. *For and Against Method: Including Lakatos's Lectures on Scientific Method and the Lakatos-Feyerabend Correspondence*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Newall, Paul et al. 2004-. *The Galilean Library on the History and Philosophy of Science*. URL: <http://www.galilean-library.org/hps.php#>
- 121 CET Knorr Cetina, Karin. 1999. *Epistemic Cultures: How the Sciences Make Knowledge*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- 320./072 Gerber, Alan S., Donald P. Green, and Edward H. Kaplan. 2004. "The Illusion of Learning from Observational Research." In *Problems and Methods in the Study of Politics*, edited by Ian Shapiro, Rogers M. Smith and Tarek E. Masoud. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp. 251-73.

## Causality

Gerring, John. 2005. "Causation: A Unified Framework for the Social Sciences." *Journal of Theoretical*

- Politics* 17 (2): 163–98.
- Mahoney, James. 2008. "Toward a Unified Theory of Causality." *Comparative Political Studies* 41 (4–5): 412–36.
- Brady, Henry E. 2008. "Causation and Explanation in Social Science." in *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*, ed. Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier, Henry E. Brady, and David Collier. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Elster, Jon, 1998. "A Plea for Mechanisms." In *Social Mechanisms: An Analytical Approach to Social Theory*, ed. Peter Hedström and Richard Swedberg. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 45–73.
- Pierson, Paul. 2000. "Increasing Returns, Path Dependence and the Study of Politics." *American Political Science Review* 94 (2): 251–67.
- Bates, Robert H., Avner Greif, Margaret Levi, Jean-Laurent Rosenthal, and Barry R. Weingast. 2000. "The Analytic Narrative Project." *American Political Science Review* 94 (3): 696-702.
- Bates, Robert H., Avner Greif, Margaret Levi, Jean-Laurent Rosenthal, and Barry Weingast. 2000. "Analytic Narratives Revisited." *Social Science History* 24 (4): 685-96.
- 320./072 Levi, Margaret. 2004. "An Analytic Narrative Approach to Puzzles and Problems." In *Problems and Methods in the Study of Politics*, edited by Ian Shapiro, Rogers M. Smith and Tarek E. Masoud. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp. 201-26.

### **How theories come about**

- 300.1 King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, pp. 12-22, 75-114.
- 300./72 Silverman, David. 2000. *Doing Qualitative Research: A Practical Handbook*. London: Sage, pp. 75-87.
- 300./72 BRE Brewer, John, and Albert Hunter. 2006. *Foundations of Multimethod Research: Synthesizing Styles*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 125-68.
- Gerring, John. 2001. *Social Science Methodology: A Criterial Framework*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, chapter 1.
- Hedström, Peter, and Richard Swedberg, eds. 1998. *Social Mechanisms: An Analytical Approach to Social Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, introductory chapter.
- Glynos, Jason, and David Howarth. 2007. *Logics of Critical Explanation in Social and Political Theory*. London: Taylor and Francis Ltd.
- 300./72 Glaser, Barney G., and Anselm L. Strauss. (1967) 1999. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Schmitter, Philippe C. 2009. "The Confessions of a Repeat Offending and Unrepentant Conceptualist." Paper presented at the Mattei Dogan Prize Ceremony at the 21st IPSA World Congress of Political Science, Santiago de Chile, 12-16 July 2009.
- Cohn, Carol. 1987. "Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 12 (4): 687-718.

### **Concept formation**

- Sartori, Giovanni 1970. "Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics." *American Political Science Review* 64 (4): 1033-53.
- Collier, David, and Robert Adcock 1999. "Democracy and Dichotomies: A Pragmatic Approach to Choices about Concepts." *Annual Review of Political Science* 2: 537-65.
- Collier, David, and James Mahoney. 1993. "Conceptual 'Stretching' Revisited: Adapting Categories in Comparative Politics." *American Political Science Review* 87: 845-55.

- 300./72 Goertz, Gary. ed. 2006. *Social Science Concepts: A User's Guide*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Adcock, Robert, and David Collier. 2001. "Measurement Validity: A Shared Standard for Qualitative and Quantitative Research." *American Political Science Review* 95 (3): 529-546.
- Bevir, Mark, and Asaf Kedar. 2008. "Concept Formation in Political Science: An Anti-Naturalist Critique of Qualitative Methodology." *Perspectives on Politics* 6 (3): 503-517.
- 300./72 ZEL Zeller, Richard A., and Edward G. Carmines. 1980. *Measurement in the Social Sciences: The Link between Theory and Data*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

### **Key methodology textbooks and handbooks on the aspiring graduate student's shelf**

- 320./072 BOX Box-Steffensmeier, Janet M., Henry E. Brady, and David Collier, eds. 2008. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 300.1 KIN King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- 300./72 BRA Brady, Henry E., and David Collier. eds. 2004. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- 320.072 Evera, Stephen van. 1997. *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- 300.1 RAG Ragin, Charles C. 1987. *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- 320./072 YAN Yanow, Dvora, and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, eds. 2006. In *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*. New York: M.E. Sharpe
- 327./072 TRA Trachtenberg, Marc. 2006. *The Craft of International History: A Guide to Method*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- 300./72 Gerring, John. 2007. *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 300./722 George, Alexander L., and Andrew Bennett. 2005. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- 300./722 Stake, Robert E. 1995. *The Art of Case Study Research*. London: Sage.
- 300./72 Gillham, Bill. 2000. *Case Study Research Methods*. London: Continuum.
- 300./722 Yin, Robert K. 1994. *Case Study Research: Design and Method*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 300./72 RIT Ritchie, Jane, and Jane Lewis, eds. 2003. *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers*. London: Sage.
- 300./72 SEA Seale, Clive, Giampietro Gobo, Jaber F. Gubrium, and David Silverman, eds. 2003. *Qualitative Research Practice*. London: Sage.
- 300./72 SIL Silverman, David. 2000. *Doing Qualitative Research: A Practical Handbook*. London: Sage.
- 300./72 Fairclough, Norman. 2003. *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Routledge.
- 327./1/01 Klotz, Audie, and Cecelia M. Lynch. 2007. *Strategies for Research in Constructivist International Relations*. New York: M.E. Sharpe
- 320./015 MORR Morton, Rebecca B. 1999. *Methods and Models: A Guide to the Empirical Analysis of Formal Models in Political Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Morton, Rebecca, and Kenneth Williams. 2010. *From Nature to the Lab: Experimental Political Science and the Study of Causality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

### **Academic writing, style sheets, prose, illustrations, reference managers**

- 808./042 Swales, John M., and Christine B. Feak. 2004. *Academic Writing for Graduate Students: Essential Tasks and Skills*. 2nd ed. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- P301.T8 Turabian, Kate L. (revised by Wayne C. Booth, Gregory G. Colomb, Joseph M. Williams, and University of Chicago Press editorial staff). 2007. *A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations: Chicago Style for Students and Researchers*. 7th rev. ed. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- 808./0663 Becker, Howard S., with Pamela Richards. 2007. *Writing for Social Scientists: How to Start and Finish Your Thesis, Book, or Article*. 2nd ed. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- 302.2/3 TUF Tufte, Edward R. 2006. *Beautiful Evidence*. Cheshire, CT: Graphics Press.
- Cleveland, William S. 1993. *Visualizing Data*. Summit, NJ: Hobart Press. (Note that Stata, SAS and R/S-Plus textbook examples for this book are available from the UCLA Academic Technology Services, Statistical Consulting Group at <http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/stata/examples/vizdata/>)
- King, Gary, Michael Tomz, and Jason Wittenberg. 2000. "Making the Most of Statistical Analyses: Improving Interpretation and Presentation." *American Journal of Political Science* 44 (2): 347–361.
- Kastellec, Jonathan P., and Eduardo L. Leoni. 2007. "Using Graphs Instead of Tables in Political Science." *Perspectives on Politics* 5 (4): 755-771.
- Association of College and Research Libraries. 2000. "Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education." Available from <http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/standards/standards.pdf>. Accessed on 12 August 2009.
- <http://www.academicproductivity.com/> (A specialized site with lots of advice, including reviews of some of the many books about effective academic writing, including:)
- Silvia, Paul J. 2007. *How to Write a Lot: A Practical Guide to Productive Academic Writing*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Muldrow, Jason, and Stephen Yoder. 2009. "Out of Cite! How Reference Managers Are Taking Research to the Next Level." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 42 (1): 167-172.

### **Techniques for literature review and meta-analysis**

- 300./72 HAR Hart, Chris. 1998. *Doing a Literature Review: Releasing the Social Science Research Imagination*. London: Sage.
- 300./72 HAR 300.72 Hart, Chris. 2001. *Doing a Literature Search: A Comprehensive Guide for the Social Sciences*. London: Sage.
- 300./72 COO Cooper, Harris. 1998. *Synthesizing Research: A Guide for Literature Reviews*. 3rd ed. London: Sage. (A 4<sup>th</sup> edition came out in 2009 under the title *Synthesizing Research: A Guide for Literature Reviews*, and contains up-to-date tips on search etc.).
- 808./0665 Harmon, Joseph E., and Alan G. Gross, eds. 2007. *The Scientific Literature: A Guided Tour*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- 300./72 OLE O'Leary, Zina. 2004. *The Essential Guide to Doing Research*. London: Sage, chapter 6.
- 300./72 LIP Lipsey, Mark W. and David B. Wilson. 2001. *Practical Meta-analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

### **Miscellaneous readings about doing a PhD and the social fabric around the process**

- Rothman, Steven B. 2008. "Comparatively Evaluating Potential Dissertation and Thesis Projects." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 41 (2): 367-369.
- 300./72 BRE Brewer, John, and Albert Hunter. 2006. *Foundations of Multimethod Research: Synthesizing Styles*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 39-58.

- 300./72 OLE O'Leary, Zina. 2004. *The Essential Guide to Doing Research*. London: Sage, chapter 3.
- 808./02 DUN Dunleavy, Patrick. 2003. *Authoring a PhD Thesis: How to Plan, Draft, Write and Finish a Doctoral Dissertation*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rothgeb, John M., Annemarie Spadafore, and Betsy Burger. 2007. "Faculty Training in Political Science: Results from a Survey of Department Chairs." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 40 (4): 759-763.
- Masuoka, Natalie, Bernard Grofman, and Scott L. Feld. 2007. "The Production and Placement of Political Science Ph.D.s, 1902-2000." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 40 (02): 361-366.
- Stefuriuc, Irina, Peter Mair, Jan Erk, Lori Thorlakson, and Erin K. Jenne. 2009. "Symposium: Building an Academic Profile – Considerations for Graduate Students Embarking on an Academic Career in Political Science in Europe." *European Political Science* 8 (2): 138-74.
- Tonge, Jonathan. 2005. "The Last Bastion of Ad Hocery? Research Supervision from Idea to Viva." *European Political Science* 4 (2): 230-7.
- 378 DEL Delamont, Sara, and Paul Atkinson. 2004. *Successful Research Careers: A Practical Guide*. Maidenhead: Open University Press
- Muiznieks, Nils. 2009. "A Political Scientist's Experience in the Real World of Politics." *European Political Science* 8 (1): 68–78.
- Keohane, Robert O. 2009. "Political Science as a Vocation." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 42 (2): 359-363.
- Goldsmith, Michael, ed. 2005. *Doctoral Studies in Political Science – A European Comparison*. Budapest: espNet. Available from [http://www.epsnet.org/mem\\_only/Doctoral%20Studies%20in%20Europe.pdf](http://www.epsnet.org/mem_only/Doctoral%20Studies%20in%20Europe.pdf), accessed on 7 August 2009.
- APSA Task Force on Graduate Education. 2004. "2004 Report to the APSA Council." Washington, DC: The American Political Science Association. Available from <http://www.apsanet.org/imgtest/Final%20Report%20Formatted%20for%20Distribution.pdf>, accessed on 7 August 2009.
- Leijenaar, Monique, and Emiliano Grossman. 2000. "Doing a PhD in Political Science in Europe: Information, Facts, Debate." Paris: Thematic Network Political Science. Available from <http://www.epsnet.org/publications/4%20Brochure%20PhD.pdf>. Accessed on 7 August 2009.
- Thorlakson, Lori, Michael Laver, Max Kaase, Jean-Michel Eymer, and Paul M. Heywood. 2005. "Symposium: Debating the Future of Doctoral Training in European Political Science " *European Political Science* 4 (1): 79-125.
- 300./72 SIL Silverman, David. 2000. *Doing Qualitative Research: A Practical Handbook*. London: Sage, pp. 113-8, 221-56, 266-71.
- 808./0663 BEC Becker, Howard S. 1998. *Tricks of the Trade: How to Think About Research While You're Doing It*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Wasby, Stephen J. ed. 2001. "Symposium: Advisors and the Dissertation Proposal." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 34 (December): 841-58.
- Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine. 2003. "Is This the Curriculum We Want? Doctoral Requirements and Offerings in Methods and Methodology." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 36 (3): 379-386.
- Bennett, Andre, Aharo Barth, and Kennet R. Rutherford. 2003. "Do We Preach What We Practice? A Survey of Methods in Political Science Journals and Curricula." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 36 (3): 373-8. Also available from <http://www.apsanet.org/imgtest/PreachWhatWePractice-Bennett.pdf>
- King, Ronald F., and Cosmin Gabriel Maria. 2008. "Defining Political Science: A Cross-National Survey." *European Political Science* 7 (2): 207–219.

- 378.1/2 DEN DeNeef, A. Leigh, and Craufurd D. Goodwin, eds. 1995. *The Academic's Handbook*. 2nd ed. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. (*The 3<sup>rd</sup> edition came out in 2007 but is not yet available in the library.*)
- Fuerstman, Daniel, and Stephan Lavertu. 2005. "The Academic Hiring Process: A Survey of Department Chairs." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 38 (4): 731-6.
- Rothgeb, John M., and Betsy Burger. 2009. "Tenure Standards in Political Science Departments: Results from a Survey of Department Chairs." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 42 (3): 513-9.
- Klingemann, Hans-Dieter. 2008. "Capacities: Political Science in Europe." *West European Politics* 31 (1): 370-96.
- 378 DEL Delamont, Sara, and Paul Atkinson. 2004. *Successful Research Careers: A Practical Guide*. Maidenhead: Open University Press
- Klingemann, Hans-Dieter, and *et al.* 2009. "Political Science in Central and Eastern Europe: National Development and International Integration." Berlin, Mannheim: Gesis - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften. Available from <http://www.cce-socialscience.net/archive/politicalscience/article1.html>. Accessed on 7 August 2009.
- Sabine Hikel. 2009. "When Should You Quit?" *Inside Higher Education*, July 20, 2009. Available at [http://www.insidehighered.com/advice/leaving\\_academia/hikel2](http://www.insidehighered.com/advice/leaving_academia/hikel2)
- Mary Jane Hurst. 2009. "Mentor Yourself." *Inside Higher Education*, July 29, 2009. Available at <http://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2009/29/hurst>
- Piss Poor Prof. 2009. "Can You Afford to Be an Adjunct?" *Inside Higher Education*, August 3, 2009. Available at <http://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2009/06/15/adjunct>
- Piss Poor Prof. 2009. "Adjunct Survival." *Inside Higher Education*, August 3, 2009. Available at <http://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2009/08/03/adjunct>
- Rhodes, Martin. 2006. "Young People in the European Political Science Profession." *European Political Science* 5 (3): 232-4.
- Hassner, Ron E. 2008. "Trial by Fire: Surviving the Job Talk Q&A." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 41 (4): 803-8.
- Wuffle, A. 2006. "Uncle Wuffle's Advice on Job Talks." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 39 (4): 883-6. Available from <http://www.socsci.uci.edu/~bgrofman/Wuffle-Advice%20on%20job%20talks.pdf>
- Mathews-Gardner, Lanethea, Michelle D. Deardorff, Grant Reecher, William Hudson, MaryAnne Borrelli, and Glen Halva-Neubauer. 2008. "Getting a Job at a Teaching Institution and Then Succeeding: A Q&A with Experienced Teacher-Scholars." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 41 (3): 575-8.
- Wuffle, A. 1993. "Uncle Wuffle's Advice to the Assistant Professor." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 26 (1): 89-90. Available from: <http://web.archive.org/web/20040212123359/www.apsanet.org/PS/march93/wuffle.cfm>

### **Advice on the reasons that may lead editors to reject your manuscripts**

- Neuman, W. Russell, Roei Davidson, Sung-Hee Joo, Yong Jin Park, and Ann E. Williams. 2008. "The Seven Deadly Sins of Communication Research." *Journal of Communication* 58 (2): 220-237.
- Johnson, Teresa Pelton. 1991. "Writing for International Security: A Contributors' Guide." *International Security* 16 (2): 171-80.
- Bonjean, Charles M., and Hullum, Jan. 1978. "Reasons for Journal Rejection: An Analysis of 600 Manuscripts." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 11 (4): 480-3.
- Wolfinger, Raymond E. 1993. "Tips for Writing Papers." *PS: Political Science* 26 (1) 87-8.

- Thunder, David. 2004. "Back to Basics: Twelve Rules for Writing a Publishable Article." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 37 (3): 493-5.
- Van Cott, Donna Lee. 2005. "A Graduate Student's Guide to Publishing Scholarly Journal Articles." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 38 (4): 741-3.
- Shatz, David. 2004. *Peer Review: A Critical Inquiry*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield
- Jeydel, Alana S., Julie Dolan, David S. Meyer, Robert J. Spitzer, and Peter Labella. 2005. "A Guide to Publishing Your First Book." *PS: Political Science* 38 (3): 745-8.
- 808./02 Germano, William. 2005. *From Dissertation to Book*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- 808./02 Germano, William. 2001. *Getting It Published: A Guide for Scholars and Anyone Else Serious about Serious Books*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

### **Uses of bibliographic performance indicators**

- Masuoka, Natalie, Bernard Grofman, and Scott L. Feld. 2007. "The Political Science 400: A 20-Year Update." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 40 (1): 133-45.
- Hix, Simon. 2004. "A Global Ranking of Political Science Departments." *Political Studies Review* 2: 293-313. (See a related paper at <http://www.essex.ac.uk/ECPR/publications/eps/onlineissues/spring2004/profession/hix.htm> and a debate about this ranking in *European Political Science* Volume 4 (2005), No. 1. Note too that Hix counted 30 full time political scientists at CEU in a period when there were only 20, which reduced our per capita scores and CEU's position in the ranking by 20 places in his chart.)
- Masuoka, Natalie, Bernard Grofman, and Scott L. Feld. 2007. "Ranking Departments: A Comparison of Alternative Approaches." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 40 (3): 531-537. (Note that a correction of their data was published in *PS: Political Science & Politics* 40 (4): 629.)
- Giles, Micheal W., and James C. Garand. 2007. "Ranking Political Science Journals: Reputational and Citational Approaches." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 40 (4): 741-751.
- Moed, Henk F. 2005. *Citation Analysis in Research Evaluation*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- David, Miriam E. 2008. "Research Quality Assessment and the Metrication of the Social Sciences." *European Political Science* 7 (1): 52-63.