3

LEARNING PROPER CITATION FORMS, FINDING THE SCHOLARLY DEBATE, AND SUMMARIZING AND CLASSIFYING ARGUMENTS

The Annotated Bibliography

We are like dwarfs sitting on the shoulders of giants. We see more, and things that are more distant, than they did, not because our sight is superior or because we are taller than they, but because they raise us up, and by their great stature add to ours.[1]

While the last chapter stressed that you are going to be performing original empirical work, you will be building heavily on the ideas and approaches of previous scholars and analysts. In fact, you cannot do a good job if your effort is not well situated in the field's understandings of the key concepts and theories at stake in your question, events, issues, and methodologies. The Annotated Bibliography (AB) is the first step in finding the giants on whose shoulders you will be sitting. What is crucial is to (1) uncover those authors who and sources that are the most important, (2) become satisfied not after finding *one* behemoth but

after locating multiple *competing* arguments that address the whole debate, and (3) understand precisely the implications of the differing claims. All of this work is an essential and critical foundation of your paper. Just as with a physical structure, if your conceptual framework is inadequate, your paper risks falling apart. The AB is where you begin the foundation on which you will base the Literature Review, thesis, and, if necessary, Model and Hypothesis sections.

Now that you have a Research Question (although you will likely refine your query as you work through the AB toward the Literature Review), your next task is to find the scholarly answers to it. Before turning directly to that endeavor, however, you must possess some skills. To make sure everyone has the same capabilities, I want to address the nuts-and-bolts issues of understanding the bibliography and the information you need to collect in this early stage, avoiding plagiarism and nicely integrating information from sources, properly citing materials, and learning how to take notes on the works you have found. Providing this information first will ensure that you keep track of all the information that you need, understand the care required in using sources, and develop the skills necessary for grouping your materials. Thereafter, you will locate, understand, and classify the participants in the debate and their most significant works.

WHAT ARE BIBLIOGRAPHIES, AND WHY DO WE BOTHER WITH THEM?

Each scholarly paper contains a list of sources, sometimes called a *bibliography*,[2] that provides all the information that contributed to the work. Over the years, particular forms for displaying this information have become standardized, and you are obligated to choose one style for documenting your sources and providing other information (e.g., rules for arranging citations and styles for headings and title pages). Proper documentation of these materials is essential in a research paper. You should be prepared from the beginning of the writing process to keep track of the sources you use and the precise places in the text where these authors have influenced your work. That means that you must choose a particular format, such as the American Political Science Association (APSA), American Psychological Association (APA), or the *Chicago Manual of Style* ("Chicago style") forms, among others. In political science publications, these are the formats you are most likely to see, but your professor may have a preference for one in particular, so check before you choose. Typically, getting access to these rules is easy: many introductory writing classes assign writing manuals that contain these guides, so you may already own one; your library typically has these materials online; or you can find them through an internet search. Please remember that you do not have to memorize the format, but you should neither make up your own style as you go along nor change the one you use midstream.

Once you have chosen a format for documentation, you need to keep careful track of where and how different works influence you. Many of you have had access to NoodleBib or some other similar source and citation management software in middle or high school. In college, you may want to use one of the other tools designed for more advanced work; these include EndNote, Zotero, and Mendeley. What this software does for you is keep track of all your sources (complete with copies of the actual works), help you create your reference list in the appropriate form, and allow you to pick and choose which sources should be in your bibliography. Some advantages of these types of software are that they can produce a reference list of precisely the sources you want (e.g., you might initially cite and save a source that ultimately turns out not to be useful, so you can choose not to include it), and they can change the format to what you need, depending on the assignment. (Let's say you collected some sources on democracy and democratization in your introductory comparative politics class and then later found them useful in an upper-division course on American political development. Imagine that the professors required Chicago style in the first class and APA in the second. These tools can easily re-create a source list in the appropriate format.) One weakness is that these programs sometimes make mistakes with the form, so you should check over the types of errors they tend to make in your required format and fix them accordingly. Another enormous benefit is that they allow easy access back to any full-text electronic files. One of the lessons I am trying to emphasize is that your work in political science is cumulative, and these devices underline that point. You can go back to these sources in any future semester, access them, and create a new bibliography (with other works added) for an entirely new paper.

Choosing among these software tools is often a matter of taste, although some disciplines and some faculty have preferences. Zotero and Mendeley are free (and your institution might have free access to EndNote), so they tend to be particularly popular. There can be an additional cost for extra online storage space, but for the purposes of a semester paper, that should not be an issue. You can use both of the free programs on- and offline, they allow you to share files with others, and you can save materials on your local computer but also access them from other devices.[3]

Of course, you can also make a citation list the old-fashioned way. If that is your choice, I recommend that you open a new document and build your bibliography as soon as you start your research, just as you would with a citation manager. That way, you won't have to type all of your sources in when you are frantically trying to finish. Also, you'll understand exactly which information you need from the outset and won't be in the position of not having a date or page numbers for an article when you need them. Last, because you will be turning in an AB, amassing the source information now is necessary for your first assignment.

In working with students, I have found that many don't understand why authors use reference lists and what the components of each entry mean. Because

demystifying the bibliography helps you conduct research, let me enlighten you. (Apologies here to those who already know.) Authors include source lists to show where they found their information and to help legitimize their work. While the quality of one's sources doesn't guarantee that a paper will be great, understanding a topic is very difficult if you haven't consulted the recognized giants of a field. So the bibliography communicates something of the quality of the work. In addition, when beginning a research project, the bibliographies of good sources are potential gold mines, telling you who the experts are and whose work you need to understand. Bibliographies can also contain information about excellent data sources for your topic. In other words, these lists lead you to important works that you must read to do a good job on your project, both at this point, when you're focusing on concepts and theory, and later, when you need data and evidence. Thus, the bibliography is a kind of treasure map, making your detective job of finding good materials much easier. Similarly, your bibliography will be a reflection of the research you did and will show others what helped you.

No matter how frequently I encourage my students to use the bibliographies of their sources to find additional resources, only the best ones seem to heed my advice. One of my conclusions (which also follows from watching them struggle when they have to produce a reference list without using software) is that students ignore me because they don't understand how to read a citation. So, let's look at some references (from different formats) to try to understand what they are communicating.

APSA Form

Mettler, Suzanne. 2018. *The Government-Citizen Disconnect.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Chicago Manual of Style Form

Goldstone, Jack A. "Understanding the Revolutions of 2011." *Foreign Affairs* 90, no. 3 (May 2011): 8–16. http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct =true&db=aph&AN=9204680&site=eds-live.

APA Form

Toal, G. (2014). *Could Crimea be another Bosnia?* Retrieved from http:// www.opendemocracy.net/od-russia/gerard-toal/could-crimea-be-another-bosnia-republika-srpska-krajina.

Wolff, S. (2012). Consociationalism: Power sharing and self-governance. In S. Wolff & C. Yakinthou (Eds.), *Conflict management in divided societies: Theories & practice* (pp. 23–56). New York, NY: Routledge.

Regardless of which citation style is used, you should be able to figure out the author, the kind of source and its title, and how you would go about finding it. Among the works I have listed above, I have four different types of sources. Can you identify them? The first is a book, which is arguably the easiest one to see.

The citation is rather simple, with the author's name (notice, always last name first—unless there is no author—because a source list is alphabetized by last name, no matter what form you use and what type of source you have), the book's title, and information about who published the book, where, and in what year. In some styles, publication year comes after the author (as in this example of APSA and APA forms), and in other instances, it goes with the details about the publisher or journal volume. But the point is, you can see that this source is a book, and if you decided you wanted to find it, you would go to your library or use interlibrary loan (ILL) to access it.

The final source comes from a book but is not the whole work. It is an article in an *anthology* (an edited book of related essays), and as you can guess, in order to locate this work, you need the name of the chapter *and* the name of the book. In addition, knowing the author, the editors, and the publication information helps. That's why there's so much more in this citation, in addition to the page numbers of the chapter.

The middle two entries are electronic. The one about the revolutions of 2011 is from an online database that indexes the journal *Foreign Affairs*. I would hope that many of you know that *Foreign Affairs* is a journal; even if you don't, though, you should recognize that volume and issue numbers are included, with a season or month and year, and the fact that a URL is listed demonstrates that this source comes from a journal in a database. The second electronic source is from a website that publishes scholarly works. Both these entries include the author's name, title of the work, and other publication information. Notice that for journals and web sources, you don't see places of publication; instead what is important for tracking a work like this one is knowing the journal, its volume and issue numbers, as well as page numbers, or simply the URL or the digital object identifier (DOI), an alternative to the URL that some databases use to locate their listings.

One last point to note: the different forms use different capitalization norms. Be sure to follow the appropriate one.

I hope that all of you now understand what these entries are communicating and will be better able to use citation lists to help you find useful sources. In addition, working with multiple style forms and different kinds of sources allows you to recognize what is similar and different among the styles and that moving between them is not difficult.

PLAGIARISM VERSUS PARAPHRASING AND AVOIDING DROP-INS AND TRANSCRIPTS, TOO

Another important reason for keeping track of your sources and exactly how they influence your thinking is to protect yourself from plagiarism, the academic offense of improperly borrowing another's ideas or words and trying to pass them

off as your own. Remember, in college, your professors are impressed when you show that other, particularly high-quality, sources influence you, even in a think-piece essay, so they want to see citations. When you're writing a *research* paper, your instructor can't imagine that you can write one without many excellent outside sources; the name of the assignment, "research paper," *means* that you will be consulting others (as well as doing independent empirical research) to write this work. So, celebrate your citations and your reference list! The more entries you have and the higher their quality, the better off you are! (Within reason, of course. You don't want citations simply for the sake of sources, and you should cite only works you use.)

You might be surprised to learn that you must cite ideas, not simply quotations and figures, and that accounting has to be done at the appropriate place in the text. This point is so important that I'll repeat it: *No matter which citation form you use, you must attribute* ideas *and* information, *not simply quotations and data, to their original authors.* If you do not, you are plagiarizing.

Plagiarism is an extremely serious academic offense, the equivalent of a scholarly crime. The plagiarist steals another's prized possessions—her or his thoughts and hard work—and passes them off as her or his own. It is analogous to driving around in a beautiful, but stolen, car. Most institutions of higher learning punish plagiarists severely, penalizing their grades, putting them on academic probation, or throwing them out of school. Once you have been identified as a plagiarist, you can often forget about postgraduate education, especially law school. The lesson is never to plagiarize, either intentionally or accidentally. Keep careful track of the works that have contributed to your intellectual development, and learn how to cite and paraphrase properly.

While one way to avoid plagiarism is to provide complete quotations (properly cited) from your sources throughout your paper, this method is neither good reading nor wholly effective when overdone. Think back to some of the works you have read for classes or while developing your Research Question (RQ). How many of them contained large numbers of direct quotations? I am confident that none did. Instead, these authors used proper *paraphrases,* restating in their own words the sense of others' arguments and citing the original sources. Your goal, then, is to minimize direct quotations but maintain, even maximize, the references. Typically, mentioning the author's name in your text to associate her or him with the ideas is appropriate, but you need to find your own way of expressing those ideas. Making your version different enough from the author's can be difficult, especially if you have the work open in front of you and/or you are trying to capture the sense of a particular sentence or a small amount of text. My recommendation is that you take the time to ruminate on the author's words and close the book, journal, or electronic file and not look at it as you try to explain the ideas. You will also have an easier time avoiding plagiarism if you are distilling a larger chunk of text into a smaller one. If you're trying to condense a chapter into one paragraph, you simply cannot use the writer's precise words, because you won't have the room. Do not consult the abstract or any summary paragraph you

may find when writing this type of summary; you will run a grave risk of plagiarizing by not making your text significantly different from the author's. In addition, do not use another writer's discussion of a work without giving that person credit. Box 3.1 provides some insight into proper paraphrasing and plagiarism, as well as some other troublesome issues involved in integrating sources into your writing.[4]

The bottom line here is to use your own words but still cite the source. It was the writer's idea, and your reader is likely to know that. With the paraphrase, you will impress the reader by showing that you know the literature and can express in your own words the ideas of the scholar. If you find, however, that you simply cannot independently communicate this author's arguments, then use a direct quotation. The direct quotation also requires its own reference, of course. Whether you've conveyed the ideas or used a direct quotation, you need to include in the citation the page number (if available) from the text from which either came.

As I am discussing plagiarism here, I'm assuming your good intentions, that you are doing your research and you are trying to include some great ideas from sources that you found. As I'm sure you know, there are malevolent versions, where some people lift the work of others—maybe a paragraph, a page, a section, or even a whole paper—from someplace. These include published pieces, papers purchased online, the work of a friend, or recycled papers from previous courses that the person submitting the paper is passing off as original and newly written. In ways, I see these violations as far more egregious than improperly paraphrasing because the student is being intentionally devious and lazy. In terms of the definition of plagiarism, however, the offenses are the same, and both will land you in trouble (although some faculty or institutions might impose even higher penalties for the more duplicitous variant). Your takeaway from this discussion should be that plagiarism is a terrible act that can ruin your life! Passing off another's work as your own is highly dishonest, the risk of getting caught is high, and plagiarists never regain the trust of others. College is not simply about getting through your courses (although I know everyone feels that way at some point) and getting your degree. The point is that having the experience of writing, researching, thinking, and writing again is what allows you to be able to handle complex research, analysis, and writing assignments in the future. You are involved in this major and this project to develop skills for the long term, and you won't accumulate any benefits by using someone else's work or recycling your own. Thus, for many reasons, plagiarism is counterproductive.

Not only is unacceptable borrowing a problem for students, but so too is knowing how to incorporate quotes or author ideas into papers. Some undergraduates simply drop quotes into their paragraphs, as if they are afraid to interrupt the flow by providing credit to the author. In fact, the text is more understandable and consistent with scholarly practice if the name of the author is included. In good writing, students show their research and credit the sources of important ideas. Thus, eliminating "drop-ins" may help you avoid quoting rather ordinary

comments and instead compel you to write them in your own words, while still giving credit in a citation to the source of the paraphrased material. A final issue in papers is students' being so afraid of plagiarizing (or, perhaps, too lazy to think carefully about what the author is saying) that they quote everything or nearly everything. In that case, the student is providing a transcript, and, frankly, readers faced with quotes dominating a page know they are better off reading the original source. Not surprisingly, you should avoid "transcripts."

   To help you avoid these various pitfalls around using quotations and give you examples of good style, take a careful look at Box 3.1.

BOX 3.1

PARAPHRASING, PLAGIARISM, DROP-INS, AND TRANSCRIPTS: INTEGRATING SOURCES EFFECTIVELY

Immediately below is an excerpt from Robert Putnam, *Our Kids: The American Dream in Crisis* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2015, 34), including his endnotes that will appear here as footnotes. After that, I've provided examples documented in APSA form of paraphrasing, plagiarism, drop-ins, and transcripts. Can you tell which is which?

Original Source

Graphically, the ups and downs of inequality in America during the twentieth century trace a gigantic U, beginning and ending in two Gilded Ages, but with a long period of relative equality around mid-century. The economic historians Claudia Golden and Lawrence Katz have described the pattern as "a tale of two half-centuries."[1] As the century opened, economic inequality was high, but from about 1910 to about 1970 the distribution of income gradually became more equal. Two world wars and the Great Depression contributed to this flattening of the economic pyramid, but the equalizing trend continued during the three post-war decades (the egalitarian period during which my classmates and I grew up in Port Clinton). "From 1945 to 1975," the sociologist Douglas Massey has written, summarizing the era, "under structural arrangements implemented during the New Deal, poverty rates steadily fell, median incomes consistently rose, and inequality progressively dropped, as a rising economic tide lifted all boats."[2] In

---

[1] Claudia Golden and Lawrence F. Katz, "Decreasing (and then Increasing) Inequality in America: A Tale of Two Half-Centuries," in *The Causes and Consequences of Increasing Income Inequality*, ed. Finis Welch (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), 37–82. [In original, this is footnote 29 of chapter 1, and the source information is on page 289.]

[2] Massey, *Categorically Unequal*, 5. [In original, this is footnote 30 of chapter 1, and the source information is on page 289. Do you know why this footnote is so much shorter? Do you know what is missing here from a full-length footnote? Putnam has cited this source before, so he uses a short form here. One way to locate this work would be to go to his bibliography and use the author and title to find the full citation.]

fact, during this period the dinghies actually rose slightly faster than the yachts, as income for the top fifth grew about 2.5 percent annually while for the bottom fifth the rise was about 3 percent a year.

Examples

1. According to Robert Putnam (2015, 34), after World War II the United States experienced thirty years of relative income equality. Wars, depression, and government policies all helped to create this time of social and economic parity. This period differed greatly from the beginning and end of the century when unevenness prevailed among American family incomes and standards of living.

2. Claiming that 1945–1975 was a long period of relative equality for the United States, Robert Putnam (2015, 34) asserts that the economy grew significantly then, and, as economists often note, the small boats were not just lifted with the good economic tide but they actually rose slightly faster than the expensive ones, as income for the top 20 percent grew slightly more slowly (2.5%) on an annual basis compared to that of the bottom fifth (3%).

3. Robert Putnam (2015, 34) contends that the ups and downs of inequality in American during the twentieth century trace a gigantic U, beginning and ending in two Gilded Ages, but with a long period of relative equality around mid-century.

4. Arguing "graphically, the ups and downs of inequality in America during the twentieth century trace a gigantic U," Robert Putnam (2015, 34) in *Our Kids* further explains, "as the century opened, economic inequality was high, but from about 1910 to about 1970 the distribution of income gradually became more equal." Giving credit to the "world wars and the Great Depression" for "this flattening of the economic pyramid," Putnam emphasizes "that during this period the dinghies actually rose slightly faster than the yachts, as income for the top fifth grew about 2.5 percent annually while for the bottom fifth the rise was about 3 percent a year."

5. What would we say (besides "Oh, no!") if Putnam, himself, had written part of the paragraph this way: This *pattern* is "a tale of two half-centuries."[3] As the century opened, economic inequality was high, but from about 1910 to about 1970 the distribution of income gradually became more equal. Two world wars and the Great Depression contributed to this flattening of the economic pyramid, but the equalizing trend continued during the three postwar decades (the egalitarian period during which my classmates and I grew up in Port Clinton). "From 1945 to 1975, under structural arrangements implemented during the New Deal, poverty rates steadily fell, median

---

[3] Claudia Golden and Lawrence F. Katz, "Decreasing (and then Increasing) Inequality in America: A Tale of Two Half-Centuries," in *The Causes and Consequences of Increasing Income Inequality*, ed. Finis Welch (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), 37–82. [In original, this is footnote 29 of chapter 1, and the source information is on page 289.]

(Continued)

incomes consistently rose, and inequality progressively dropped, as a rising economic tide lifted all boats."[4] In fact, during this period the dinghies actually rose slightly faster than the yachts, as income for the top fifth grew about 2.5 percent annually while for the bottom fifth the rise was about 3 percent a year.

Answers

1. **Paraphrase:** The student mentions Putnam's name in the text (with the proper in-text citation information), and then reduces the sense of the paragraph into a few sentences that are written in her or his own words.

2. **Plagiarism:** Even though the student mentions Putnam's name in the text (with the proper in-text citation information), she or he takes his precise words in places without quotation marks, and in other parts, the student exchanges synonyms and slightly rewrites, but the basic sentence structure of the key points remains the same. Even if the writer did not intend this passage to seem sneaky and to hide plagiarism, a faculty member is likely to interpret bad motives here.

3. **Plagiarism:** Although the student identifies Putnam and provides the citation information, she or he uses Putnam's precise words without quotation marks.

4. **Transcript:** The student here is trying to be careful regarding plagiarism, but she or he is simply rewriting Putnam's paragraph by quoting him repeatedly and adding some transitional words. More than 80% of this text is Putnam's own! Such writing is unacceptable because it does not show that the writer has understood what the author is saying, only that she or he has found a "good passage" to use. Remember, your papers are supposed to reflect *your* thinking about the research.

5. **Drop-in:** Look at how close this version is to the original—almost identical in much of its phrasing—but in fact, Putnam did *not* write this way. He sought to give credit **within** his paragraph to the authors of the works that influenced his analysis; he did not simply drop their words into his own writing. You, too, should be like Robert Putnam and other published authors and avoid drop-ins.

Finally, notice one last point regarding Putnam's use of sources; in preparing the reader for his quotes, Putnam does not name the titles of the works. He provides the authors' names only, and so should you. Unless you have multiple works by a single author (or set of authors) published in the same year or unless the work that you are citing is *so important*, you should avoid naming titles in the text. Interested readers can discover the title by looking at your final list of sources. That is why in-text citations include year, and reference lists arrange works alphabetically by author last name and include the year, regardless of which citation form is used.

---

[4]Massey, *Categorically Unequal*, 5. [In original, this is footnote 30 of chapter 1, and the source information is on page 289.]

ANNOTATING THE BIBLIOGRAPHY

Now that we understand what a bibliography is and why it is important, as well as what plagiarism is, how serious an offense it is, and how to avoid it (along with other issues in incorporating sources), we turn to annotation—what is it and why do it? In writing an AB, you are providing a list of the works (so that you will have a jump on your final bibliography), but you are adding something else to it. Underneath each entry and for the purposes of this type of research paper, you write a paragraph or more that contains a summary of the *arguments of the work as they relate to your Research Question*, as well as key information about the topics the author discussed in making the argument and the research findings. Please note that to yield useful information, you must summarize the argument, not just discuss the topic. For instance, if you were like Gabriela, searching for works on polarization, and you were discussing only the topic, you would be writing, "This work is about political polarization in America" for each source. And a reader would reply, "Well, of course! You were searching for sources about polarization." So train yourself to *never again* write "This work is about" but instead to record "The author argues/asserts/contends/insists"—pick your favorite verb and vary it as you write your summaries. Again, your goal is not simply to describe (tell a reader *about* something), but rather you are seeking to explain or demystify, and therefore you are arguing and assessing and looking for sources that do the same. In other words, for the AB to help you—and all of the tasks presented in this book are designed to assist you, not simply to make extra, unnecessary work— you have to identify (and capture in your writing) each piece's thesis (which is likely closely connected to how it answers your RQ); how the authors define concepts that are crucial to your topic; what instances, cases, or data sets the works use to assess their arguments; and what the findings (or conclusions) are.

In reading these sources, remember that a scholar will write her or his book or article in a form similar to the one you are learning about here for research papers. So you should be able to find the thesis and the motivation for writing up front in the preface or abstract and the introduction. Typically, authors write because they believe that existing approaches are wrong or they have superior policy solutions. Again, this information is a gold mine for you, because the author is telling you who and what other arguments are out there! In a more detailed literature review section, you can discover how that author divides the field into schools of thought or various answers to the research question.[5] The writer will also identify the most important proponents of each view and the essential works to read. Thus, early on in reading a good source, you are on your way to unlocking the scholarly debate on your question and finding other excellent sources to consult for your own paper. You still must use care, however, not to accept someone else's assessment of the field at face value. Each author has a particular argument she or he is making, and while you may initially agree with that position, you cannot be sure you find it convincing until after you have read other principal works too. Thus, you should read several scholarly accounts carefully to develop an idea of

the debate and the major players in it. Then, you know who else you need to read to have full command of the discussion. Once you start to see the same authors, concepts, and theories discussed, you know you have satisfactorily unearthed the scholarly controversy.

IDENTIFYING THE KEY CONCEPTUAL ISSUES

Now you know what you need to do and why to write the AB, but how should you get started? Your first job is to find good scholarly sources, and the best place to start is your question and the concepts you identify in it. Those concepts will lead you to the issues political scientists are debating. While journalists and commentators may provide interesting answers and insights into your question, they should not be the authors you are searching for at this stage, although early on in question development, newspapers and journals of opinion were important inspirations and even now they can give you a quick primer on some details. These popular works may make their way into your AB, but you absolutely need to supplement them. Your primary goal now is to uncover recognized experts in the field, and they are *not* journalists. Then, who are they and where can you find their work? Generally, these experts are scholars who tend to be professors (working at universities or colleges) or people employed by think tanks, public policy organizations, and/or governmental institutes. These people usually publish their work in books (often, but not exclusively, ones that are published by university presses, think tanks, textbook publishers, and certain imprints of large publishing houses) and in what are called peer-reviewed journals, periodicals with policies of sending any piece that comes in for consideration out to other experts to review and approve. Academic journals publish varying numbers of issues a year but aren't weekly. Scholarly journals tend to have footnotes and bibliographies. A few may lack the list of sources used—instead including a list of recommended or related readings, but the articles that appear in them can be extremely relevant and are by prestigious scholars who are invited to write or whose work is peer reviewed. Thus, the authors writing for them are recognized as important voices in the debate.

With the need for scholarly sources in mind, we will turn to the task of finding some. Let's start, as mentioned, with an examination of some of the questions our students suggested. To move us forward, I have created Table 3.1, which highlights the key concepts on which their research will focus and includes the hunches our students have (if they have any) for answering their questions.

Notice that a well-formulated question leads straight to a concept the student can use to search for information and link back to the work that she or he has done in previous courses. You should try to identify a concept or set of them around which your question revolves.[6] Although some students (Kevin and Hannah) have

TABLE 3.1 ■ Questions, Concepts, and Hunches			
Student	**Question**	**Key Concept(s)**	**Hunch(es)**
Gabriela	Why is U.S. politics so polarized now, and what are the policy consequences of polarization?	Polarization Effects of polarization	??? not sure
Kevin	Why did the Arab Spring occur in 2011?	Revolution, uprisings	Social media
Max	Why did Russia intervene in 2008 and 2014 in the disputes between separatists and the leaders of post-Soviet states (Georgia and Ukraine)?	Intervention Explaining the external behavior of states	??? not sure Olympics matter?
Hannah	To what extent has Supreme Court action been a factor in bringing about recent changes in the juvenile life without parole sentencing policy?	The Court as an actor Juvenile justice/ sentencing Law and social change	Great extent?

guesses about what the answers are, they are not necessarily in a better situation than the others. At this stage, keeping an open mind about the possible responses to your question is very important, because the goal, which I will turn to next, is to find competing or alternative answers to your query.

SEARCHING FOR SOURCES

Once you have identified the key concepts at issue, go back to your materials from related courses (textbooks, anthologies—edited volumes that contain collections of articles written by different authors—and electronic reserves and course packs). Also look at the sources you found when working on your question. Some of these authors might be scholars whose academic works you can find. Pay attention to what I *not* suggested: I have not recommended that you perform a Google (or other internet search engine) search. Your goal is to find scholarly sources that answer your RQ. While the web is a fabulous source of information and you can find many of the same materials you will uncover using the methods I suggest, you need a certain degree of knowledge to use the internet wisely for scholarly research. You cannot trust that every article posted on the web is important or accurate. This is also not the time to search for facts

or turn to encyclopedia-type sources. An encyclopedia can provide important basic information as you are starting your process, and it is fine for primary and secondary school reports, but report writing is behind you. So, just to be clear, no Wikipedia for your research paper. Never.[7] Now, you are to engage in the scholarly debate and process.

Back to our search of course materials. Use the tables of contents and indexes of textbooks to find the sources on your subject. Reread and take notes on (1) the key concerns, arguments, and issues involved with this concept and (2) the authors and sources (sometimes in the text and footnotes and usually at the end of chapters in "For Further Reading" sections). The materials mentioned should be the next place to look for information, and if you find important substantive material (for instance, definitions of the concepts and characterizations about the debate in the field), then you should make your first bibliographic entry—either the old way or using citation management software, taking care to note the source and other relevant information.

When Gabriela went back over her Introduction to American Politics syllabus and found the section on polarization (yes, it was there, but of course, she hadn't really noticed it the first time through), she saw an article that she vaguely remembered, Scott Stossel's "Subdivided We Fall."[8] She decided to reread the piece and then noticed that it was a review of a book by Bill Bishop, *The Big Sort: Why the Clustering of Like-Minded America Is Tearing Us Apart* (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 2008). Thus, Gabriela found two sources just from looking at a syllabus! If she went back through her textbook, she would find even more materials in the related section if she checked the reference list and suggested or further readings for that chapter. She will seek to obtain Bishop's book at her library.

How to find other books? Gabriela could browse, looking at books she can find on the shelf near Bishop's work, or browse electronically: after looking up *The Big Sort*, she could click on the subjects that come up in that record or on the call number. What happens when you begin your search and you don't have a work to start from? What should you do to find books? If you are a student at a research university—one that trains graduate students in our field and thus is likely to have an excellent scholarly book collection—you can search your own library catalog; if not, anyone can use the online Library of Congress (LoC) catalog. Why search the LoC when you can't take out its books? Because it will help you pinpoint the most important works in your field, which you then can check out from your own library or request through interlibrary loan. I can't stress enough how convenient and easy ILL is for obtaining excellent materials; the only issue is that receiving the books takes a little time. I have found, however, that the wait is relatively short, usually about one week, and that is typically plenty of time if you're starting your assignment on time. This search also helps you identify who the important authors are in your field. When you're looking at article databases (or even doing a Google search), you can zero in on works they have written, obtain them immediately, and know that they will be of high quality.

BOX 3.2
RESULTS FROM A LIBRARY OF CONGRESS ONLINE CATALOG SEARCH

DATABASE: Library of Congress Online Catalog

YOU SEARCHED: Key word (match all words) = polarization and American politics

●●●●● Baumer, Donald C., 1950- Parties, polarization, and democracy in the United States/Donald C. Baumer, Howard J. Gold. 2010

●●●●● Abramowitz, Alan. Disappearing center: engaged citizens, polarization, and American democracy/Alan I. Abramowitz. 2010

●●●●● McCarty, Nolan M. Polarized America: the dance of ideology and unequal riches/Nolan McCarty, Keith T. Poole, and Howard Rosenthal. 2006

Gabriela went to the LoC site and typed in "polarization and American politics" as a key word search. Box 3.2 contains some of what she saw.

Notice six things about these results. First, the dots in front of the author's name (if there is a name supplied) indicate how relevant the search results are likely to be given the terms used. In Gabriela's case, the results I've shown you are all highly relevant (receiving the top number of dots possible). Second, if the book has authors (not editors), the first author's name appears first and again after the title. The book, then, is not an anthology, an edited volume that collects the works of many writers. If a book has multiple authors, do not change the order of the list (even if they are not in alphabetical order). The sequence is intentional and often reflects the level of contribution to the work. Third, the titles are hypertext, and you can click on them for more information. Fourth, the publication date is provided, and often when you're starting your search, you want to look at the most recent publications because they will give you the newest perspectives while also citing (and often summarizing) the arguments of the old. Thus, they help do some of your work. Fifth, while the information you will need for your bibliography is here in the citation (after you click the hypertext), please realize that depending on the format you're using, if you're not using a citation manager, you might have to change capitalization and the order of the information. The listing also may provide extraneous material that you don't need. So have your style guide near you when you're doing your work so that you can write your citation properly the first time. Sixth, Gabriela received a "Goldilocks" number of hits on her search—not too many, not too few (more than 10, but fewer than 50). Actually, Gabriela first searched for "polarization and politics" and got more than 100 hits. Then, she added the adjective *American* and obtained a more manageable and more relevant set of books given her research interests.

Remember that the search process takes careful thought, sometimes a little luck, and always perseverance. If your search terms are not leading you to other sources, you likely need to do a better job generating these terms. So go back to your course materials or those articles that aided the generation and refinement of your question. Search for those sources in the relevant database and see what subject terms are related to them. Also, ask yourself again, what are the key concepts at stake? Whom does my textbook identify as important? If you can locate new authors, titles, or search terms, use them to lead you to additional ones. If you still haven't had success, consult a reference librarian for help. That person will be well versed in subject searching and will be able to identify new terms. The librarian, however, can only help you. You need to do the primary thinking about your question and what you're really interested in. The important points, however, are not to give up and to use the resources you have to your advantage. Also, finding sources takes time. Be sure to allot yourself enough.

Now let's return to Gabriela and her search for sources. She decided to click on the first two titles to find out more. Clicking on the hyperlinks not only will give her all the publication information she needs and the numbers she will need to find the books in the library but also will provide great information to help her assess the potential value of the books and will lead to more sources (see Box 3.3).

What's interesting here are the two publishers: Paradigm Publishers and Yale University Press. These are different kinds of publishing houses, both of which have value in Gabriela's search. Paradigm Publishers typically publishes specialty textbooks, to be used in upper-division classes for undergraduates. Thus, this work will have lots of relevant information, citations, and arguments and will be presented in a style that is highly accessible to college students. This kind of book can offer a great start. Other similar presses are CQ Press/Sage Publications, W. W. Norton, Rowman & Littlefield, Routledge, and Lynne Rienner, among others. The second book's publisher is Yale University Press. As Yale University is a major research university, its press publishes what it considers to be the best of contemporary scholarship. This book (also called a *monograph*, a scholarly work on a relatively narrow topic) by Abramowitz, then, is an essential part of the debate you are likely to enter (unless you transform your question away from its concerns) and is a must for you to understand. Moreover, as a good scholar, Abramowitz has included a discussion of the experts' disagreements in a conceptual, or literature review, chapter. This work will also help you identify the key issues, though from Abramowitz's perspective. Because you know you need to examine the debate, you must be sure that you don't allow the first work you read to sway your opinion too much. Realize that authors will portray their approaches in the best light and will be stressing the weaknesses of others. You, on the other hand, need to look to those others to see how they justify their positions.

The records also tell you where to find the books. If you were at a research library, you could use both the call numbers and the locations to physically retrieve the books. This information (as well as the titles and author names)

BOX 3.3
LEARNING MORE FROM TWO LIBRARY RECORDS[9]

Brief Record	Subjects/Content	Full Record	MARC Tags
Parties, polarization, and democracy in the United States/Donald C. . . .			
LCCN Permalink:	http://lccn.loc.gov/2009036149		
Type of Material:	Book (Print, Microform, Electronic, etc.)		
Personal Name:	Baumer, Donald C., 1950-		
Main Title:	Parties, polarization, and democracy in the United States/Donald C. Baumer, Howard J. Gold.		
Published/Created:	Boulder: Paradigm Publishers, c2010.		
Description:	xi, 243 p.: ill.; 24 cm.		
CALL NUMBER:	JK2265.B38 2010		

Brief Record	Subjects/Content	Full Record	MARC Tags
The disappearing center: engaged citizens, polarization, and American . . .			
LCCN Permalink:	http://lccn.loc.gov/2009033737		
Type of Material:	Book (Print, Microform, Electronic, etc.)		
Personal Name:	Abramowitz, Alan.		
Main Title:	The disappearing center: engaged citizens, polarization, and American democracy/Alan I. Abramowitz.		
Published/Created:	New Haven: Yale University Press, c2010.		
Description:	xi, 194 p.: ill.; 25 cm.		
CALL NUMBER:	JK2261.A28 2010		

allows you to search for the books in your own college library; however, if your institution doesn't own them, don't fret, because you can get them through ILL. A week's wait isn't bad, but it shows that those of you at institutions without large libraries need to start searching earlier.

There are other useful items to glean from the records. As I have mentioned many times before, one of the key values of sources is in helping you find additional ones. For this, not only will the physical text be helpful, but you can also use the records to find better search terms and similar sources. If you click on the hypertext that follows "LCCN Permalink," you will find the records shown in Box 3.4 (with some rows cut to eliminate redundancy).

BOX 3.4
LEARNING FROM THE PERMALINK

Parties, polarization, and democracy in the United States/Donald C. . . .	
Personal Name:	Baumer, Donald C., 1950- » More like this
Main Title:	Parties, polarization, and democracy in the United States/Donald C. Baumer, Howard J. Gold.
Related Names:	Gold, Howard J., 1958- » More like this
Contents: 1.	Political parties in the twenty-first century — 2. Parties and the electorate I: images of the parties — 3. Parties and the electorate II: the dynamics of party polarization — 4. The midterm elections of 1994 and 2006 — 5. Parties in power: Congress, presidents, partisanship, and gridlock — 6. Political parties in Anglo-America — 7. Looking backward and forward: the election of 2008 and the future of American politics.
Subjects:	Political parties—United States. » More like this Elections—United States. » More like this Polarization (Social sciences)—United States. » More like this United States—Politics and government—1989- » More like this

The disappearing center: engaged citizens, polarization, and American . . .	
Type of Material:	Book (Print, Microform, Electronic, etc.)
Personal Name:	Abramowitz, Alan. » More like this
Main Title:	The disappearing center: engaged citizens, polarization, and American democracy/Alan I. Abramowitz.
Subjects:	Political parties—United States. » More like this Party affiliation—United States. » More like this Polarization (Social sciences) » More like this United States—Politics and government—2009-» More like this

Clearly, that additional click brings you valuable information. For the first source, you learn the chapter titles, providing you a greater sense of what the book concentrates on and how it proceeds. In the record for both this book and the scholarly monograph by Abramowitz, you see new search terms to try (under "Subjects") as well as links to books about those related subjects. In addition, you can find more works by the authors by clicking on the hypertext after their names. Thus, you are on your way to finding many useful works *and authors*—don't forget that searching for authors in catalogs and on databases is important

too. Notice how much you have learned, and you've been looking at only two sources! You are well on your way to constructing your bibliography. If you are using citation management software, some library catalogs allow you to easily transport this information into their programs. In the old-fashioned method, you should be copying and pasting this information into your draft references document.

After you find some important books (important because they are relevant given your topic and they are either very recent or what everyone tells you are the classics, i.e., older and essential works in the field), it is time for you to turn to database searching to find useful articles. Scholars write both books and articles (actually, some tend to write books, some write articles, and some write both). They publish their books with scholarly, textbook, and some trade presses, and they publish their articles in multiple kinds of journals, too. For the AB, you're trying to uncover the most important contemporary scholarly arguments or answers to your question, so you want to find academic journals. Sometimes the journals of opinion, news articles, and/or editorials that helped you formulate your question are also relevant, and you can summarize them, but remember these alone are not sufficient. Relying on newspaper or popular magazine articles (from, e.g., *U.S. News & World Report*, *Time*, *Newsweek*, the *Economist*) shows your teacher you haven't grappled with the important works and done sufficient research. Find those recognized experts and then see who they are citing and with whom they are debating. These are the academic giants on whose shoulders you will stand when you write your paper.

To find journal articles, you use similar techniques as you did with the library catalog except you turn to library databases. These are tools that index journals. From your earlier searching, you will already have some key articles or authors that you need to find. We've already become acquainted with some of these library databases from our work developing the Research Question. I frequently suggest that my students start in Academic Search Premier and ProQuest (under "Research Libraries"). I like these because they index a number of scholarly journals, and they usually have very recent issues online. As mentioned before, other useful databases include Project MUSE and JSTOR, but be careful with JSTOR, because there is a delay in bringing materials online.

When you search, you will want to use all that you have learned before to help you find appropriate sources. Search using your key concept (from your question), the names of the authors you found (in your texts or from the LoC search), and the additional subject terms you turned up in your earlier efforts. Then, use those terms and similar techniques to return just the right number of good sources. What's nice about database searching is that you can also read an abstract of an article and get a sense of the argument and the article's utility before you read the whole work. You can also easily export these articles and citations into Zotero, Mendeley, or EndNote and get a copy of the citation, often in the correct form. Use the abstracts to help you choose the best articles. Once you have picked a manageable number of good sources, you will have to read them and write your

own original summaries for the AB, summaries that help you understand not only what the authors are arguing but whom they are arguing against, whom they agree with, and how they came to their conclusions. Remember: do not write your summary while looking at the abstract, introduction, or conclusion of the article because you will be in greater danger of plagiarizing. Of course, you may need to go back and consult the works as you write the blurb, but find your own way of explaining the source. Focus on how the article answers your Research Question. Remember: these summaries will allow you to make groups of similar sources.

IDENTIFYING SIMILAR ARGUMENTS AND GROUPING YOUR SOURCES

When you are working on your AB, I recommend that you create a new document that will contain both the source information and the summary paragraphs. You will use these to construct your AB. In this document, you will play around with, in violation of the bibliographic conventions, your source list, grouping sources with other works that make similar arguments. (In the AB, sources are not arranged alphabetically, as they would be in a reference list, but conceptually.[10]) My logic here is to get you to see whether you actually have multiple, different answers to your RQ and to identify the essentials of those answers. If you know you have *three or more* answers (and many more sources), then you will be in a good position to write about the debate in your Literature Review. (You can't have a debate with just one argument with which all your authors agree!) Yes, some debates have only two positions, but generally, my students are too willing to stop searching when they have found a couple of perspectives and sources; thus, I'm trying to encourage you to obtain a broad and early overview of the field. In fact, your search should only stop when you find you aren't learning anything new anymore, when you keep seeing the same authors, concepts, and controversies. Having an incomplete understanding of the scholarly debate hampers too many projects and puts students in an early hole, which they never seem to dig out of.

Although uncovering the whole debate is your goal, so too is summarizing the different answers so that you can identify the differences and similarities in the work of scholars. Again, you aren't uncovering what your sources are *about,* but what they argue, how they explain, and/or how they analyze. Don't just assume that two works are different or the same; read and think carefully about the theses and supporting arguments. Ultimately, if you can articulate what those answers have in common, then they are likely to be similar, and you are likely to have found what academics refer to as a school of thought, a similar approach to answering the question. Thus, your goal is to have about three or four scholarly approaches to your RQ, and in order to achieve that end point, you will

need approximately ten to fifteen sources at the outset. One work does not make a school! So, don't be satisfied with the first materials you find. You may be lucky and they may be excellent, but particularly when you are new to an area of research or simply a novice researcher, you must spend a good deal of time understanding the field. Expect to put some time into learning and reading sources that you ultimately don't use. I wish there were a way for me to tell you how to be perfectly efficient, to find and read only those sources that will benefit you directly. Frankly, the more experience you have with research, the more efficient you will be, but even those of us who have been working in the field for decades always spend a little time on pieces that aren't really that helpful. It's all in your perspective; even negative findings (i.e., learning that an article isn't helpful) reveal that you are learning and understanding more about your work. In other words, you are still making progress.

Now, if you've found an important scholarly work—like Abramowitz for Gabriela—you will also know who that author argues against and how that scholar divides the field. You will want to be aware of her or his categories, but not necessarily committed to them. Maybe you'll like the author's labels, maybe the categories are the standard ones for everyone who studies polarization in the United States (you'll find that out by reading authors your "big book" criticizes), or maybe you'll think that her or his perspective is misguided. Keep in mind all of those possibilities. If you end up liking the author's approach, you can borrow the terms (giving proper credit in a citation, of course) and use that scheme (and the citations) to help you make sure you have the most important sources in your bibliography. If you don't like a particular scheme, you can look for others that better match your ideas and needs or you can even make up your own set of labels. Remember, the research paper is your chance to put your stamp on the field, so feel free to be original.

The guiding points for your AB, however, are to be sure that (1) your sources respond to your question, (2) you focus on the answer to *your question* and not on recording what your sources are writing *about,* and (3) the answers to your question are different. If you determine that your source isn't interested in your question at all, then you have to abandon that work. Now, there are times when an important piece might have a different main focus than yours but has an answer to your question. Particularly when that work is by a famous political scientist or is a "big book" that "everyone" cites, you want to include it. In general, though, this is the time to zero in on answers to the Research Question. I also strongly recommend that you seek to state the response in a very short form (one word, if possible, or phrase) as well as a longer, more explanatory form. What element(s) or factor(s) is(are) essential to the author's answer? If you look back to Table 3.1, in which I summarize our students' questions (in a short form) and hunches (if they had any), you'll notice that those answers are very short: "social media" (Kevin) and "great extent" (Hannah). Of course, such a brief response is not sufficient for the AB, but what it does is ensure that you understand the core of the author's argument, which might be the essence of

one school of thought. Just as with question writing, I have seen students get lost in the wonderful verbiage of a respected author. They are unable to state the basic point. Force yourself at this early stage to focus on your question, the author's question (if it is different), a short response (factor), and a longer answer (thesis). Ask yourself, does this argument sound familiar or very different from what I have read in my classes? If you jog your memory, you are likely to find additional good works for your AB from your previous courses. If you keep this focus on the answers, you will help yourself arrive at a well-balanced set of readings that provide you a broad view of the field, with multiple contending perspectives. As you are writing up your summaries, if you find that all your sources agree, you need to go back and search for more materials. Use the works you have to find out with whom these authors disagree. Writers always point out who they think is wrong and why, so you can use your sources to help you identify alternative schools. Again, realize that no matter how much good advice you receive, neither your professor nor I can provide the magic formula for looking only at the works you will use in your research. If you use the various techniques explained here, you will minimize the time you perceive as unproductive; however, most of us need to go down a few blind alleys as we learn more about our questions and topics. Just try to be as directed as you can, keep reading and searching as long as you are uncovering a new *reply to your controversy* (don't be led astray thinking about related queries), and stay focused on your goal of finding the most important scholarly answers to your question, responses that should not all agree.

ONE LAST WORD OF ADVICE: GENERIC SCHOOLS OF THOUGHT

When you're in the middle of locating sources, finding only the most recent ones or only the arguments with which you agree can be really tempting. You can also sometimes have a hard time thinking about what else might be relevant or how some previous readings (e.g., from other courses) might be helpful. That's when you should remember that in political science there are (arguably) five key factors that map into broad schools of thought.[11] For ease of remembering them and in the hope of linking these concepts with work you have done in other courses, I refer to the group as *IIIIE*, "quadruple-I E"—*i*nterests, *i*nstitutions, *i*deas, *i*ntersectionality, and *e*conomics—or the *5 Ps*—*p*ower, *p*olitics, *p*rinciples, *p*rivilege, and *p*rosperity—and list them in summary form and with some clarifications in Box 3.5. Thinking through these factors and their possible impact on your research topic can be very helpful, and I guarantee that you have all seen explanations that use these concepts in previous classes.

Interest- or *power-based* approaches assert that actors make decisions that maximize their strategic (i.e., ultimate) priorities. In American and comparative politics, these are often called rational-choice theories; in international politics, some refer to such perspectives as rational-actor approaches. From this viewpoint,

BOX 3.5
FIVE FACTORS (IN TWO VERSIONS) AND CORRESPONDING SCHOOLS OF THOUGHT

IIIIE	5 Ps	Related Factors and Clarifications
Interests	Power	**Also see:** *strategic or national interest, rational actor, action–reaction* Actors' interests, impact of power on an actor, generally an assumption of rationality with those involved choosing the "best" option based on considerations of interest or power
Institutions	Politics	**Also see:** *bureaucratic politics, domestic pressures, new institutionalism* Actors are embedded in systems with rules that provide incentives and punishments. In those environments, actors make choices based on their parochial assessment of costs and benefits (what is "best" for that particular actor), not some systemwide payoff structure (the "general good" or "national interest").
Ideas, Identities, Ideologies	Principles	**Also see:** *cultures, values, prestige, normative dispositions* Actors are not simply rational calculators motivated to maximize their benefits or minimize their costs, but they are motivated by other ideas or values (on a global, national, organizational, or lower level). Actors choose outcomes that conform to their understandings of what is "right" or appropriate or they may be motivated to enhance their status and prestige.
Intersectionality	Privilege	**Also see:** *feminist, gender, critical race, identity politics, "the personal is political"* Actors' identities are complex and must be interrogated to uncover power, privilege, and disadvantage that come from intersections of their identities. Gender, race, class, sexual orientation, national origin, immigration status, and religion, among other identity factors, interact to create hierarchies of possibility and obstructions that actors face. When actors are identified by more than one element of disadvantage (e.g., gender, race, being an undocumented immigrant) the oppression they face is more than additive.

(*Continued*)

(Continued)

Economics	Prosperity	**Also see: *neoclassical, neoliberal, Marxian, world systems views***
		Actors are embedded in an economic system that sends them signals (regarding rewards and punishments) and conditions their behavior in ways that maximize economic returns and minimize those losses. Such systems reward certain behaviors and punish others; according to some views, exploitation of the weak by the advantaged is endemic.

agents take the steps that best serve their interests, whether the actors are voters deciding whether turning out to cast a ballot is worth the effort, protestors thinking about taking to the streets to demonstrate when the threat of violent regime retaliation is looming, or a country determining whether an intervention will serve its power position. *Institutional* or *politics-oriented* perspectives focus on the rules or structures of institutions in which actors are embedded and show that these established routines, in other words, the politics, have an impact on outcomes. For instance, in studying elections, political scientists know that the type of electoral system—whether it is first-past-the-post or some form of proportional representation scheme—affects both how candidates and voters behave and the outcome of the contest.[12] The third I & P pair—*ideas* or *principles*—includes ideas, identities, cultures, and prestige. These types of explanations contend that what actors think, who they are (or who they think they are), what they value or hold dear, and what they want to become determine results. Some of the factors involved might be called psychological, whether these are the schemas and scripts that actors use to make sense of the world or one's orientation (e.g., positive and outgoing) toward society, or sociological, that is, elements of an identity and intersubjective understandings that condition behavior. Culture could mean a particular world culture, as well as those sets of values and practices specific to an organization or group. *Intersectionality* and *privilege* refer to the ways that multifaceted identities advantage some and leave others impaired. Thus, there are social power constructions that are often invisible to those that are not looking and more complicated (involving the intersections of an actor's identity) that must be explored to understand why politics turns out as it does. Here, intersectionality and privilege can help students of political economy understand, for instance, why development strategies often rely on creating gendered workplaces that bring poor, rural females in to make products for world markets. Last, a final group of explanations stresses the role of *economic* (or sometimes socioeconomic)

factors or *prosperity*. Typical assertions of the primacy of economics or affluence include those that argue that recessions cause the party in power to lose in mid-term elections and that wealth produces democracies around the world.[13]

This discussion about the generic schools, I hope, helps you focus on the driving forces in politics, reminds you of perspectives you have learned about in your classes, and links you to the debates in the field and even the broader culture. How do different people account for your phenomenon? The value of remembering these generic schools is that they can keep your mind open to multiple possible understandings as well as link you to other scholarship and perspectives. They also help you think in terms of that one-word answer to your Research Question that I was encouraging above and again connect you to scholarship you already know (thus helping you place what you might see as an isolated argument into a "school"). Using these generic approaches to spin out possible accounts is a kind of mental exercise to help warm you up as you search for the actual scholarly explanations out there; moreover, this activity can prevent you from missing an obvious response. After you have a set of answers to your question, ask yourself the following: Have I covered IIIIE/5Ps? Which ones are missing? If one or more is lacking, does the absence make sense, or can I imagine an answer from that perspective? For instance, I find that students generally are drawn to interest/power– and identity/principle–based answers, but miss accounts that assert institutions/politics, intersectionality/privilege, and economics/prosperity. Sometimes, those arguments are very important, and students have heard them before, so reminding them, for instance, of modernization theory as an important explanation of why some regimes are able to become democratic and others aren't is very important. Thinking about IIIIE/5Ps should help you, too, to have the insight and stamina to keep looking for different approaches when you are seeking to understand your field as well as to provide some ideas for creatively linking your research to other strands of inquiry to which you have been exposed in your academic career. Thus, these generic schools of thought might also help you make sense of your sources as you try to group them. Which ones focus on interests and power? Do others emphasize institutions or politics? Literally looking for these key I/E- or P-words in your sources can help you group them for your AB.

WRITING THE ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

As we have seen, your goal is to identify the scholars who have made the biggest contributions to answering your question and use them to help you move forward on your paper. Those great works enhance your own understandings and help build a solid theoretical foundation for your project. After you have located some excellent sources and begun summarizing them as suggested above, you can classify your answers and write your AB. I suggest that your AB contain five distinct

and important elements, stated here in the order in which you should work on them. (Although as mentioned before, you will rethink and revise as you work through your sources, proceeding in more of a spiral than a straight line.) First is your Research Question. You want to be sure that you have a clear one and that ultimately your sources are answering it. You need to state the query in the AB not only for your benefit but also for your instructor's. This way you both will be able to evaluate whether your question and your sources are well suited to each other and whether you are finding alternative answers. Second, your sources are presented as bibliographic entries and written in a consistent form. This list should be the easiest part of your AB. Third, you should work on finding the thesis and identifying the subsidiary points or fundamental factor(s) upon which the author of your source is basing her or his argument. Fourth is to flesh out a paragraph discussion of the author's argument, and last is the job of grouping sources and trying to characterize the school of thought, stating what is essential to the argument, and perhaps even giving the approach a label. That fifth step is the most complex, and you will likely have to puzzle over your notes for a while until you are ready to handle it. In fact, I recommend that you concentrate initially on the first four steps as you begin this task.

Let's look at Gabriela's early efforts. At the outset, she read her assignment and noted that her professor wanted her paper written in American Political Science Association form. Gabriela began using the works from the journals of opinion she had consulted as she was mulling over her topic and trying to identify a question. Through interlibrary loan, she received the Abramowitz book first, which then led her immediately to the works of Morris Fiorina, an author with whom Abramowitz disagreed. When she went to pick up Fiorina at her library, she noticed nearby it a work written by a former congressman that looked relevant, *The Parties versus the People*, and another one by Thomas Mann and Norman Ornstein. You can see her working through the early steps of the AB in Table 3.2, using a format I recommend you use too.

What can Gabriela (and you) learn from this first exercise? First, that a book review, her first source, does a very nice job of summarizing a larger work. While Gabriela would be better off reading Bishop for herself, this review gives her a nice sense of the book and helps her easily expand her knowledge of the issue. Second, that in their theses, authors often explain who and what they are arguing against, so that can help you look for other "big arguments" you need to find. In explaining Bishop, Stossel says that gerrymandering is not the best answer (in other words, some other author must have blamed electoral districts and their redrawing), Abramowitz contends that elites aren't at fault (someone must be saying they are), and Edwards argues that the problem is not "constitutional processes." And right after they identify what is *not* the source of the problem, they identify the "real" answer. In order, these are "the movement from below" (Bishop/Stossel), the ideologically extreme views of citizens and their increased activism (Abramowitz), and "the political party framework" (Edwards) or, as the authors have identified in their titles, "the big sort," "the disappearing center," and "parties."

The next job is to state the author's brief answers to your Research Question and see how each argument (might) link to the generic schools. Gabriela could continue by adding two more columns on the earlier table, but for the purposes of presentation, look at Table 3.3.

This exercise allows Gabriela to see that she has some competing explanations here: are citizens, elites, or the party and electoral structures to blame for the polarization in American politics? It also shows her that while some scholars agree on a factor, such as "citizens," they might analyze the role of citizens differently. In other words, Gabriela should explore further the extent to which Bishop (and she'll really need his book here; the book review isn't enough) and Abramowitz agree. Are the factors motivating the clustering of like Americans that Bishop sees the same as the ideological intensity and principled activism that Abramowitz identifies? And as Fiorina focuses on elites, is it something about those elites (are they self-interested actors?) or, digging deeper, is he making a more institutional and political argument, one like Edwards's and maybe Mann and Ornstein's, which focuses on the structure of the American party and electoral systems?[14]

TABLE 3.2 ■ Beginning Your Annotated Bibliography: Gabriela's Basics		

Research Question: Why is U.S. politics so polarized now, and what are the policy consequences of polarization?[15]

Author	Brief Title	Answer to Research Question or Thesis[a]
Stossel	"Subdivided We Fall" (book review of Bishop's *The Big Sort*) *NYT* book review	"Bishop argues that this clustering of like with like [i.e., 'the Big Sort'] accelerated in the tumult of the 1960s when, unmoored from the organizations and traditions that had guided their choices about how to live, Americans grew anxious and disoriented—and reflexively sought comfort in the familiar, cocooning themselves in communities of people like themselves." . . . "Gerrymandering—the redrawing of political districts by partisan legislation from above—partly accounts for increasing polarization. But the more significant force, Bishop argues, has been movement from below." . . . "Bishop cites research suggesting that, contrary to the standard goo-goo exhortations, the surer route to political comity may be less civic engagement, less passionate conviction. So let's hear it for the indifferent and unsure, whose passivity may provide the national glue we need." (no page, online source)

(*Continued*)

TABLE 3.2 ■ (Continued)		
Abramowitz	*The Disappearing Center*	Among American citizens, the ideological center is disappearing, instead being replaced by extremes that are more active and influential in politics. A polarized majority, then, does not follow politicians but leads elected officials and candidates to more partisan and ideological positions. More citizens than ever are highly engaged in politics, as recent voter turnout, activism, and political contributions show.
Edwards	*The Parties versus the People*	"The dysfunction that has almost paralyzed our federal government has its roots not in the people, not in any fundamental flaw in our constitutional processes, but in the political party framework through which our elected officials gain their offices and within which they govern" (p. xiii).
Mann and Ornstein	*It's Worse than It Looks*	The authors characterize the current nature of American politics as "the new politics of hostage taking" (3-30), and its roots are in a mismatch between a highly ideological party system (newly emerged) and the Madisonian separation-of-powers structure (xiv-xv). In addition, a culture of demonizing opponents has emerged to make polarization worse.
Fiorina with Abrams	*Disconnect: The Breakdown in Representation in American Politics*	The media and some academics are mischaracterizing contemporary American politics. Elites and not citizens are the ones who are polarized and highly ideological (pp. 11–20). Citizens are usually moderate and not very interested in politics, but elites and the media take extreme positions and leave citizens unsure and frustrated as they vote. Thus, the American system of representation has broken down (pp. 27–28).

ᵃ A verbatim answer can be easiest; put it in quotation marks, and supply pages if available. When you are capable, seek to write in your own words as you want to avoid transcripts, as Box 3.1 explains.

Moreover, Gabriela can see that there might be other explanations out there, ones that focus more explicitly on interests/power, ideas/principles, or economics/prosperity to answer the question. Still, this targeted focus on theses, fundamental

TABLE 3.3 ■ Identifying the Key Factors or Short Answers

Research Question: Why is U.S. politics so polarized now, and what are the policy consequences of polarization?

Author	Brief Title	Key Factor	Generic School (IIIIE)?
Stossel on Bishop	"Divided We Fall" and *The Big Sort*	**Citizens moving** to live with, **listening** to, and **interacting** with only those like themselves	Ideas/Principles? Intersectionality/ Privilege?
Abramowitz	*The Disappearing Center*	**Americans** becoming increasingly **ideological** and **involved**	Ideas/Principles?
Edwards	*The Parties versus the People*	**Political party** and **election systems**	Institutions/Politics? Economics/ Prosperity? (because money and elections are important)
Mann and Ornstein	*It's Worse than It Looks*	Political party and governing **institutions**, a "hostage-taking" **culture**	Institutions/Politics Ideas/Principles (of noncompromise)
Fiorina with Abrams	*Disconnect*	**Elected officials** and the **media** (system elites) are disconnected from ideas and priorities of ordinary people. The system of representation has broken down.	Interests/Power? Institutions/Politics?

factors, and generic schools of thought puts Gabriela on a firm footing to proceed with identifying, reading, and understanding additional sources and, ultimately, writing her Annotated Bibliography.

Let's imagine that Gabriela has spent some more time looking for other sources, adding them to her tables, and then starts to write her Annotated Bibliography. She carefully locates the theses of her sources, paraphrases them,

thinks deeply about the fundamental factors they are identifying, rethinks and revises her work, and then begins writing up her entries. While she is not finished yet, I want to share her draft below. Notice that she was able to link her research to works she had read or learned about in her classes (see Putnam, Yglesias, and Robinson and Ellis, in addition to Stossel), and she still might decide to add something on wedge issues[16] (a key concept she learned about in her Introduction to American Politics course) to her first school of thought, which she will dub the Elite Extremism School. While she still has some jobs to do—get the Bishop book to compare his argument with that of Abramowitz, find other adherents of each school, search for any additional perspectives, and look for some scholarly articles, Gabriela is on her way to developing a good AB and a strong understanding of the scholarly debate around her Research Question.

Now, let's see what Gabriela has written for her AB so far. Look at exactly how she provides her Research Question, creates names of schools of thought, provides basic answers, lists the works, and writes her summaries (with good paraphrases). You should seek to mimic her approach (while using the citation form your professor requires).

THE BEGINNINGS OF GABRIELA'S AB

Research Question: Why is U.S. politics so polarized now, and what are the policy consequences of polarization?

School 1—Brief Name: Elite Extremism School; Basic Argument/Answer to Research Question: Elites are highly polarized, and their vitriol alienates many citizens and leads to a breakdown in representation.

Fiorina, Morris P., with Samuel J. Abrams. 2009. *Disconnect: The Breakdown of Representation in American Politics*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Fiorina, Morris P., with Samuel J. Abrams and Jeremy C. Pope. 2006. *Culture War? The Myth of a Polarized America*, 3rd ed. New York: Pearson Longman.

Responding to both media characterizations and what they see as incorrect academic readings of the data, Morris P. Fiorina and colleagues contend that ordinary Americans tend to be comfortably situated in the middle of the ideological spectrum (2006, 11–12; 2009, 12–20). Elites, on the other hand, occupy the ideological extremes. Thus, the polarized debate in politics is simply a product of elite and media manipulations. Citizens are not always very well informed, because they don't pay close attention to politics, and when they are they do not necessarily have very strong likes or dislikes. They are often forced to make choices (especially at election time), but those selections do not capture accurately their political views, which are usually moderate (2006, 27–28). This risk of elite polarization is that citizens become further turned off by politics. Politicians, then, increasingly do not adequately represent the views of their constituents (2009, 24–48).

Robinson, Michael, and Susan Ellis. 2004. "Purple America: The Country Is Really an Even Mix of Blue and Red." Weekly Standard, August 16, 27–29. https://search.proquest.com/docview/232985619.

Although they differ with Fiorina and his coauthors on the emphasis on elites' being disconnected from their constituents, Robinson and Ellis stress that there are no "blue" or "red" states. Instead, citizens from all states elect people from both parties (27). While the Pew Research study finds significant evidence of polarization, these authors claim that a closer look at the data shows something else. Citizens are, for the most part, in the middle, and "purple" reflects their partisanship more than blue or red (29).

School 2—Brief Name: Party and Election Systems School; Basic Argument/Answer to Research Question: American party and electoral systems have created highly ideological parties and rewards extremism as the most partisan (citizens and leaders) control who wins the nominations, how to draw districts, and the funding of campaigns. This extremism also creates a culture of noncooperation from elites and citizens, fueled by new and traditional media.

Edwards, Mickey. 2012. *The Parties versus the People: How to Turn Republicans and Democrats into Americans*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Polarization in American politics is rooted in neither the ideology of elites and citizens nor citizen behavior. Instead it results from the nature of the contemporary and interrelated party and electoral systems (4). Ironically, the harmful elements of the institutions developed as a result of the efforts of reformers, beginning in the Progressive Era, to provide citizens with more of a say in elections and to take control away from back-room-dealing party bosses. The reforms put into place primary systems so that partisans could pick candidates and later led to more party influence over the drawing of districts (5–6). The reforms continued into the mid-20th century, as government was growing. With this expansion came more questions over government's role and more reasons to disagree over its use (30–32). Ultimately, these structures and the reach of government have caused the highly ideological nature of American politics and the end of across-the-aisle voting and fluid congressional voting coalitions. Instead, party-line votes tend to rule the day today. Not only has the Congress become highly partisan but so too has the presidency. Instead of focusing on problem solving, presidents tend to be looking for ideological advantage (146–48). Only when we institute structural reforms to the system to reduce the role of parties (36–38) and big, private money (70–73) in elections and force partisans to find ways of cooperating and thinking first about the country, and not party victories, will we effectively undermine polarization.

Mann, Thomas, and Norman Ornstein. 2016. *It's Worse than It Looks: How the American Constitutional System Collided with the Politics of Extremism,* rev. ed. New York: Basic Books.

American institutions are not a good match for the heightened polarization that now exists in U.S. politics. In the old days, political parties were "big tents,"

(Continued)

but as a result of the efforts of activists, donors, and politicians, particularly aligned with the Republicans (xv–xvi), politicians are far less likely to compromise and are punished when they do. Moreover, politicians and activists have taken steps (through redistricting and bringing court cases) (143–47, 73–74) to harden this highly partisan behavior (17, 25–26), creating "safe seats," allowing unprecedented sums of money to flow (67–80), and using media and campaign strategies that demonize the other side (xvi, 58–67). The authors characterize the current nature of American politics as "the new politics of hostage taking" (3–30), and its roots are in a mismatch between a highly ideological party system (as in Europe, not previously seen here) and the still remaining Madisonian separation-of-powers nature of the U.S. (xiv–xv). In a pessimistic last sentence, Mann and Ornstein claim that the roots of the problem are both these U.S. institutions and the pervasive culture of conflict. They write, "Finding a way to return to normality—two parties with distinct views and visions who operate with respect for political institutions, seeing the other side as worthy adversaries not enemies within, while battling tooth and nail over the nation's direction, and finding, when problems loom, ways to get to yes—will not come easily or quickly" (220).

School 3—Brief Name: Citizen Engagement School; Basic Argument/Answer to Research Question: Citizens are highly polarized; this polarization has positive and negative consequences.

Abramowitz, A. I. 2010. *The Disappearing Center: Engaged Citizens, Polarization, and American Democracy.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

In direct opposition to Fiorina, Alan I. Abramowitz (2010) argues that most citizens are politically engaged, and they are taking increasingly polarized views. He concedes that a portion of Americans have little interest, but this portion is a minority and is shrinking. This polarized majority, then, does not follow politicians but leads elected officials and candidates to more partisan and ideological positions. More citizens than ever are highly engaged in politics, as recent voter turnout, activism, and political contributions show. These behaviors are positive because they reflect the democratic ideal, the rule of an informed and involved citizenry. In fact, American political parties are now approaching the once-longed-for goal: ideologically consistent, responsive, and responsible groupings of representatives (4–5). Engaged citizens have strong ideological views, and they tend to seek out people like themselves. Unlike in the past, people tend to live, go to school or work, and worship with people who share their own positions. Given the changes in the media, citizens can also block out sources of information that don't correspond to their views (Chapters 3–5). Thus, not everything about this polarized America is positive for politics, as U.S. institutions were not designed for ideologically consistent and responsive parties. Given U.S. institutions, as well as the almost even ideological split among the public, polarization means gridlock and the increasing frustration and alienation of the remaining part of the public, which is not as interested in politics (111–38).

Yglesias, Matthew. 2007. "The Great Divider." *The American Prospect* 18 (4): 47–49. http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.sju.edu/docview/201159517?accountid=14071 (Accessed April 2, 2014).

    Partisanship and ideology are increasingly aligning. Geography, religion, gender, and, of course, race are now more than ever correlated with citizens' political views (47). While events may drive popularity of presidents and enhance their ability to govern, this support can be fleeting, particularly among those who aren't strong partisans, when the relevance of a crisis fades (49).

Stossel, Scott. 2008. "Subdivided We Fall." *New York Times*, May 18. http://www.nytimes.com/2008/05/18/books/review/Stossel-t.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0 (Accessed February 3, 2018).

    Scott Stossel provides an excellent summary of Bill Bishop's book *The Big Sort,* in which Bishop argues that citizens are taking steps to close themselves off from people who think differently about political and social issues than they do. These actions include moving to certain areas of the country, state, city, or town to be with like-minded individuals, watching or listening to only certain programs that confirm their existing view of the world, and socializing with others of their ideological persuasion. Perhaps surprisingly, Bishop argues, according to Stossel, that the United States would be better off if fewer people cared so deeply or were involved in politics. This indifference would provide more places for compromise and a less polarized America.

School 4—Brief Name: Declining Social Capital School; Basic Argument/Answer to Research Question: Polarization is worse today because social capital is much lower. People have very little contact with those they don't agree with and have constructed dense social networks among the like-minded. The consequences, however, are negative for encouraging deliberation and considered choice.

Mutz, Diana C. 2006. *Hearing the Other Side: Deliberative versus Participatory Democracy.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

    According to Diana C. Mutz (2006), dense social networks are great for creating an enthusiastic and engaged citizenry but not good for engendering a tolerant society (7–10). Characteristics we have tended to idealize in a citizen—informed, engaged, opinionated, and involved—are actually contrary to the flexible and open society our national narrative and our democratic theory praise (34–44). Polarization has come about because people who are actively engaged are increasingly inclined to shut themselves off from ideas and others that they neither like (perhaps seeing those others as "liberals," "rednecks," or "extremists") nor want to know. The consequences for democracy are significant. People are less exposed to opposing viewpoints and policies and less willing to consider seriously alternative perspectives. Mutz claims this loss threatens tolerance as well as the quality of the political process and political outcomes (Chapter 3). We may have a good deal of participation, but not enough

(*Continued*)

(Continued)

deliberation—thoughtful and comprehensive consideration of issues. Both factors—participation and deliberation—are equally important and essential to the good health of the American polity; deliberation must be revived today without losing participation (128–35, 147–51).

Putnam, Robert, with Robert Leonardi and Raffaella Y. Nanetti. 1994. *Making Democracy Work: Civil Traditions in Modern Italy.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Putnam, Robert. 1995. "Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital." *Journal of Democracy* 6 (1): 65–78. http://muse.jhu.edu/article/16643 (Accessed February 2, 2018).

Mutz's argument builds on a line of reasoning most associated with Robert Putnam. In the first work here, *Making Democracy Work,* Putnam and his colleagues seek to understand whether regional variation in the quality of democracy in Italy has continued since the 1970s institutional reforms that put in place common structures throughout the country (8–13). In particular, they contrast the impact of socioeconomic modernity and civic community on institutional performance (their proxy for democracy) and find that civic community—how engaged citizens are in associations—is a far better predictor of the quality of democracy than is modernization (see Chapter 4, especially). In the second work, "Bowling Alone," Putnam changes the name of that key factor from civic community to social capital and contends that the decline in social capital—the links that citizens have with others, particularly others with whom they wouldn't ordinarily associate—in the United States has led to a decrease in social trust and has dangerous consequences for democracy.

As you can see, Gabriela has made great progress: She has four schools, multiple sources under each, important works in the form of books and articles (though she is heavy on books so far), as well as articles from her courses. Gabriela has a terrific start. Still, if she turned in her AB now, her professor might ask her to go back and find some additional current sources, as well as to be sure she has a handle on the whole debate. If she has done a good job searching (and given the number and quality of sources she has, she should be confident if this is a semester-long project), Gabriela would know that she has uncovered the debate when she stops encountering voices saying anything new. Still, to be as up-to-date as possible, she can take the two diametrically opposed scholarly voices on the sources of polarization—Abramowitz and Fiorina—and look them up in the Web of Science database to help her find their most recent works as well as discover if additional people have joined the discussion and added insights. What is special about Web of Science is that it tells you which sources are highly cited. That means you can easily find those papers that anyone "in the know" thinks are important. To be sure she has done her best, Gabriela will turn to Web of Science as a next step before she feels that she has completed her exploration of the scholarship.

Also important to recognize about Gabriela's process is that she took a small break from searching for sources, started summarizing and began grouping them. This pause was wise. Like Gabriela, you should try as soon as you can (even when you haven't finished identifying all your key sources yet) to begin thinking about and writing your AB. Better to know sooner rather than later whether you have different approaches, whether you understand the arguments, how to group and what to call the schools, and what you are lacking. Too often students realize they have only one school of thought (or just two, but most of their works fall in one camp) because they did not stop, write, and think about what they had uncovered. When students are in that phase, they also tend to have works that really do not belong in their AB, but they include them anyway because otherwise their final product looks so thin. The lesson here is you must begin the writing and thinking part of the AB in plenty of time to go back and find additional sources. Don't be surprised if you decide to jettison some of the early works you have summarized because they actually stray from your ultimate focus. Also, expect to rearrange your groups. Here, perhaps Gabriela will decide that schools 2 and 4 should be combined into a single perspective. Students often refine their summaries (go back to the original sources) and think through their groupings for some time after completing their first pass through the literature. Moreover, Gabriela will have to decide whether she wants to focus on the *causes* of polarization or its *consequences*. As this AB reads now, Gabriela is more concerned with the reasons deep divisions have emerged, so she may want to eliminate the discussions of the results. If her goal, however, is to study the effects, then she needs to shift her emphasis to outcomes and abandon her sources on causes. Thus, Gabriela needs to think and write, as the way forward is to circle back while thinking ahead. This is a stage, then, to refine the Research Question, cull some sources while finding some new and more appropriate ones, sharpen understandings of the schools, and improve summaries. By practicing the research-writing-thinking spiral, you, too, will arrive at an organized and excellent understanding of the existing scholarship on your RQ.

Practical Summary

To succeed in writing your Annotated Bibliography, you must have access to an appropriate style guide, a well-formed Research Question, excellent academic sources that provide competing answers to that question, and an understanding of exactly how those scholarly responses are similar and in what ways they are different. Early in the process, you start by finding sources, and as we have seen here, uncovering good works to use is not automatic. The job does not have to be hard, however, if you follow the steps identified of using works you already have, generating search terms from those existing sources or from brainstorming, and

then methodically identifying sources and using them to lead you to more works. Absolutely, Gabriela's process (thinking about her course materials, turning to the LoC catalog, interrogating the LoC results, going to the databases, and ending with the Web of Science to find the most important and current scholarly sources) has been consistent with the recommendations provided here.

The next phase includes summarizing the arguments of these works. Simply telling your reader what these sources are about will not get you far. You must explain how they answer your Research Question (with one word or a phrase), and, if possible, what factors they focus on as the main response (in a paragraph or so). Also be sure that you are keeping track of your sources with citation management software or in the appropriate bibliographic form and that you know the precise page numbers for your specific information. Take this opportunity to reread Box 3.1 on plagiarism and vow that you will never make that kind of mistake. Also, be mindful of all the lessons in that box when you are writing your summaries; be sure to paraphrase and avoid using drop-ins or writing transcripts. Practice those good writing habits now, and then later, you will likely be able to use these accounts in your paper.

Always remember: the more good works you read and summarize, the easier it will be for you to understand the arguments being made and the small distinctions between them. So, even after you think you are done with your article wrap-ups, you will want to take some time and rethink your characterizations and groupings. You may need to reread sources, rewrite summaries, and even refine your RQ. While at times frustrating, proceeding through this iterative spiral will ultimately bring you the most success and the highest-quality paper because this kind of precision and care translates into a better understanding of what you will be studying. I cannot overstress that the foundation of the project is absolutely essential for its proper construction and your successful follow-through.

Recipe 2: Annotated Bibliography

Ingredients

- Research Question

- Access to the reference guide for the citation style you will use

- Syllabi and materials from previous, related courses

- Tables 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3 as blanks, which are collected together in the digital materials as "Resources for the AB"

- Access to Gabriela's various efforts at writing the AB

Instructions

1. Open the Digital Resources for the AB worksheets and start filling in the first chart (Table 3.1) for yourself. Take special care to write your question(s) and your hunch(es) as clearly as possible.

2. Using the various methods spelled out in this chapter, identify sources, search terms, and search authors who respond to your Research Question. Whenever you find one that appears good, use it to find more, by locating authors your source agrees with and those with whom it disagrees. Begin filling out the second chart of the Resources for the AB (Table 3.2), which will require you to write the summaries of your sources' arguments, focusing on the way they answer your RQ.

3. Record/save your sources so that you will be able to easily cite and access them later.

4. After you think you have found a "good" number and variety of sources—when you read new ones, you're not learning about new arguments, and you seem to have an array of answers to your question—start identifying the fundamental factors and generic schools for your sources. Turn to the last worksheet in the Resources for the AB (Table 3.3) and look carefully at Box 3.5 for inspiration.

5. Most likely, you lack the variety of sources you had hoped for. Go back and find some additional ones that make different arguments. If you have not used your existing sources fully, now is the time to identify whom your authors are arguing against. Summarize and categorize these new sources in your table.

6. Move rows of your chart around so that you are grouping sources with similar fundamental factors, arguments, and/or approaches.

7. Begin to write the AB, using Gabriela's as a model. Your RQ should be at the top, to keep you focused. Group your sources into schools with brief names that highlight the answer to the question, as well as longer explanations to your query. Include the bibliographic information and a summary (in your own words, but with page numbers included for relevant information) of the author's answer to your RQ.

8. Go to the Web of Science database and look up the seemingly most important authors in your AB. Find their most frequently cited articles, as well as their newer ones. Also search using the subject terms you have developed. Be sure to read any new sources and have them lead you to others, especially ones that confirm and take issue with the authors you know. If you follow this path, you can be confident you are identifying the broad debate. Pick out additional important articles, summarize them, and decide where and how to classify them and add them to your chart.

9. Rethink and revise your classifications. Refine your question if necessary.

10. When you have a set of sources, arranged into three or more schools (with typically several scholarly sources in each category) for which you can identify a common approach to answering your RQ, then you can be satisfied. Remember, your professor will be the ultimate judge of "doneness" on all your efforts, and most of the time, you can always do more researching and refining (there's that iterative spiral again). Still, following these guidelines will give you a great start.

Exercises

1. Pick one of our other students, Kevin, Max, or Hannah. Search for a few excellent books using the LoC catalog or your own library. Then perform a search for articles by a few of these authors in one of the online databases available at your institution. Find what you think are the four best works. Explain why they are best (e.g., most cited; most prestigious authors, presses, or journals; most controversial; offering a literature review). Using your efforts, identify some search terms for this student. Then, go to the Web of Science with a search term and an author's last name. Did you find a "good" search term and an "important" author? If not, try a new search term and a different author to guide the student.

2. Using the citation form your professor has specified, take the sources listed in Gabriela's example AB and create an appropriate reference list for a paper that relied on all of them.

Notes

1. While the fundamental ideas of this quotation are typically attributed to Sir Isaac Newton, many believe the original source is John of Salisbury and his work *Metalogicon* of 1159. This quotation reflects his precise words. For discussion, see http://www.phrases.org.uk/meanings/268025.html.

2. This book uses Chicago style to format its sourcing, and I am using its term, "Bibliography," for the list of works consulted in a project. The Modern Language Association calls this "Works Cited," and the American Political Science Association and American Psychological Association use "References." In all styles, the works are listed in

alphabetical order by author last name. They are not numbered. Each approach treats the entries slightly differently, so consult a manual for the precise format.

3. For more information on which program is right for you, please consult University of Chicago Library, "Which Tool Is Best for Me?" (July 28, 2017) http://guides.lib.uchicago.edu/c.php?g=297307&p=1984557.

4. See Diana Hacker, *A Pocket Manual of Style*, 4th ed. (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2004), 115–26, 157–64, 185–92.

5. Sometimes, you can find an article that is solely a literature review. Such a piece will be very helpful in understanding the different approaches to your Research Question. Still, you should not copy or reiterate all of that author's analysis. You must think through the literature on your own. A great place for finding articles that summarize a field of inquiry is Ira Katznelson and Helen V. Milner, eds., *Political Science: State of the Discipline*, centennial ed. (New York: Norton, 2005). More recent compilations are Robert E. Goodin, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Political Science* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011); R. A. W. Rhodes, Sarah A. Binder, and Bert A. Rockman, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008); Carles Boix and Susan C. Stokes, eds., *Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009); and Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal, eds., *Oxford Handbook of International Relations* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010).

6. In the supplemental Digital Resources, I have made a list of some of the "big concepts" for each of the subfields. If you are absolutely stuck regarding the central point of your question, read over my list and use that to help stimulate ideas. In addition, carefully reviewing the list might also help if you are still struggling over a topic and question.

7. Do I dare say that I am overstating this point because students often abuse the use of encyclopedias? These resources can help you identify important works and authors and so can be useful at the bibliography-building stage or when you are looking for data. They can also give you a nice overview, but you cannot rely on them alone, cite them, and do a quality job. Absolutely consult the sources that you find in the entry; do not use and cite the encyclopedia, online or otherwise, itself.

8. *New York Times Book Review* (May 18, 2008), http://www.nytimes.com/2008/05/18/books/review/Stossel-t.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0.

9. I have excluded information I have deemed extraneous, but you can access the LoC database to see the full record.

10. You may also do some of this in your citation management program. How you work here is up to you.

11. Not all political scientists are satisfied with this division of the field. Some prefer a focus on levels of analysis, others on agents and structures or rationalist versus interpretivist approaches, and still others would say that the subfields are too different for commonalities. Some faculty insist that students are not ready to think in terms of generic schools/ factors and that this representation is too complex for undergraduates. I remain committed, however, to seeing the overlap within the discipline (i.e., between the subfields) and encouraging students to think in terms of causal or key factors as they search for answers to their questions, and thus I advocate using one of these schemes. Those of you who have seen earlier versions of this book will note that I have included another set of alliterations (the Ps) and added a *fifth* factor—intersectionality or privilege. Given the increasing importance in scholarship of gender and critical race studies, this additional category is a must. I have borrowed the Ps (with the addition of "privilege" and the change of "peace" to "politics") from Bruce Jentleson, *American Foreign Policy: The Dynamics of Choice in the 21st Century*, 5th ed. (New York: W. W. Norton, 2013).

12. Note, of course, that institutionalist explanations can also be rational-choice perspectives, as the rules within institutions establish the incentives and guidelines for gains-seeking behavior.

13. Students of global politics will know these perspectives by different names. IIIIE/5Ps map onto realism, liberalism, constructivism, feminism, and Marxism, too, although not all explanations that focus on economics are Marxist in international politics or other fields.

14. Gabriela needs to be careful here because Edwards does not blame "constitutional processes" but Mann and Ornstein cite problems with the Madisonian system. She will have to think about whether these authors do belong in the same school or not.

15. Notice that Gabriela actually has two questions. At this stage, I typically allow students to proceed with two questions because they are still learning and trying to understand what they want to study. Other faculty might have a different opinion, and students themselves should acknowledge that asking multiple questions typically means more complexity and work.

16. See Daniel A. Smith and Caroline J. Tolbert, *Educated by Initiative: The Effects of Direct Democracy on Citizens and Political Organizations in the American States* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004); Peter Shrag, *Paradise Lost: California's Experience, America's Future* (New York: New Press, 1998).