

at the very least, to advocate for their concerns with APSA, encouraging the Association to draft its own comment reflecting matters particular to political science research. Although much attention has, rightly, been focused on Congressional efforts to curtail National Science Foundation funding, as IRB policy affects *all* research engaging human participants, it deserves as much disciplinary attention.

References

- Childress, James F., Meslin, Eric M., and Shapiro, Harold T., eds. 2005. *Belmont Revisited*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Desposato, Scott. 2013. Ethics in Comparative Politics Experiments Conference, University of California, San Diego (May 1-2). <http://polisci2.ucsd.edu/polisciethics/> (accessed September 20, 2014).
- Eissenberg, Thomas, Panicker, Sangeeta, Berenbaum, Sheri, Epley, Norma, Fendrich, Michael, Kelso, Rosemary, Penner, Louis, and Simmerling, Mary. 2004. "IRBs and Psychological Science: Ensuring a Collaborative Relationship." www.apa.org/research/responsible/irbs-psych-science.aspx (accessed 18 September 2014).
- Erikson, Kai. 1995. "Commentary." *The American Sociologist* 26(2): 4–11.
- Fujii, Lee Ann. 2012. "Research Ethics 101." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 45(4): 717–723.
- Irvine, Janice M. 2012. "Can't Ask, Can't Tell: How Institutional Review Boards Keep Sex in the Closet." *Contexts* 11(2): 28–33.
- Lederman, Rena. 2007. "Educate your IRB: An Experiment in Cross-Disciplinary Communication." *Anthropology News* 48(6): 33–34.
- Majic, Samantha. 2014. "Policy Meets Practice: Qualitative Political Science Fieldwork and the IRB process." Presented at the Betty Glad Memorial Symposium, Field Research and US Institutional Review Board Policy, University of Utah (March 20-21).
- Leo, Richard A. 1995. "Trial and Tribulations: Courts, Ethnography, and the Need for an Evidentiary Privilege for Academic Researchers." *The American Sociologist* 26(1), 113–134.
- Nader, Laura. 1972. "Up the Anthropologist: Perspectives Gained from Studying Up." In *Reinventing Anthropology*. Dell Hymes, ed. (New York: Pantheon), 284–311.
- Office for Human Research Protections, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. 2015. "International Compilation of Human Research Standards, 2015 edition." www.hhs.gov/ohrp/international/ (accessed January 2, 2015).
- Office for Protection from Research Risks, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. 1995. "Exempt Research and Research that May Undergo Expedited Review, Report Number 95-02 (May 5)." www.hhs.gov/ohrp/policy/hsdc95-02.html (accessed August 18, 2014).
- Orsini, Michael. 2014. "'May I See Your Color-Coded Badge?' Reflections on Research with 'Vulnerable' Communities." In *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*. Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, eds. (Armonk, NY: ME Sharpe), 406–420.
- Pachirat, Timothy. 2011. *Every Twelve Seconds: Industrialized Slaughter and the Politics of Sight*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Salemink, Oscar. 2003. "Ethnography, Anthropology and Colonial Discourse: Introduction." In *The Ethnography of Vietnam's Central Highlanders*. (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press), 1–39.
- Schrag, Zachary M. 2010a. *Ethical Imperialism: Institutional Review Boards and the Social Sciences, 1965–2009*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Schrag, Zachary M. 2010b. "More Universities Uncheck their Boxes." www.institutionalreviewblog.com/2010/08/more-universities-uncheck-their-boxes.html (posted August 6; accessed June 6, 2014).
- Schrag, Zachary M. 2010c. "Twenty-Six Percent of Boxes go Unchecked." www.institutionalreviewblog.com/2010/03/twenty-six-percent-of-boxes-go.html (posted March 19; accessed June 6, 2014).
- Schrag, Zachary M. 2013. "SACHRP: Exempt Research May 'Be Subject to IRB Review.'" www.institutionalreviewblog.com/2013/06/sachrp-exempt-research-may-be-subject.html (posted June 11; accessed June 10, 2014).
- Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine and Yanow, Dvora. 2014. Field Research and US Institutional Review Board Policy. Betty Glad Memorial Symposium, University of Utah (March 20-21), <http://poli-sci.utah.edu/2014-research-symposium.php>.
- Stark, Laura. 2012. *Behind Closed Doors: IRBs and the Making of Ethical Research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Thomson, Susan. 2013. "Academic Integrity and Ethical Responsibilities in Post-Genocide Rwanda: Working with Research Ethics Boards to Prepare for Fieldwork with 'Human Subjects.'" In *Emotional and Ethical Challenges for Field Research in Africa*. Susan Thomson, An Ansoms, and Jude Murison, eds. (London: Palgrave Macmillan), 139–154.
- US Code of Federal Regulations. 2009. "Title 45, Public Welfare, Department of Health and Human Services, Part 46, Protection of Human Subjects." www.hhs.gov/ohrp/humansubjects/guidance/45cfr46.html.
- van den Hoonaard, Will. C. 2011. *The Seduction of Ethics*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Yanow, Dvora and Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine. 2008. "Reforming Institutional Review Board Policy." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 41(3): 484–494.

Announcements

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.894472>

David Collier Awarded 2014 Johan Skytte Prize

David Collier, founding president of the APSA Section for Qualitative and Multi-Method Research, is the 2014 recipient of the Johan Skytte Prize in Political Science. This award is often referred to informally as the Nobel Prize of political science.

Previous winners of the prize include major contributors to three fields central to the APSA Section, and also to Collier's own work: qualitative methods—Alexander George, Arend Lijphart, and Adam Przeworski; concept development—Hanna Pitkin, Robert Dahl, and Juan Linz; and comparative-historical research—Theda Skocpol.

The statement from the Skytte Foundation recognizes Collier's "contribution to the conceptual development and the re-thinking of qualitative methods in Political Science, his thorough empirical research on Latin-American political pathways, his theories on critical junctures and legacies, in combination with his energetic re-thinking of the position of qualitative methods in the discipline, makes him a scholar of great importance to contemporary political science."

The award statement goes on to say: "Whoever mentions David Collier thereby simultaneously mentions Ruth Berins Collier, also a professor of political science at the University of California, Berkeley. Since the 1970s they have worked side by side. We may ask, who pulled the heaviest load in their large coauthored work, *Shaping the Political Arena: Critical Junctures, the Labor Movement and Regime Dynamics in Latin*

America? Collier comments: ‘We both did 75 percent of the work.’”

“In an interview a couple of years ago, David Collier explained: ‘I would rather be identified with research that is fair and balanced, that addresses issues of real analytic importance, but that does not pretend to accomplish things that, in fact, it does not accomplish.’ With this comment he described his own research temperament. . . . If you look for a characteristic trait, it is primarily the desire to carry out genuine cumulative research, to build on the work of others, and to synthesize and critically examine in order to reach greater knowledge and understanding. There is humility and a refreshing lack of self-centering in Collier’s great co-authored works.”

Collier’s Skytte Prize Lecture, delivered at Uppsala University in Sweden, was entitled “Harvesting the Surface and Drilling Down: Quantitative and Qualitative.”

QMMR Section Awards

David Collier Mid-Career Achievement Award

Recipient: Evan Lieberman, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Committee: Colin Elman, Syracuse University; James Mahoney, Northwestern University; and Lisa Wedeen, University of Chicago.

The Collier Award is presented annually to a mid-career political scientist to recognize distinction in methodological publications, innovative application of qualitative and multi-method approaches in substantive research, and institutional contributions to this area of methodology. We could not have a more worthy recipient than Evan Lieberman.

Lieberman has published several major articles on methodology in top journals. In 2001 in *Comparative Political Studies*, he published, “Causal Inference in Historical Institutional Analysis: A Specification of Periodization Strategies.” That piece won the best article prize from the Politics and History section. In 2005, he published “Nested Analysis as a Mixed-Method Strategy for Comparative Research.” This *APSR* article is one of the most influential methodological pieces we have on conducting mixed-method research. Specifically, it is a foundational statement on how to select case studies to improve both qualitative and quantitative findings. It has informed research designs in many studies, including work by some of our former students. A more recent statement of this piece that explores nested analysis in the context of experiment research and other methodologies is forthcoming.

Lieberman’s empirical work innovatively applies methods to substantive problems of great normative importance. He used his nested analysis methodology in his first prize winning book, *Race and Regionalism in the Politics of Taxation in Brazil and South Africa*. (Cambridge University Press, Studies in Comparative Politics, 2003). That book stands as one of the best applications of nested analysis ever produced. Deep, contextualized qualitative field research greatly informed his next prize winning book, *Boundaries of Contagion: How Ethnic Politics Have Shaped Government Responses to AIDS*

(Princeton University Press, 2009). Once more, this book combines multimethods in new ways in service of addressing its questions.

Finally, the committee also noted that Lieberman has been a very active member of the discipline and the section. He has served on our nominating committee and our book committee, and he has been centrally involved in organizational initiatives concerning multimethod research sponsored and supported by the section.

The committee was deeply impressed by Lieberman’s contributions to creation of new methodologies, his application of these methodologies to substantive scholarship, and his forwarding of qualitative and multimethod research through organizational participation. We were delighted to present Evan with the David Collier award.

Giovanni Sartori Award for Best Book on and/or Using Qualitative Methods

Recipient: Katerina Linos, *The Democratic Foundations of Policy Diffusion: How Health, Family and Employment Laws Spread Across Countries* (Oxford University Press, 2013).

Committee: Séverine Autesserre, Columbia University; Alan Jacobs, University of British Columbia; and Frank Schimmlenfennig, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology.

In this book, Linos advances an argument about the sources of policy diffusion that is grounded in the logic of electoral competition. Why, as study after study has found, do specific social policies, criminal prohibitions, environmental regulations, and other policy choices tend to spread across countries? Why, for instance, did the policy idea of a National Health Service, introduced in Britain in the 1940s and then championed by the WHO, diffuse rapidly across rich democracies—despite the particularly large costs that this arrangement imposes on well-organized interests, such as doctors?

Past studies have generally considered diffusion an elite-driven technocratic process of lesson-drawing. In contrast, Linos develops an innovative argument about electoral strategy, in which policy emulation helps incumbent governments solve a credibility problem vis-à-vis voters. Voters frequently worry that their representatives are either incompetent or in thrall to special interests and have little information with which to judge governments’ decisions. Policy ideas imported from abroad can help reassure low-information citizens that they are being governed wisely and well. By borrowing programmatic designs from large, rich, proximate countries and adopting models championed by international organizations, politicians can send a clear and easy-to-interpret signal that they are capable guardians of the public interest. Linos demonstrates this logic at work in the fields of health care and family policies, showing for instance that rich democracies have disproportionately borrowed from the policy designs of countries with which their own voters are more familiar, and that adoptions spike after endorsement by international organizations.

In the committee’s view, Linos’s book stands out both for the transparency of its evidentiary reasoning and for the wide

diversity of empirical strategies that it employs to test its argument. Linos is exceptionally clear and resourceful in articulating a set of distinctive observable implications of her argument, located at multiple levels of analysis, testing links along a causal chain that runs from international models to politicians' strategies to the reasoning and behavior of voters at election time. These include, for instance, predictions about which countries politicians will borrow from, under what electoral conditions they will do so, which voters will be most responsive to foreign exemplars, and what kind of rhetoric politicians will employ during election campaigns and parliamentary debates.

This diverse array of predictions sets the stage for a multi-method empirical analysis that leverages the distinctive strengths of different modes of inquiry. Linos, for instance, employs careful qualitative analysis to establish which policy models are dominant in the international environment at particular points in time. She turns to event-history analysis to test predictions about the specific political contexts in which such models will be adopted. Linos then undertakes a set of in-depth case studies of policymaking and content analysis to examine the penetration of foreign models into domestic election campaigns and parliamentary debates. Further, Linos employs survey experiments to test for the individual-level cognitive processes implied by the theory, showing that these processes operate even in the least-likely context of the United States. Throughout, the book is exceptionally clear in linking evidence back to predictions and competing theoretical claims.

The committee applauds Linos for the transparency, creativity, and resourcefulness of this substantively important study. The book offers a model of qualitative and multi-method research that we hope will spread.

Rebecca Neaera Abers and Margaret Keck received an honorable mention for *Practical Authority: Agency and Institutional Change in Brazilian Water Politics* (Oxford University Press, 2013).

Practical Authority explores the gap between formal and actual allocations of authority in politics. The book investigates the forging of practical authority via in-depth case studies of the development of new institutions for water-resource management in Brazil. The study makes an important theoretical contribution in identifying the range of mechanisms that individuals and organizations deploy to generate new capabilities, recognition, and influence in a policy domain. The argument is especially original and sophisticated in conceptualizing allocations of authority in politics as endogenous to actors' choices rather than exogenously given.

Empirically, the book represents an ambitious and successful effort to gather elusive data in difficult circumstances. The sheer amount of empirical material collected during the course of the project, covering processes of policy development over three decades across 16 river basin committees, is itself noteworthy. The award committee was particularly impressed by the strength, transparency, and honesty of Abers and Keck's research methodology. Qualitative field research is frequently characterized by setbacks in data collection, shifts in empirical strategy, and the reconsideration of theoretical

hunches. Few scholars, however, reflect on this process in their publications or explain how such challenges shaped their final arguments. Abers and Keck do an exceptional job of making their methodological choices and the problems that they encountered explicit. They discuss their methodology as an evolving process with many "entanglements" rather than a hard-and-fast, preconceived design. Also exemplary is the authors' openness in responding to surprises and lessons from the field. The award committee was particularly impressed by the authors' willingness to inductively learn from their cases, to attend carefully to contingency and complexity in the processes they were studying, and to discuss when their initial expectations were disappointed by the evidence.

Practical Authority serves as a model and an important antidote to powerful pressures in the discipline that commonly compel researchers to present only sparse and elegant theories backed by reams of confirmatory tests. The book is an exemplar of methodological transparency and honesty.

Alexander George Award for Best Article or Book Chapter on and/or Using Qualitative Methods

Recipient: Jonathan Mercer for his article "Emotion and Strategy in the Korean War," *International Organization* 67:2 (April 2013), 221–252.

Committee: Robert Mickey, University of Michigan; Layna Mosley, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; and Lily Tsai, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

We received 10 nominations for the Alexander L. George Award. This award "honors Alexander George's contributions to the comparative case-study method, including his work linking that method to a systematic concern with research design, and his contribution of developing the idea and the practice of process tracing." It is given to a journal article or a chapter in an edited volume which stands on its own.

The nominated articles represented a wide range of substantive topics as well as methodological approaches, and we enjoyed the opportunity to read such a broad range of qualitatively-focused scholarship. Ultimately, we agreed that Jon Mercer's "Emotion and Strategy in the Korean War" best met the parameters of the George Award.

Mercer's article addresses signaling in foreign policy: he aims to identify the conditions under which a diplomatic or military signal is credible. While he assumes that actors operate rationally in strategic settings, he also argues that they face the challenge of interpreting signals. In doing so, they rely on intuition, beliefs and imagination—what he generally labels "emotion." Actors interpret signals partly as a function of their emotions toward the sender; these same actors also use their emotional response (to the signaling event) as an additional source of information. Hence, Mercer posits that emotion plays a key role in the creation of credibility in international politics.

In order to test his claims, Mercer looks to the Korean War. Using primary and secondary sources, he considers why Stalin believed that the United States would not respond to a

informal social networks—can only be accomplished through careful and sustained qualitative research.

North Korean attack on South Korea, and why United States leaders did, in fact, respond. Mercer points to emotion as a key driver of the shift in U.S. preferences (and behavior) after the attack: the attack generated a range of negative, intense emotions for Truman and these, rather than a change in costs and benefits, motivated the shift in U.S. strategy. Mercer also considers a second case from the Korean War, asking why U.S. leaders did not believe that the Chinese government would respond militarily to U.S. attempts at Korean unification.

Mercer's systematic treatment of emotion and detailed analysis of two specific events allows us to consider how emotion might be consistent with rationalist explanations of leaders' behavior. While we might debate the extent to which emotion can or should be treated as "a variable," Mercer's causal logic could be applied to and tested in a range of other strategic interactions, both within and beyond the realm of conflict.

**Best Qualitative and Multi-Method Submission to the
American Political Science Review in the Preceding
Calendar Year**

Recipient: Sarah E. Parkinson for her article manuscript, "Organizing Rebellion: Rethinking High-Risk Mobilization and Social Networks in War" (subsequently published in *APSR* 107:3 (August 2013), 418–432.

Committee: Stathis N. Kalyvas, Yale University; Tianna Paschel, University of Chicago; and Jillian Schwedler, Hunter College.

The award recognizes a manuscript that must be (a) new research on qualitative methodology per se, i.e., a study that introduces specific methodological innovations or that synthesizes and integrates methodological ideas in a way that is in itself a methodological contribution; and/or (b) substantive work representing an exemplary application of qualitative methods, or exemplary multi-method work with a substantial qualitative component.

The committee reviewed 8 manuscripts that fell into either of these areas, and unanimously selected Sarah Parkinson's manuscript. The committee felt that it leveraged qualitative methods in innovative ways to make important theoretical as well as empirical observations. The committee members were also impressed that Dr. Parkinson displayed a clear sense of the limits of her empirical material.

"Organizing Rebellion" advances the literature on violent mobilization by moving beyond debates about who joins such groups and why, to focus instead on the timing of participation and, even more, precisely what counts as participation. Dr. Parkinson draws her evidence from extended fieldwork in Lebanon, where she conducted ethnographic work on female-dominated clandestine supply, financial, and information networks in the 1980s. She argues that to understand wartime mobilization and organizational resilience, scholars must situate militants in their organizational and social context. Identifying and understanding the importance of these sorts of insights—such as the overlap between militant hierarchies and

**Sage Award for Best 2013 APSA Paper on
and/or Using Qualitative Methods**

Recipients: Macartan Humphreys and Alan Jacobs, "Mixing Methods: A Bayesian Unification of Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches."

Committee: Alexander Downes, George Washington University; Claudius Wagemann, Goethe University Frankfurt; and Deborah Ward, Columbia University.

In "Mixing Methods: A Bayesian Unification of Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches" Macartan Humphreys and Alan Jacobs refer to two different approaches to causal inference, which some see as unifiable, while others treat them as fundamentally different logics. Quoting from the abstract of their paper, Humphreys and Jacobs "formalize an alternative unification using a simple Bayesian framework that allows for simultaneous learning from cases to populations and from populations to individual cases."

The committee unanimously selected the paper from among the nominees. The committee found it to be especially innovative, concrete, and well-elaborated. While papers on mixed methods often repeat what is already known, Humphreys and Jacobs' paper instead propose a new Bayesian approach. While admittedly highly formalized, the approach promises to have important effects on research design.

The committee also appreciated that the authors build from a very broad range of literature. The authors reference both qualitative and quantitative literature, and a wide variety of sources are taken up and integrated into their broader approach. Finally, but equally important to the committee's evaluation of the paper, the arguments are very clearly presented.

**Interpretive Methodologies & Methods (IMM)
Conference Group Awards**

Hayward Alker Best Paper Award

Presented for the conference paper by a Ph.D. student that best demonstrates the uses of interpretive methodologies and methods for the study of politics. This award honors the memory of Hayward R. Alker, a tireless champion of interpretive methodologies, from his own humanistic critique of mainstream political science to his role in developing and promoting interdisciplinary, historically grounded, linguistically and hermeneutically-informed approaches and his commitment to nurturing and encouraging graduate students and young scholars.

Recipient: Nicholas Rush Smith, City College of New York, "Contradictions of Vigilance: Contesting Citizenship in Post-Apartheid South Africa"

Committee: Parakh Hoon (Virginia Tech), Devorah Manekin (Arizona State University), and Douglas Dow (University of Texas, Dallas)

“Contradictions of Vigilance: Contesting Citizenship in Post-Apartheid South Africa,” by Nicholas Rush Smith, as the title of the paper suggests, interrogates competing notions of citizenship in post-apartheid South Africa through a case study of the meanings that members and leader of a South African vigilante movement ascribe to their activities, in particular the violence against criminals. The paper is methodologically sophisticated in its use of interpretive methods and theoretically innovative. The paper deftly uses ordinary language interviews, participant observation while weaving the author’s first person narrative to excavate the meanings that members of South Africa’s urban vigilante movement Mapogo assign to vigilance and civic engagement. Its theoretical strength is in creatively linking abstract normative concerns in democratic theory with the political ‘on-the-ground’ realities of post-apartheid South Africa. In particular, the author explores the tensions in the meanings of the concept of vigilance and vigilante and its relationship to citizenship in a democracy. The paper takes seriously the meanings that members of the Mapogo movement attach to their own violent actions, and uses their interpretations to advance our understanding of citizenship in post-Apartheid South Africa and elsewhere. That is, rather than viewing citizenship as a bundle of rights, which is one of the dominant perspectives in democratic theory, the paper deploys alternative conceptualization in which citizenship itself is a “terrain of contestation,” a political field of violent claims. In so doing, the paper contributes to a broad array of literatures on citizenship, democratization, and on the contradictory effects of expansion of rights.

Charles Taylor Book Award

Presented for the best book in political science that employs or develops interpretive methodologies and methods. This award recognizes the contributions of Charles Taylor to the advancement of interpretive thinking. His 1971 essay “Interpretation and the Sciences of Man,” which powerfully critiqued the aspiration to model the study of politics on the natural sciences and cogently explains how “interpretation is essential to explanation” in the human sciences, along with his many other articles, book chapters, and volumes, have long been a source of inspiration for scholars seeking to develop and apply an interpretive approach to the study of politics.

Recipient: Paul Amar, University of California, Santa Barbara
The Security Archipelago: Human-Security States, Sexuality Politics, and the End of Neoliberalism (Duke University Press, 2013).

Committee: Timothy W. Luke (Virginia Tech; Chair); Robert Adcock (George Washington University); Dennis Galvan (University of Oregon)

Paul Amar’s *Security Archipelago* exemplifies the rich and innovative potential of interpretive methods and methodology in comparative and transnational research. Bringing together events, practices, and discourses in the global cities of Rio and Cairo, from the landmark United Nations summits held in these cities (in 1992 and 1994, respectively) to the present,

Amar interweaves fascinating empirical detail and provocative meta-reflection on the trajectories and paradoxes of militarism, humanitarianism, and sexuality politics in our global age. His book especially stands out for the Taylor award due to its self-reflexive, creative, and confident crafting and pursuit of what Amar terms his “archipelago method.” With this method Amar brings his cases together in a multitude of ways: from charting similarities and differences between cultural heritage urban planning projects in each city, to exploring implications of the structural position of both cities in semiperipheral states, to following transnational flows of security practices and humanitarian rescue discourses, to persuasively interpreting the two cities as generative sites of new forms of human security power and governance. Moreover, Amar skillfully integrates his rich array of comparative moves to advance an invigorating metanarrative that aims to displace narratives of neo-liberalism with his own novel narrative of a move from liberalization to securitization. This narrative situates the Global South as the center, rather than the recipient or resister, of global trends, and reintegrates events of the 9/11 decade within flows and trajectories that reach from preceding events in the 1990s up to compelling readings of contemporary events, especially the 2011 Egyptian revolution.

Honorable Mention: Frank Fischer and Herbert Gottweis, eds.
The Argumentative Turn Revisited: Public Policy as Communicative Practice (Duke University Press, 2013)

Grain of Sand Award

Presented to a political scientist in recognition of longstanding and meritorious contributions to interpretive studies of the political.

Recipient: Deborah A. Stone (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)

Committee: Lee Ann Fujii (University of Toronto), Joe Lowndes (University of Oregon), Ido Oren (University of Florida; chair), Timothy Pachirat (University of Massachusetts, Amherst), Frederic C. Schaffer (University of Massachusetts, Amherst), Joe Soss (University of Minnesota), Peregrine Schwartz-Shea (University of Utah), Dvora Yanow (Wageningen University)

As a scholar and as a human being, Deborah Stone is a model of how to make a difference in the world. She’s a leading constructivist theorist who is deeply involved in the practical world of policy design and implementation and manages to build bridges of understanding across these too-separate worlds. She is a prolific scholar who takes on a broad range of intellectual topics and public issues, using her wit and intellect to denaturalize taken-for-granted assumptions in politics and policy. For those tempted to dismiss interpretive and constructivist work as “theoretical” and unhelpful for practice, Deborah is the empirical evidence we need. She and her insights could hardly be more in demand among practitioners.

To illustrate, consider three of her most well known books. In *The Disabled State* (1984) Deborah analyzes the politics and practice of disability policy through a constructivist lens,

showing how contested interpretations of social categories stand at the center of each.

It's a truly remarkable work that uses interpretive historical analysis to show how definitions of ability and need are constructed through political conflict and function to regulate the boundary between market-based and need-based systems of provision. In the official pronouncements of the state, to be "disabled" is to be unable to work, and the status of being "disabled" is something we can determine scientifically and apolitically. *The Disabled State* explodes this myth, clarifies how constructed categories underlie all policy operations, and places struggles over interpretation at the center of efforts to explain the politics of public policy.

Policy Paradox (first published in 1988, with a third edition in 2012 and winner of the 2002 Wildavsky Award) is a path-breaking work of constructivist scholarship that challenges central pillars of graduate training in policy analysis and public affairs. Deborah frames the book in opposition to "the rationality project"—a tidy linear understanding of the policy process as a rational mode of problem-solving rooted in policy analysis and program evaluation. At the same time, she demonstrates the perils of mistakenly conceiving of the polis as a realm of action that is analogous to the market. In place of these misguided efforts to place politics in a tightly bounded role, Deborah elaborates a model of "political rationality" in which efforts to reason pervade political processes and political processes pervade efforts to reason (even in the most scientifically analytic forms). The range of the book is remarkable, and each chapter serves as the occasion for an incisive constructivist analysis that places meaning-making at the center of politics and policy. *Policy Paradox* has been so widely assigned and discussed that no exaggeration is required to say that few other books have done as much to bring the benefits of constructivist and interpretive scholarship to students and practitioners of public policy.

Deborah's most recent book is an exemplary work of publicly engaged scholarship. In *The Samaritan's Dilemma: Should Government Help Your Neighbor?* (2008), she mounts a defense of altruism as a basic human trait and an attack on the dominant narratives of "economists, social scientists, conservatives, and free-market ideologues" that have fooled so many among us into believing "that greed is good.... that help is harmful [because] it undermines ambition and makes people dependent and helpless." Drawing on the everyday experiences of Americans, she illuminates the vast chasm that separates prevailing political discourses from the moral truths we know in our bones—that we care about other people and go out of our way to help them. *The Samaritan's Dilemma* is a sustained critique of political discourses that elevate self-interest as a moral good and urge citizens to become bystanders in the presence of suffering. It is a brilliant analysis of how social scientific concepts (e.g., moral hazard) and political arguments work together to define our beliefs about reality, cause and effect, and ethical living in the world.

Deborah Stone's scholarship is widely recognized and rightly celebrated. She has been an inspiration to generations of academics who have heeded her call to participate in public

life and place human meaning making at the center of their scholarly endeavors. Her body of work helps us all to understand the many ways we can see a world in a grain of sand.

Call for Editors: C&M Working Paper Series

The IPSA Committee on Concepts and Methods seeks an editor, or team of editors, for a two-year term. This is an opportunity to make a significant contribution to one of the leading discussion forums for conceptual and methodological issues in Political Science.

The committee publishes two electronic working paper series at its webpage (www.concepts-methods.org):

Political Concepts contains work of excellence on political concepts and political language. It seeks to include innovative contributions to concept analysis, language usage, concept operationalization, and measurement.

Political Methodology contains work of excellence on methods and methodology in the study of politics. It invites innovative work on fundamental questions of research design, the construction and evaluation of empirical evidence, theory building and theory testing.

Both series cut across conventional methodological divides, as between quantitative and qualitative methods, or between interpretive and positivist approaches. Editors may assume responsibility either for both series or for one of them.

The roles of the editor/s are to:

receive submissions, send them out for peer review, and decide on rejecting or accepting them on the basis of the reviews received;

search for suitable manuscripts among papers presented at professional conferences and workshops;

solicit manuscripts from notable members of the community; upon discretion of the editor, these could be refereed or regarded as "invited papers"

produce the papers by creating individual front pages for each, adding it to the main text in PDF, and upload it to the C&M website;

contribute to changes and innovations designed to increase the quality and impact of the working paper series;

advertise the series through reciprocal ads in newsletters, working papers, and other publications on conceptual and methodological issues in the social sciences;

determine changes in the composition of the editorial board in consultation with the C&M chair.

C&M expects a strong commitment to scholarly excellence, intellectual openness and methodological pluralism. The editor is responsible to the C&M Board.

The position is honorary. It will start on May 1, 2015 and run initially for two years, renewable for further three years subject to mutual agreement between the Editor and the C&M Board.

Applications should be made in the form of a covering letter explaining how the candidate would develop the publication under their editorship and a full CV. The closing date is March 1, 2015, and all applications should be sent via e-mail to the C&M chair, Professor Frederic Schaffer (schaffer@polsci.umass.edu). All enquiries should as well be directed to Professor Schaffer.

**ECPR Methods School:
Course Program for the 2015 Summer School**

Good research requires a solid methodology. The vision of the ECPR Methods School is to offer an unparalleled breadth and depth of courses offered in an informal, stimulating teaching setting, at the lowest possible cost to participants (not for profit principle).

Held at the University of Ljubljana from the 23rd of July to the 8th of August 2015, the 10th ECPR Summer School is comprised of main courses either lasting one or two weeks, and a series of short refresher courses held over three days that are designed to prepare you for a main course, if required.

The ECPR's Methods School offers start-of-the-art methods training across the whole range of methodologies (and across different paradigms and approaches), which are particularly salient for research questions in political science and neighboring disciplines, as well as dealing with all stages of a project and catering to the needs of research set at the macro and at the micro level.

While primarily aimed at Ph.D. students, courses can also be taken by junior and more senior faculty members. Courses offered range from introductory courses to a method or approach, to more specialized, advanced courses on innovative new methods and techniques. Courses cover both quantitative and qualitative designs as well as more positivist and more interpretative perspectives. Courses can either be followed on a stand-alone basis or can be combined over one or more events to provide a fuller, more comprehensive course of training.

The School comprises an intensive program of seminars and lab sessions that require a strong commitment from participants. The teaching language is English, and therefore all participants must be fluent in spoken English.

The course program for the 2015 Summer School includes the following courses. More information on the courses and application procedures can be found at <http://www.ecpr.eu/Events/EventDetails.aspx?EventID=99>.

Main Courses

Research Design

- SB101 Research Designs - Samo Kropivnik (one week)
- SB102 Case Study Research: Method and Practice – Ingo Rohlffing (two week)
- SB103 Process Tracing Methodology I + II – Rasmus Brun Pedersen and Ingo Rohlffing (two week)
- SB104 Qualitative Comparative Analysis and Fuzzy Sets – Carsten Schneider and Patrick A. Mello (two week)
- SB105 Mixed Methods Designs – Bojana Lobe (one week)

- SB106 Political Game Theory – Florence So (one week)
- SB107 Causal Inference – Elias Dinas (one week)

Data Collection/Generation

- SC101 Expert Interviews for Qualitative Data Generation Alenka Jelen (one week)
- SC102 Archival Research – Robert Adcock (one week)
- SC103 Ethnographic Research (title to be determined) – Dvora Yanow (one week)
- SC104 Internet-Based Socio-Political Data: Research Designs and Methods – Laura Sudulich (one week)

Introductory Data Analysis Courses

- SD101 Qualitative Data Analysis: Methods and Procedures – Marie-Hélène Paré (one week)
- SD102 Analysing Discourse I and II – Analysing Politics: Theories, Methods, and Applications – Michal Krzyzanowski (two week)
- SD103 Content Analysis – Kostas Gemenis (one week)
- SD104 Multivariate Statistical Analysis and Comparative Crossnational Surveys Data 2 week intro – Bruno Cautrès (two week)
- SD105 Multiple Regression Analysis: Estimation, Diagnostics, and Modeling – Bernhard Kittel (one week)
- SD106 Generalised Linear Modelling – Federico Vegetti (one week)
- SD107 Correspondence Analysis – Philippe Blanchard (one week)
- SD108 Experimental Methods : Laboratory, Survey and Field Designs – Wolfgang Luhan (one week)

Advanced Data Analysis Courses

- SD201 Analyzing Political and Social Sequences – Philippe Blanchard (one week)
- SD202 Event History and Survival Analysis – Janez Stare (two week)
- SD203 Applied Multilevel Modelling – Zoltan Fazekas (two week)
- SD204 Geographic Information Systems for the Social Sciences – Francisco Freitas (one week)
- SD205 Introduction to Network Analysis with Pajek – Vladimir Batagelj (two week)
- SD206 Introduction to Structural Equation Modelling – Jochen Mayerl (two week)
- SD207 Advanced Topics in Applied Regression – Levi Littvay (two week)
- SD208 Introduction to Geographic Event Data Analysis in R – Sebastian Schutte (one week)

Short Courses (3 days prior to the main courses)

- SA 101 Introduction to SPSS
- SA 102 Introduction to R
- SA 103 Linear Algebra and Calculus
- SA 104 Basics of Inferential Statistics for Political Scientists
- SA 105 Introduction to Programming for Social Scientists
- SA 106 Introduction to STATA

Letter from the Editor continued from page 1

edly agreed with the section level commitment to pluralism. This commitment has been instantiated in the newsletter in three different ways. First, the section's epistemic diversity has been represented, not in every single issue, but across a series of issues taken together. Second, the newsletter has included both philosophical and practical material: discussions about epistemology and ontology, but also content that better engages individuals who would be happy to hear less about -ologies and more about immediately practical or technical issues that face qualitative researchers. In light of this, I am especially pleased that the current issue features both a philosophically lively symposium on causation responding to Ned Lebow's (2014) *Constructing Cause in International Relations* and Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea's practical primer on formal regulations and concrete practices of human subjects-focused Institutional Review Boards (IRBs).

The third, perhaps most contentious, implication of methodological pluralism as I see it is to go beyond encompassing diverse epistemic viewpoints to also embrace active debate among them. As the current section president Lisa Wedeen (2014: 1) expressed it in her recent letter, the point here is "to endorse healthy contention" and welcome "serious scholarly disagreements" among the section's methodologically diverse members. A telling example of such a welcoming attitude can be seen if we recall how multi-method research has been dealt with in the newsletter. At the 2007 APSA meeting the section voted to rename itself from the section on "Qualitative Methods" to the section for "Qualitative and Multi-Method Research." The same time period saw a surge of newsletter pieces promoting and providing examples of multi-method research, with anything from one piece to a full symposium on multi-method work appearing in every issue in 2007 and 2008. Against this backdrop then-editor Gary Goertz welcomed into the Fall 2009 newsletter a symposium on "Cautionary Perspectives on Multi-Method Research" and in doing so, gave concrete substance to the kind of pluralism laid out by Elman in his letter in that same issue. It was in a similar spirit that I welcomed the chance to publish the symposium "The Set-Theoretic Comparative Method: Critical Assessment and the Search for Alternatives" in the Spring 2014 issue. In turn, to further the active discussion Wedeen has endorsed, I invited Ingo Rohlfing and Carsten Schneider to respond to that symposium in the current issue, and in turn David Collier will offer a surrebuttal

in the Spring 2015 issue. Rohlfing and Schneider's piece appears in an "Exchanges" section of this issue following an exchange between Alrik Thiem and Simon Hug on QCA. I am happy to express the commitments of this section to be inclusive of multiple viewpoints and to encourage debate between them by publishing Thiem's response to an article Hug (2013) published last year in *Political Analysis*, along with a surrebuttal from Hug.

As noted above, practicing and promoting methodological pluralism was one of my commitments in taking up editorship of this newsletter in 2011. In looking back over the seven issues I have edited, however, I am also struck by a trait I did not foresee or plan: the geographic distribution of the contributors. Of the 61 scholars who have contributed substantive pieces since Fall 2011, fully 24 are affiliated with academic institutions outside the United States. Among these contributors, moreover, no single country dominates: 5 are from Danish institutions, 4 from Swiss, 3 German, 2 Netherlands, 2 British, and 1 each Austrian, Estonian, Finnish, Hungarian, Israeli, and Swedish. Having some 40% of the newsletter's content contributed by scholars from such a wide array of non-US academic institutions is a practice that interacts interestingly with the section's methodological pluralism. If one were to go back over the history of the newsletter relating the methodological orientation of contributors to the country location of their academic institution, there is certainly no particularly tight correlation, but there is a basis for some intriguing observations about which of the diverse constituencies within the section are most firmly rooted on which side of the Atlantic. Such an exercise might teach, I would suggest, that methodological pluralism and geographical reach should be embraced as mutually supporting ambitions and commitments.

I have been honored to have had the opportunity to serve as the section's newsletter editor. I wish Alan and Tim all the best as they begin their term.

References

- Elman, Colin. 2009. "Letter from the Section President: Pluralism as a Hard Choice." *Qualitative & Multi-Method Research* 7 (2): 1–2.
- Hug, Simon. 2013. "Qualitative Comparative Analysis: How Inductive Use and Measurement Error lead to Problematic Inference." *Political Analysis* 21 (2): 252–265.
- Lebow, Richard Ned. 2014. *Constructing Cause in International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wedeen, Lisa. 2014. "Letter from the Section President." *Qualitative & Multi-Method Research* 12 (1): 1–2.