

SEMINAR ON HISTORICAL-COMPARATIVE SOCIOLOGY, 15 WEEKS

(on offer at ICS-UL since 2008)

COURSE DESCRIPTION & OBJECTIVES

This course provides an overview of important themes, debates, and agendas in historical-comparative sociology. One objective is to help students understand, appreciate, and critique important works in this area. Readings will include both classical contributions to historical sociology and works pertaining specifically to problems of methodology and theory. In addition, by providing a forum to discuss important theoretical and methodological issues in the field and by pushing students to grapple with these issues relative to their own research projects, this seminar aims at helping post-graduate students develop the skills necessary to become critical, informed researchers.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND EVALUATION

Grading for the course will be based on the following:

Participation (20%): Participation in this class is crucial. You will be paired with at least one other student on the first day of class, and will be assigned responsibility for leading discussion for a particular class session(s). All students are expected to be prepared to discuss all of the assigned readings. The overall participation grade will be based on attendance, your leadership of discussion on a particular day, and your contribution to classroom discussion throughout the entire semester (including those days when you are not presenting).

Book Review (20%): Reviews will be submitted during weeks 5 – 10 of the semester (students will select a date on the first day of class). This gives students a chance to read and review an exemplary work in historical-comparative sociology, intellectual history, or social and political theory. Students may draw from any of the supplemental readings on this syllabus, from an annotated bibliography such as that found in Theda Skocpol's *Visions and Method in Historical Sociology* (available at the ICS library), or any suitable work that clear with me first. Book reviews include both a summary of a book's argument and a discussion of the book's contributions and shortcomings. See reviews in the

Análise Social or the *American Journal of Sociology* for useful examples. Book review should be about 800-1000 words in length and double-spaced. Students are expected to give a short oral presentation (about 5 minutes) on the book on the day that they submit their review.

Preliminary Literature Review/Project Proposal (20%): This is due at week 6 and requires students to specify the focus of their course paper/proposal and provide a relatively well-organized and developed literature review relative to that question. More specific instructions will be provided in the first few weeks of class.

Final Paper/Paper Proposal (40%): This will be the end result of the semester, and will reflect either a completed paper with analyses and a conclusion or a well-developed research proposal. It is due in class on early December and students are required to give a short presentation summarizing their work (similar to a conference presentation, about 15 minutes in length). This is partially a revision of their prior work and should include a clear presentation of a topic/outcome, relevant literature review, clear conceptual/theoretical discussion, the methodology to be employed and why it is suitable, and then the analyses and conclusions. In the case of a proposal, and in lieu of analyses and conclusions, I expect a sound research plan, including clear discussion of the data that will be used, its location and quality, perhaps some cursory examination of the data, and what will be gained from this proposed analysis.

WEEKLY SCHEDULE

Week 1: Course Organization and Introduction

Sumário das aulas: A escolha do desenho de pesquisa, das metodologias a empregar, a própria selecção do tema de investigação não é independente da história da disciplina em que trabalham. Este é um exercício que, em princípio, pode ser feito para qualquer ciência social. Nestas aulas, fá-lo-emos para a ciência política e, em parte, para a sociologia. O outro ponto a discutir, na segunda metade das aulas, é o das implicações deste tipo de exercício. A ideia aqui é tornar-vos mais sensíveis ao carácter contingente do trabalho científico: uma vez que aquilo que estudamos e como o fazemos não é fruto de um qualquer processo natural de evolução da ciência, devemos incorporar no nosso próprio trabalho uma certa reflexividade do percurso sócio-histórico que nos trouxe até aqui. Tal distância crítica face aos nossos instrumentos (conceitos, métodos, agendas) é algo inestimável em si mesmo. Poderá ter igualmente um valor heurístico muito significativo. Em suma, o objectivo destas aulas, para além de vos introduzir a um conjunto de conceitos (teoria, hipóteses, variável, etc.), é o de vos tornar mais conscientes de que, quando optarem por uma determinada metodologia de pesquisa, têm de arranjar uma melhor justificação para o fazer do que o mero “porque é assim que se faz”.

Week 2: Mannheim and the historicity of social sciences. The case of political science.

Required reading:

Mannheim, K. [1936] 1972. *Ideology and Utopia. Collected Works, Volume One.*

London: Routledge. (pp. 237-280) (F-476/1)

Miller, E. 1972. "Positivism, Historicism, and Political Inquiry," *American Political Science Review*, 66, 796-817. (JSTOR)

Skinner, Q. 1969. "Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas," *History and Theory* 8 (1): 3-53. (JSTOR)

Supplemental reading:

Tully, J. (ed.) 1989. *Meaning and Context: Quentin Skinner and his Critics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. (especially pp. 7-25; 68-132; 231-288) (P-2431)

Hirschman, A. 1991. *The Rhetoric of Reaction: Perversity, Futility, Jeopardy*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press. (H.-2461)

Pocock, J.G.A. 1972. *Politics, Language and Time. Essays in Political Thought and History*. London: Methuen. (32.POC)

Pocock, J.G.A. 1985. *Virtue, Commerce, and History: Essays on political thought and history, chiefly in the eighteenth century*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (especially pp. 1-49) (H.-1885)

Week 3: From the state of the discipline to the return of the state. The behaviorist revolution of the 1950s and the neo-institutionalism of the 1980s.

Required reading:

Farr, J. 1995. "Remembering the Revolution: Behavioralism in American Political Science," in James Farr, John S. Dryzek, e Stephen T. Leonard (eds.), *Political Science in History: Research Programs and Political Traditions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 198-224. (a disponibilizar pelo docente)

Farr, J. 2003. "The New Science of Politics." *The Cambridge History of Twentieth Century Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 431-45. (P.-3033)

Hall, Peter A. e Rosemary C.R. Taylor. 1996. "Political Science and the Three New Institutionalisms." *Political Studies* 44(5): 936-957. (B.On)

Supplemental reading:

Farr, J. e Seideman, R. (eds.) 1993. *Discipline and History: Political Science in the United States*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Farr, J., John S. Dryzek, e Stephen T. Leonard (eds.), *Political Science in History: Research Programs and Political Traditions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 198-224.

March, J. e Johan Olson 1984. "The New Institutionalism: Organizational Factors in Political Life," *American Political Science Review* 78 (3): 734-749. (JSTOR)

Week 4: The debate on "methodological nationalism" and the epistemological challenges posed by globalization. Challenges to research design in political science today.

Required reading:

Farr, J. 1996. "Political Science and the State," in *Discipline and History: Political Science in the United States*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Beck, U. and Sznaider, N. 2006. "Unpacking Cosmopolitanism for the Social Sciences," *The British Journal of Sociology* 57 (1): 1-23. (B.On)

Chernilo, D. 2006. "Social Theory's Methodological Nationalism", *European Journal of Social Theory* 9 (1): 5-22. (Sage Journals Online)

Supplemental reading:

Chernilo, D. 2007. *A Social Theory of the Nation-State. The Political Forms of Modernity Beyond Methodological Nationalism*, London: Routledge.

Beck, U. 1999. *World Risk Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press. (especially introduction)

Beck, U. 2000. *What is Globalization?* Cambridge: Polity Press. (especially pp. 64-86) (P.-2433)

Silva, F.C., Vieira, M.B. 2008. "Plural Modernity. Changing modern institutional forms: disciplines and nation-states," *Social Analysis. The International Journal of Cultural and Social Practice* 53 (2): 60-79.

Week 5: *Time is of the Essence: Sociology, History, and the Place of Theory*

Required reading:

Baert, P. and Silva, F.C. 2010. *Social Theory in the Twentieth Century and Beyond*. Cambridge: Polity Press, pp. 170-180.

Kiser, Edgar, and Michael Hechter, "The Role of General Theory in Comparative-Historical Sociology," *American Journal of Sociology* 97: 1 (1991), pp. 1-30.

Somers, Margaret R. "‘We’re No Angels’: Realism, Rational Choice, and Relationality in Social Science," *American Journal of Sociology* 104: 3 (November 1998), pp. 722-784.

Mahoney, James, "Revisiting General Theory in Historical Sociology," *Social Forces* (December 2004).

Supplemental reading (more from the 1998 AJS symposium on historical sociology):

Kiser, Edgar and Michael Hechter. 1998. "The Debate on Historical Sociology: Rational Choice Theory and Its Critics." *American Journal of Sociology* 104: 722-84.

Goldstone, Jack A. 1998. "Initial Conditions, General Laws, Path Dependence, and Explanation in Historical Sociology." *American Journal of Sociology* 104:829-845.

Calhoun, Craig. 1998. "Explanation in Historical Sociology: Narrative, General Theory, and Historically Specific Theory." *American Journal of Sociology* 104: 846-871.

Week 6: Carlo Ginzburg: *Much more than a micro-historian*

Required reading:

Ginzburg, Carlo. 1989(1986). "Clues: Roots of an Evidential Paradigm." Pp.96-125 in *Clues, Myths, and the Historical Method*. Translated by John and Anne C. Tedeschi. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Ginzburg, Carlo. 1989(1986). "The Inquisitor as Anthropologist." Pp. 156-64. in *Clues, Myths, and the Historical Method*. Translated by John and Anne C. Tedeschi. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Ginzburg, Carlo. 1999. *The Judge and the Historian. Marginal Notes on a Late-Twentieth-Century Miscarriage of Justice*. Translated by Antony Shugaar. London: Verso.

Supplemental reading:

On the dark side of history: Carlo Ginzburg talks to Trygve Riiser Gundersen
(<http://www.eurozine.com/pdf/2003-07-11-ginzburg-en.pdf>)

Week 7: *S.N. Eisenstadt: Civilizational comparative analysis, or, why to take a bird's eye view of the world*

Required reading:

Eisenstadt S.N. (Editor) 2002. *Multiple Modernities*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.

Eisenstadt, S.N., 2004. *Comparative Civilizations and Multiple Modernities*, Leiden: Brill.

Eisenstadt, S.N. 2006. *The Great Revolutions and the Civilizations of Modernity*. Leiden: Brill.

Week 8: *Case Studies and the Small-N problem*

Required reading:

Skocpol, Theda. 1979. *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia, and China*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (part 2)

Lieberson, Stanley. 1991. "Small N's and Big Conclusions: An Examination of the Reasoning in Comparative Studies Based on a Small Number of Cases." *Social Forces* 70: 307-320.

Rueschemeyer, Dietrich. 2003. "Can One or a Few Cases Yield Theoretical Gains?" Pp. 305-336 in *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*, edited by James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Supplemental reading:

Ragin, Charles C. and Howard S. Becker, eds. 1992. *What is a Case? Exploring the Foundations of Social Inquiry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Excellent collection, pieces from Ragin, Andrew Abbott and others).

Ragin, Charles C. 1997. "Turning the Tables: How Case-Oriented Research Challenges Variable-Oriented Research." *Comparative and Social Research* 16:27-42.

Week 9: *Time, Sequence & Path Dependence in Historical Sociology*

Required Reading:

Abbott, Andrew. 1988. "Transcending General Linear Reality." *Sociological Theory* 6: 169-186.

Sewell, William. 1996. "Three Temporalities: Toward an Eventful Sociology," Pp.245- 280 in the *Historic Turn in the Human Sciences*, edited by Terrence J. McDonald. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Mahoney, James. 2000. "Path Dependence in Historical Sociology," *Theory and Society* 29: 507-548.

Pierson, Paul. 2000. "Increasing Returns, Path Dependence, and the Study of Politics." *American Political Science Review* 94: 251-67.

Supplemental Reading:

Haydu, Jeffrey. 1998. "Making Use of the Past: Time Periods as Cases to Compare and as Sequences of Problem Solving," *American Journal of Sociology* 104: 339-371.

Pierson, Paul. 2003. "Big, Slow-Moving, and . . . Invisible: Macrosocial Processes in the Study of Comparative Politics," in James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, eds., *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Week 10: *Quantitative Approaches in Historical Sociology*

Required reading:

Isaac, Larry W., and Larry J. Griffin. 1989 "Ahistoricism in Time-Series Analysis." *American Sociological Review* 54: 873-890.

Bearman, Peter, James Moody and Robert Faris. 2002. "Networks and History." *Complexity* 8:61-71.

Kiser, Edgar and April Linton. 2002. "The Hinges of History: State-Making and Revolt in Early Modern France." *American Sociological Review* 67:889-910.

Franzosi, Roberto. 1998. "Narrative as Data: Linguistic and Statistical Tools for the Quantitative Study of Historical Events." special issue of *International Review of Social History* Vol. 43 (supplement) 81-104.

Supplemental reading:

Special issue of *International Review of Social History* on Quantitative Approaches in Social History. 1998, Volume 43 (Supplement).

Week 11: *Quantitative Approaches Continued/Large Data Collection Projects*

Required reading:

McCammon, Holly J. 1998. "Using Event History Analysis in Historical Research: With Illustrations from a Study of Passage of Women's Protective Legislation." special issue of *International Review of Social History* Vol. 43 (supplement) 33-55.

Gamson, William A. 1975. *The Strategy of Social Protest* (Chapter 2, Appendices A - E). Homewood, IL: The Dorsey Press.

Hodson, Randy. 1998. "Organizational Ethnographies: An Underutilized Resource in the Sociology of Work." *Social Forces* 76:1173-1208.

Supplemental reading:

Allison, Paul. 1984. *Event History Analysis: Regression for Longitudinal Data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hodson, Randy. 1999. *Analyzing Documentary Accounts*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Week 12: *Doing Archival Research & the Use of Historical Sources in Sociology*

Silva, F.C. (2008). *Mead and Modernity. Science, Selfhood and Democratic Politics*. Lanham: Lexington Books. (Introduction)

Silva, F.C. (ed.) (2010). *G.H. Mead. A Reader*. London: Routledge. (Introduction)

Goldthorpe, John. 1991. "The Uses of History in Sociology: Reflections on Some Recent Tendencies," *British Journal of Sociology* 42: 211-230.

Milligan, John D. 1979. "The Treatment of an Historical Source," *History and Theory* 18: 177-196.

Week 13: *Reading Day*

Individual Meetings on Research Projects

Week 14: *Archival Research Continued/ Strategies and Agendas in Historical Sociology*

Mills, C. Wright. 1959. *The Sociological Imagination* (appendix). New York: Oxford University Press.

Week 15: *Research Presentations*