

**GV/GGOV 701 – GLOBAL GOVERNANCE RESEARCH METHODS
Winter 2012**

Time/Dates: Thursday, 1:30-4:20
Location: BSIA 311
Instructor: Thomas Homer-Dixon
BSIA 312
Quantitative Instructor: JJ Huo

Office Hours: Thursday 10:00-11:30
or by appointment

This seminar encourages students to think about broad questions of epistemology, ontology and methodology in relation to the design of their own dissertation research projects. In addition to preparing students for their dissertation research, the course exposes students to methodological debates and approaches so they can professionally assess others' academic work. The course encourages students to engage and confront the methodological challenges that arise in a multidisciplinary/interdisciplinary context. In doing so, it addresses methodological issues that transcend the scope of the three core Ph.D. courses.

Please note: Students are encourage to read the materials assigned for each week in the order listed.

Grades

Component A and C	70%
Reaction Papers 10% each (x 4)	40%
Seminar Facilitator (Notes and Presentation)	5%
Seminar Rapporteur (Notes and Presentation)	5%
Seminar Participation (8 seminars)	20%
Component B (Huo)	30%
Written Assignment A	10%*
Written Assignment B	15%*
Seminar Participation (Presentation)	5%
	*highest grade weighted 15%

COMPONENT A: INTRODUCTION, THE CONTEXT OF METHODOLOGICAL DEBATES IN GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

Jan. 5th Introduction.

**Skim through these readings. How would you describe the methodological approach is the author taking and why? What cases have they chosen and why?*

MacMillan, Margaret. 2001. *Paris 1919: Six Months that Changed the World*. New York, Random House. Read "Introduction," xxv-xxxix.

MacMillan, Margaret. 2006. *Nixon in China: The Week that Changed the World*. Toronto: Penguin, 1-13.

Moore, Barrington. 1966. "Preface," xi-xix in *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World*. Boston: Beacon.

Moul, William. 2003. "Power Parity, Preponderance, and War between Great Powers, 1816-1989." *Journal Of Conflict Resolution* 47, 4 (August): 468-489. **Skim.**

Moul, William. 2005. "Counting the Seven Weeks War: Dyads, Disputes and Balances of Power." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 38, 1 (March) 153-74. **Skim.**

Jan. 12th Disciplinary Divides in History, Economics and Political Science – An Introduction.

This component examines the challenges inherent in addressing issues of research methods in a multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary context. It raises the question of what historians, economists and political scientists are typically doing when practicing their craft and helps contextualize the subsequent discussion of research methods. The seminar raises a theme running through the course -- whether a 'scientific' approach is possible or desirable in social research and, if so, what is the essence of such an approach. It also lays some groundwork for the later discussion of whether and how disciplinary boundaries can – and should – be bridged.

Readings:

Collier, David, Henry E. Brady and Jason Seawright. "Four Approaches to the Qualitative versus Quantitative Distinction," 244-50 **only** excerpted from "Sources of Leverage in Causal Inference," 229-66 in Henry E. Brady and David Collier, ed., *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Toronto: Rowman and Littlefield.

Bennett, Andrew and Colin Elman. 2006. "Epistemological Issues: Effects of Causes versus Causes of Effects," 456-8 **only** excerpted from "Qualitative Research: Recent Developments in Case Study Methods," *Annual Review of Political Science* 9: 455-76.

Mahoney, James. 2008. "Toward a Unified Theory of Causality." *Comparative Political Studies* 41, 4/5 (April/May 2008): 412-36.

*Review January 6th readings in light of discussions in readings above. [Required for reaction brief.]

Jan. 19th The Philosophy of Science – Positivism, Post-Positivism, and Constructivism.

This seminar considers the philosophical underpinnings of science as an endeavour whether as applied to the natural or social world. It is intended to expose students to the deep philosophical debates about how we know what we know and how science, as an organized social endeavour, goes about determining what constitutes knowledge.

Readings:

Popper, Karl. "Science as Falsification," in *Conjectures and Refutations* (New York: Basic Books, 1962). Available online at http://www.stephenjaygould.org/ctrl/popper_falsification.html.

Friedman, Milton. "The Methodology of Positive Economics," in *Essays in Positive Economics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953), 3-43. Available online at <http://members.shaw.ca/compilerpress1/Anno%20Friedman%20Positive.htm>.

Kuhn, Thomas. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962). Read Chpt.1 "Introduction: A Role for History," 1-10 and Chpt. 13 "Progress through Revolutions," 159-72. Students might also skim Chpts. 2-12. (Copies available from instructor – please don't recall from library.)

Matteo Motterlini. "Introduction: A Dialogue between Imre Lakatos and Paul Feyerabend," 1-18 in Imre Lakatos and Paul Feyerabend, *For and Against Method* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999).

Jan. 26th Quantitative vs. Qualitative Empirical Approaches in the Social Sciences

This seminar returns to a consideration of epistemology and ontology and the question of actual research design including a reconsideration of the relative strengths and weaknesses of single or small-n case studies versus large-n statistical studies. Proceeding from this discussion, the seminar considers how and why various research approaches are (or ought to be) chosen.

Readings:

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry : Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton, N.J. : Princeton University Press. Chapter 1: The Science in Social Science,” 3-33.

Achen, Christopher H. and Duncan Snidal. 1989. “Rational Deterrence Theory and Comparative Case Studies” *World Politics* 41, 2 (January): 143-69.

Bennett, Andrew and Colin Elman. 2006. “Complex Causal Relations and Case Study Methods: The Example of Path Dependence.” *Political Analysis* 14 (2006): 250-67.

Mahoney, James and Gary Goertz, “A Tale of Two Cultures: Contrasting Qualitative and Quantitative Research.” *Political Analysis* 14 (2006): 227-249.

McKeown, Timothy. “Case Studies and the Statistical Worldview,” *International Organization* 53 (1999): 161-190.

COMPONENT B: QUANTITATIVE TECHNIQUES IN THE STUDY OF GLOBAL GOVERNANCE [Huo]

Regardless of whether one accepts or rejects the position that research should or can aspire to ‘scientific’ standards and that quantitative statistical approaches are the best method for achieving these standards, all consumers of knowledge in disciplines related to global governance must be conversant in quantitative techniques for at least two major reasons: first, to understand the logic of inference which underpins quantitative methodology (and which also underpins certain qualitative approaches) as well as to be able to competently access and assess quantitative works. This component provides students with a brief overview of how quantitative research is constructed, the logic of inference which underpins it, the main challenges that quantitative research faces, and the standard criticisms to which many examples of quantitative research are subject.

Feb. 2 Developing a Research Question and the Role of Hypotheses [Huo]

This session examines the basic components of proposing a research question. The right research question should clearly specify the elements of the theoretical relationship to be explained or interpreted. The theoretical conjecture should also be easily amenable to empirical testing. Key topics in this session include causality versus interpretation, variables, and the role of the hypothesis. The seminar also addresses methodological questions relating to selecting cases on the basis of the independent versus the dependent variable.

Methodological Arguments

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry : Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton, N.J. : Princeton University Press. Chapter 3.

James Fearon, "Counterfactuals and Hypothesis Testing in Political Science," *World Politics* 43 (1991): 169-195.

Peter Hedstrom and Richard Swedberg, "Social Mechanisms," *Acta Sociologica* 39 (1996): 281-308.

Research Examples

Duane Swank, "Globalization and the Taxation of Businesses in Advanced Market Economies," *Political Studies* 46 (1998): 671-692.

Torben Iversen and Thomas Cusack, "The Causes of Welfare State Expansion: Deindustrialization or Globalization?" *World Politics* 52 (2000): 313-349.

Feb. 9th Developing Measures of Concepts
[Huo]

Regardless of their diverse nature, all data serve as empirical observations of theoretical relationships and concepts. Depending on the nature of data, researchers adopt different collection methods, in order to ensure that (1) the data measure what they meant to measure, and (2) the possible extent of error is reduced to the minimum. Key topics in this session include the translation of concepts into measurable phenomenon, measurement, sampling, survey, focus groups, and some ways of obtaining qualitative data.

Methodological Arguments

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

Robert Adcock and David Collier, "Measurement Validity: A Shared Standard for Qualitative and Quantitative Research," *American Political Science Review* 95 (2001): 529-546.

William G. Jacoby, "Levels of Measurement and Political Research: An Optimistic View," *American Journal of Political Science* 43 (1999): 271-301.

Research Examples

Paul Abramson and Ada Finifter, "On the Meaning of Political Trust: New Evidence from Items Introduced in 1978," *American Journal of Political Science* 25 (1981): 297-307.

Zachary Elkins, "Gradations of Democracy? Empirical Tests of Alternative Conceptualizations," *American Journal of Political Science* 44 (2000): 293-300.

Feb.16th Strategies for Quantitative Causal Hypothesis Testing
[Huo]

Finally, having examined both theory formulation and proper data measurement, this session considers quantitative approaches to testing theory. Here we focus especially on the various research strategies designed to test causal relationship, as this is the most important and frequently proposed relationship in the social sciences. Most ideally, causality is tested through experiments, due to the "counterfactual" nature of causality. In reality, political institutions and behavior are rarely subject to easy manipulation and control by the researcher, and therefore non-experimental methods are the main causal strategies for political science. This model will also discuss some issues related to the comparative merits of statistical versus other research methods such as the experimental method.

Methodological Arguments

Bates, Robert, et al. 1998. "The Politics of Interpretation: Rationality, Culture, and Transition." *Politics and Society* 26: 603-42.

Lieberson, Stanley. "Variation, Levels of Analysis and the Research Question," in *Making It Count: The Improvement of Social Research and Theory*. Berkeley: University of California, 1985.

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry : Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton, N.J. : Princeton University Press. Chapter 6.

Research Examples

David Rueda, "Insider-Outsider Politics in Industrialized Democracies: The Challenge to Social Democratic Parties," *American Political Science Review* 99 (2005): 61-74.

Evelyn Huber, Charles Ragin and John D. Stephens, "Social Democracy, Christian Democracy, Constitutional Structure, and the Welfare State," *American Journal of Sociology* 99 (1993): 711-749.

COMPONENT C: QUALITATIVE APPROACHES

Parallel to the discussion of quantitative methods in Component B, this series of sessions provides a brief overview of the rationale for qualitative approaches, how qualitative research is constructed, the main challenges that qualitative research faces, and the standard criticisms to which many examples of qualitative research are subject.

Mar. 1st Tools and Strategies in Qualitative Research.

Keeping in mind the divide between proponents of small-n qualitative research design as discussed in the preceding seminar, this seminar examines discussion of concrete issues relating to case choice, empirical strategies and tools in qualitative research.

Readings:

Hall, Peter A. 2003. "Aligning Ontology and Methodology in Comparative Research," 373-404. In James A. Mahoney and Dietrich Reuschmeyer, ed., *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

George, Alexander and Andrew Bennett. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2005. Chpt. 3, 4, 8-11.

Munck, Gerardo. 2004. "Tools for Qualitative Research," 105-21 in Henry E. Brady and David Collier, ed., *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Toronto: Rowman and Littlefield.

Mar.8th Case Studies and Case Selection.

This seminar returns to the conversation begun in Week 3 using Prof. Homer-Dixon's work, criticisms of it, and his response as a focus for further discussion of case studies, comparative methodology and case selection.

Thomas Homer-Dixon, *Environment, Scarcity, and Violence* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), Chapter 2, pp. 12-27; Chapter 5, plus appendix, pp. 73-106; and Chapter 7, plus appendix, pp. 133-176. Skim chapters but closely read the two appendices.

Nils Petter Gleditsch. "Armed Conflict and the Environment: A Critique of the Literature." *Journal of Peace Research* Vol. 35, no. 3, 1998: 381-400.

Daniel Schwartz, Tom Deligiannis, and Thomas Homer-Dixon, "The Environment and Violent Conflict: A Response to Gleditsch's Critique and Some Suggestions for Future Research," *Environmental Change & Security Project Report*, Issue 6 (Summer 2000), available at: http://www.homerdixon.com/download/Response_to_Gleditsch.pdf.

Mar. 15th Comparative Approaches.

Ontological and epistemological debates do not end with the choice to adopt qualitative methods over quantitative/statistical methods or vice versa. This seminar examines debates among proponents of small-n studies regarding the nature of causality and how researchers should best proceed in designing their research programs.

Readings:

Lijphart, Arend. "Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method," *American Political Science Review* 65 (1971): 682-93.

Przeworski, Adam and Henry Teune. 1970. *The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry*. New York: Wiley. 3-46, 86-7.

Lijphart, Arend. "The Comparable-Cases Strategy in Comparative Research," *Comparative Political Studies* 8 (1975): 158-77.

Landman, T. (2002). Comparative Politics and Human Rights. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 24 (4), 890-923.

Mar. 22nd Interdisciplinarity and Multidisciplinarity -- Bridging Disciplinary Divides?

This session returns to consider a question raised in the introductory session – how and to what degree should we attempt to bridge disciplinary divides? How likely is it that such a project will be successful in terms of generating, in Lakatosian terms, a progressive collective research project?

Peter A. Hall, "The Dilemmas of Contemporary Social Science," *Boundary 2* vol. 34, no. 3 (Fall 2007): 121-41.

Asbjørn Nørgaard, "Political Science: Witchcraft or Craftsmanship? Standards for Good Research," *World Political Science Review* 4, 1 (2008).

Victoria Chick, "On Knowing One's Place: the Role of Formalism in Economics," *The Economic Journal*, 108 (1998): 1859-69.

Elman, Colin and Miriam Fendius Elman, "Diplomatic History and International Relations Theory: Respecting Differences and Crossing Boundaries," *International Security* 22, 1 (Summer 1997): 5-21.

Paul Hirsch, Stuart Michaels and Ray Friedman, "'Dirty Hands' Versus 'Clean Models': Is Sociology in Danger of Being Seduced by Economics?" *Theory and Society* 16 (1987): 317-36.

Mar. 29th A. Policy Relevance

George, Alexander and Andrew Bennett. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2005. Chpt.12.

Nye, Joseph S. "Scholars on the Sidelines" *Washington Post* 13 April 2009.

Drezner, Daniel. "So You Want to be Policy Relevant?" *Foreign Policy* 18 February 2010.

Cohen, Patricia. "Field Study: Just How Relevant is Political Science?" *New York Times* 20 October 2009.

Foreign Policy. *100 Top Thinkers List 2010*.

http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/11/29/the_fp_top_100_global_thinkers?page=full

Apr. 5th B: Overview on Proposal Writing

Przeworski, Adam and Frank Solomon. *The Art of Writing Proposals*. PDF.

Goff, Patti and Gerry Boychuk. *Conceptualizing a Major Research Program*. PDF.

George, Alexander and Andrew Bennett. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2005. Please re-read Chpt.4 regarding preparing proposals.

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry : Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton, N.J. : Princeton University Press. Chapter 1: The Science in Social Science," **12-33 ONLY**.

Hancké, Bob. *Intelligent Research Design: A Guide for Beginning Researchers in the Social Sciences*. Oxford University Press, 2009. pp. 27-33.

WRITTEN ASSIGNMENTS

Component A and C – Reaction Briefs (4x10% each)

Reaction briefs examine how the readings fit together with one another (in what sense do they complement one another, are there tensions between them?), outline how the readings and the issues they raise fit with the broader set of class discussions and readings to date, and identify the most important topics/issues raised in the readings. While they should provide a concise overview of the readings' central arguments, they *should not summarize* the readings but, rather, should attempt to *synthesize* the materials (on the one hand, the readings for a given topic and, on the other, the readings for that topic within the broader course materials.) The briefs should themselves present a clear, concise central argument—the student's reaction to the readings for a given topic. The latter should be based on the following types of considerations:

If there are tensions among the readings, is one perspective more compelling than other?
Are there issues or perspectives that are not adequately addressed by any of the readings?
How important is the overall contribution of the readings for a given topic (taken as a whole) to the broader course discussions given the readings that have already been considered to that point in the course?

Students are required to complete four reaction briefs from the eight assigned topics in Components A and C. Students **must** complete at least one reaction brief for a topic in Component A (e.g. at least one reaction brief for Jan 12, 19 or 26.)

The reaction briefs should be 6 pages (1500 words) **maximum**. While appropriate citation is required, there is no need to produce a bibliography except for any additional materials that may be (but need not be) cited.

Reaction briefs are due *before* the start of class on the date that the associated lecture topic is discussed. The main reason is to ensure that students provide an original reaction to the readings rather than reprise the class discussions. For this reason, there is *no provision for late assignments*. If a student cannot complete the brief on time, they would simply complete another brief for a later date.

Component B (Weeks 4-6) – Assignments A and B (Huo)

Once during the Component B module you will briefly present some of the weekly readings to the class that serve as a resource for class discussion. The instructor will assign the readings for you for that particular week. The requirement of the presentation is twofold. First, you should provide information that helps further clarify the readings. Second, you should offer some of your own comments and evaluations on the readings to the class. The presentation should be around 10 minutes.

For *two* of the three weeks of this component, students are required to submit an article reviewing readings assigned to this particular week. Please notice the following rules:

- As you will see, for the quantitative weeks we make distinctions between two categories of readings: (1) abstract “methodological arguments” and (2) “research examples”. Each of your articles has to cover *at least two readings from (1) and one reading from (2)*.
- Do not summarize the readings. Just provide your reviews.
- The review article should be 5 pages in length (no more no less).
- *Guidelines on How to Review Methodological Arguments.* You should develop your opinions and responses to the reading. What are questions left unanswered? Are the author’s arguments plausible? Are these methodological suggestions/recommendations empirically feasible? Can the arguments be extended? These are just some examples of questions you might want to think about when reviewing the readings.
- *Guidelines on How to Review Research Examples.* Essentially you are serving as a referee for these readings. Focus on research methodology. *Your evaluation must be related to the methodological arguments we are discussing that particular week.* For example, was there a meaningful and significant research question? Was data measurement appropriate? Did the research design adequately test and confirm the theoretical proposition? If you are the editor of a journal, will you accept these publications based on their methodology, and why?

In-Class Assignments

Components A and C – Seminar Facilitators and Rapporteurs

Students will be required to act both as a facilitator for one seminar and a rapporteur for one seminar. (Dates will be assigned at the beginning of the course.)

As facilitators, students will be expected to provide the class (by email before 5:00 p.m. on the Tuesday prior to the seminar) with a brief outline (maximum two pages) which 1.) identifies the linkages between the readings for the week, 2.) places the readings in the broader context of the themes of the readings and class discussions to date, and 3.) outlines a set of discussion questions for the seminar. (Facilitators should assume all students have done the readings and, as such, should *not* provide an overview of the readings or of any individual reading.) At the start of class (following the rapporteur's report as outlined below), the facilitators will briefly (6-10 mins.) open the class by outlining the themes and questions they think the class should focus on. While the facilitators are not expected to run the seminar *per se*, they will be expected to make a contribution to helping move the discussion along and ensuring that all of the relevant issues which their notes have identified are touched upon.

As rapporteurs, students will submit a brief report (maximum two pages) to the class by email before 9:00 a.m. on the Monday following the seminar. Seminar reports should attempt to capture the overall flow of the discussion focusing on the most important themes, outlining the degree to which consensus was reached by the class on the various question and issues discussed, and identifying any issues which remain unresolved. In this sense, they should draw upon the facilitator’s notes for that week to determine which topics/questions were adequately addressed and which were not. At the start of class, rapporteurs will give a brief overview (6-10 mins) of the last week's discussion and their assessment of it.

The rapporteur's reports are due on Monday morning so that they are available for use by students preparing facilitator notes for Tuesday. Facilitator notes are due on Tuesday afternoon so that they are available for use by students in preparing for the class on Thursday. In both cases, students have a right to expect that the material will be available on time. As such, the assignment will be considered not to have been completed if the reports are not available on time and will be assigned a grade of zero.

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDED READINGS

2. Philosophy of Science

Laudan, Larry. *Progress and Its Problems*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.

Putnam, Hilary. *Reason, Truth and History*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Rockmore, Tom. *On Constructivist Epistemology* (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2005).

Rorty, Richard. *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979.

Weber, Max. "Objectivity in Social Sciences and Social Policy," 50-112 in Edward A. Shils and Henry A. Finch, ed., *The Methodology of the Social Sciences*. New York: Free Press, 1949.

Weber, Max. "Science as Vocation" in H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, ed., *Essays in Sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946. Available online at http://www.ne.jp/asahi/moriyuki/abukuma/weber/lecture/science_frame.html.

Weber, Max. "The Meaning of 'Ethical Neutrality' in Sociology and Economics," 1-49 in Edward Shils and Henry A. Finch, ed., *The Methodology of the Social Sciences*. New York: Free Press, 1949.

3. Quantitative vs. Qualitative Research Methods

Almond, Gabriel and Stephen Genco, "Clouds, Clocks, and the Study of Politics," *World Politics* 29 (1977): 489-522.

George, Alexander and Andrew Bennett. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2005. Chpt.1 and 7.

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 2004. "The Importance of Research Design," 171-92 in Henry E. Brady and David Collier, ed., *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Toronto: Rowman and Littlefield.

Mahoney, James, Erin Kimball, and Kendra L. Koivu. 2009. "The Logic of Historical Explanation in the Social Sciences." *Comparative Political Studies* 42, 1 (January): 114-146. Esp. pages 114-28 on different meanings of "causation."

4. Developing a Research Question and the Role of Hypotheses.

Quan Li and Rafael Reuveny, "Economic Globalization and Democracy: An Empirical Analysis," *British Journal of Political Science* 33 (2003): 29-54.

6. Strategies for Quantitative Hypothesis Testing.

Culpepper, Pepper. "Institutional Change in Contemporary Capitalism: Coordinated Financial Systems since 1990," *World Politics* 57 (2005): 173-199.

Nora Cate Schaeffer and Presser, Stanley, "The Science of Asking Questions," *Annual Review of Sociology* 29 (2003): 65-88.

7-9. Comparative Methodology and Case Selection

George, Alexander and Andrew Bennett. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2005. Chpt.9, 11-12 and section on "Assessing the Evidentiary Value of Archival Materials," 99-108.

McKeown, Timothy J. 2004. "Case Studies and the Limits of the Quantitative World View," 139-67 in Henry E. Brady and David Collier, ed., *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Toronto: Rowman and Littlefield.

Mill, John Stuart. *The Logic of the Moral Sciences*. London: Duckworth, 1987.

Pierson, Paul. "The Costs of Marginalization: Qualitative Methods in the Study of American Politics," *Comparative Political Studies* 40, 2 (February 2007): 146-69.

Ragin, Charles C. 2004. "Turning the Tables," 123-38 in Henry E. Brady and David Collier, ed., *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Toronto: Rowman and Littlefield.

10. Interdisciplinarity and Multidisciplinarity

Petrie, Hugh G. 1976. 'Do You See What I See? The Epistemology of Interdisciplinary Inquiry.' *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, Vol. 10, No. 1: 29-42.