

Report to the Louisiana Board of Regents
Review of Proposals Submitted for Funding Consideration
In the Board of Regents Support Fund R&D Program
Awards to Louisiana Artists and Scholars (ATLAS) Subprogram
Subject-Area Review: SOCIAL SCIENCES

Prepared by:

Susanne Lohmann (Chair)

Professor

Departments of Political Science and Public Policy

University of California, Los Angeles

In collaboration with:

John Hartigan

Professor

Department of Anthropology and

Americo Paredes Center for Cultural Studies

University of Texas, Austin

February 28, 2018

Phase One: IN-DEPTH EVALUATIONS OF PROPOSALS BY SUBJECT-AREA PANEL

Professors Susanne Lohmann and John Hartigan reviewed 19 social sciences proposals using the following criteria: (1) the significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences, (2) the strength of the proposal's conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution, (3) the quality of the applicant's previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant's preparations for the current project, and (4) the feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe.

Lohmann reviewed the proposals of Professors Kalmoe, Marks, Sullivan, Long, Yilmaz, Sperisen, Button, and Egan, and Hartigan reviewed the proposals of Professors Lam, Feist, Wu, Mathewson, Martin, Gary, Sluyter, Crow, Nesbitt, McKillop, and Lesen. Lohmann and Hartigan further exchanged notes on each others' proposals and reviews to merge their respective rankings and create a joint ranking.

Two proposals—Lesen and Sullivan—were “revise and resubmits” from last year. Sluyter is a previous recipient of an ATLAS grant.

The dollar amount of \$99,000 is allocated to the social science proposals, and there is a possibility that further funding will become available. This implies that the “funding action” lies with the top three proposals. Hence we put special care into ranking the top three proposals.

We sorted the proposals into two categories: (1) recommendation to fund and (2) recommendation to reject. The proposals in category (1) are rank-ordered by quality, that is, #1 should be funded before #2, which should be funded before #3, and so on. The proposals in category (2) are sorted alphabetically by last name. The funding recommendations are followed by the individual reviews, which are sorted alphabetically.

(1) Recommendation to fund (rank order)

- #1. Nathan Kalmoe, With Ballots & Bullets: Partisanship and Violence in the American Civil War
- #2. Amy Lesen, Oral Histories of Scientists at the Boundary: Interdisciplinarity, Public Engagement, and Transformation
- #3. Lori Martin, The Untold Story of Abe Hawkins: Horse Racing, Romanticizing, and the Myth of Privilege on Southern Plantations
- #4. Wei Long, An Investigation of the Ferguson Effect and How Publicized Events Impact Behaviors of Law Enforcement and Criminals
- #5. Michele Feist, Exploring Time, Metaphor, and Language
- #6. Andrew Sluyter, Publication of an Online Database of Colonial Maps for the Analysis of Social and Environmental Change in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries

(2) Recommendation to reject (alphabetical order)

- Patrick Button, Age Stereotypes and Age Discrimination: Evidence from Field Experiments
- Jason Crow, Architectural Representations: A Compendium on the Use of Drawings, Models and Computers
- Patrick Egan, Global Production and the Politics of Monetary Policy
- D. Gray, New Orleans Archaeology at the Tricentennial
- Nina Lam, Assessing and Enhancing Community Resilience to Coastal Hazards: Methods and Applications
- Brian Marks, Socio-economic Effects of the BP Oil Spill
- Kent Mathewson, From Afro-Diasporic Weed to WMD: The Curious Case of the Castor Bean Plant
- Heather McKillop, Presenting the Ancient Maya in 3D
- Jason Nesbitt, Chavín de Huántar and its Neighbors: Reconsidering the Chavín Phenomenon
- Benjamin Sperisen, Optimal Policy Under Collusion
- Christopher Sullivan, Why not rebel? The micro-foundations of political order
- Yejun Wu, Classifying English Verb Phrases as Semantic Relations
- Ferruh Yilmaz, Media, Crisis and Populist Success

Patrick Button, Age Stereotypes and Age Discrimination: Evidence from Field Experiments

Project Summary:

In a previous project Professor Button established the fact and extent of age discrimination in U.S. labor markets. In this follow-up project he seeks to explore the role of age-related stereotypes in driving age discrimination. The intended audience includes academic and policy-oriented economists.

Criterion 1: The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

This project fits into the field of labor economics, which is a subfield of the economics discipline. The topic of age discrimination is clearly of great practical importance given that the number of seniors is ever-increasing; many of them are underfunded in retirement; and hence many of them seek employment, at which time they face age discrimination. If something is to be done about age discrimination, we need to understand the phenomenon, which is where Professor Button's research comes in handy.

Criterion 2: The strength of the proposal's conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

In the previous project, Professor Button and his coauthors measured age discrimination with the help of two field experiments involving fictitious resumes. They found that employers respond more positively to a given resume when the fictitious applicant is young or middle-aged than when he or she is over 65 years old.

The proposed project follows up on the previous project. Professor Button seeks to explore whether age discrimination is driven by age stereotypes, both negative (e.g., "worse with technology"), positive (e.g., "more experienced"), and mixed ("better/worse interpersonal skills"). The first step is to conduct a literature review to come up with a list of age stereotypes. The second step is to employ language processing software to probe the language of about 47,000 job advertisements and detect the presence of age stereotypes. Step 3 is to use machine learning to compare job advertisements calling for older workers with job advertisements calling for younger workers; once again, the point is to identify words and phrases that appear relatively more often in advertisements that exclude senior candidates to get a picture of employer biases against senior Americans.

The project is innovative in several respects. First, it relies on actual employer behavior (the wording of job advertisements) as opposed to employer surveys—or (weirdly) student surveys. The reliance on actual employer behavior is particularly useful if employer biases are unconscious. Second, the project will tell us whether employers use ageist language.

Third, the project will shed light on what kinds of jobs (e.g., jobs that require a lot of consumer interaction) are especially prone to age discrimination. Fourth, Professor Button and his coauthors will develop and make available to other researchers new methodological tools (language processing software, machine learning).

Professor Button is seeking to publish his results in a leading economics journal as well as policy-oriented outlets such as the San Francisco Federal Reserve Economic Letter Series; publications in the latter kind of outlet have a good shot at getting picked up by news media.

While there is nothing particularly bad with or wrong about the application (apart from poor writing, about which more below), there is also nothing in the application that pops out as thrilling or excellent. The ATLAS Award is extremely competitive, and it is not enough for an application to be merely very good. The recommendation to reject is not so much a comment on the project as it is a comment on the ATLAS budget constraint.

Criterion 3: The quality of the applicant's previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant's preparations for the current project

Professor Button holds a Ph.D. in Economics from the University of California, Irvine and joined Tulane University in 2015 as an assistant professor. Relative to his short career, he has been very productive. His resume includes an article forthcoming in the *Journal of Political Economy*, which is a leading economics journal; he is one of three co-authors. It is a good sign that he has received numerous fellowships, grants, and awards, some of them quite prestigious. The news media (e.g., *The New York Times*) has on occasion commented on his work. The overall picture is one of accomplishment.

If there is one thing that undercuts this impression it is the poor writing. Take the first paragraph on the page titled "Context for Project and Work Plan." The sentence "Seniors are much more likely to face poverty" is crying out to be completed: more likely than who or what? There are two ambiguous references ("This," "This") in this paragraph. Almost every paragraph has one or more problems of this kind—little problems, admittedly, but they add up.

Criterion 4: The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

The proposed plan of work is realistic, and it appears likely that the applicant will complete the project within the proposed time frame.

Recommendation for Funding:

The panel does not recommend funding.

Jason Crow, Architectural Representations: A Compendium on the Use of Drawings, Models and Computers

Project Summary: Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

Crow will compile a critical compendium introducing key materials in the history and theory of architectural design tools. The audience he envisions will be “able to critically examine the development and critical changes in the use of drawings models and computers both chronologically and across media.”

Criterion 1: The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

Crow’s goal is “to increase scholarship on artisanal activities as analogues to mystical and theological practices.” He aims to accomplish this by pulling together a collection of articles on architectural design reaching back to antiquity. This book will have three sections (Drawings, Computation, and Models) that will combine the “entire tradition of analogue and digital media in one reference” guide. This is ambitious, but whether it will achieve his goal “to increase scholarship on artisanal activities as analogues to mystical and theological practices” is unclear, largely because the details of this vision are not developed or articulated. For instance, it is hard to tell how the above-stated goals align with his further aim, to apply “hermeneutical phenomenology to argue against the manner in which computation has overtaken conceptualization within the creative process.” Such arguments would need to be more fully fleshed to assess the potential significance of this project.

Criterion 2: The strength of the proposal’s conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

Crow works in big philosophical gestures, but this proposal is lacking an elaboration of how this compendium will be assembled—what are the key works to be compiled; how do they speak to each other; will periodization hold steady across all three sections? Basically, how will this book actually be compiled and what will it look like at the end? Not conveying this in some detail weakens the overall proposal considerably.

Criterion 3: The quality of the applicant’s previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant’s preparations for the current project

Crow is an architect and historian. He has co-directed architectural installations and pursued a variety of multidisciplinary collaborations. His historical work appears in a variety of book chapters and, most notably, a forthcoming monograph, *A New Interpretation of Twelfth-Century Architecture* (University of Amsterdam Press). This is a solid record but the broad historical scope of the project he now envisions exceeds the scope of what he has produced to date.

Criterion 4: The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

Crow is working with co-editors on a manuscript already under contract from Routledge. Since it is not clear how many people are involved and what their respective roles entail, it is difficult to be certain this edited volume will be completed during the grant period.

Recommendation for Funding:

The panel does not recommend funding.

Patrick Egan, Global Production and the Politics of Monetary Policy

Project Summary: Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

Professor Egan is seeking ATLAS support for the completion of three projects on monetary policy.

Criterion 1: The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

Here is a list of the three projects in Professor Egan's own words: "how firms interpret exchange rate movements," "the question of exchange rate regime in developing countries," and "the service sector and the role of service multinationals in monetary policy." On top of that, while the three projects are vaguely related ("monetary policy"), they are actually quite disconnected. The ATLAS Award is extremely competitive, and it is designed to reward scholars who are seeking to pursue one big idea in a book or a sequence of articles; the big idea might consist of a sequence of subideas, but those subideas need to form a larger whole.

Separately, none of the three projects is likely to make a splash vis-à-vis some academic or broader audience. Professor Egan is an assistant professor of political science at Tulane, but his projects don't seem to contain any politics (e.g., "how firms interpret exchange rate movements"), and it is not obvious that the resulting articles will make it into leading political science journals. There is obviously no problem with a political science professor publishing in economics, but the projects are defined in such a way that they are unlikely to appeal even to second-tier economics journals. Interdisciplinarity is not the same thing as falling between the chairs of two disciplines.

Nor do any of the three projects sound like they will appeal to a broader audience. No fresh take on exchange rate politics is visible in the writeup of this proposal, and the writing and the ideas are too plodding to attract an educated layperson.

Criterion 2: The strength of the proposal's conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

As noted above, the three topics come across as small and disconnected. (This isn't to say that the topics are inherently small—it's the plodding treatment that makes them small.) There is nothing particularly bad with or wrong about the application (apart from poor writing, about which more below). The problem is that there's nothing in the application that pops out as excellent or thrilling. The ATLAS Award is extremely competitive, and it's not enough for an application to be merely very good, let alone minimally decent.

Criterion 3: The quality of the applicant's previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant's preparations for the current project

Professor Egan holds a Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill and joined Tulane University in 2011 as an assistant professor. Relative to the length of his career, he has been productive but not extraordinarily so. He has a book forthcoming with MIT Press, which is a decent press but does not count as a top press in political science, and he has published about half a dozen articles in peer-reviewed journals, once again, these are decent journals, but not considered top-shelf in political science.

Generally speaking, political scientists write well compared to economists. The writing in this application is quite poor, as if it was written (weirdly enough, given the above remarks about falling between the chairs of the disciplines) by an economist. The issue is not spelling or grammatical errors. It is more a matter of word choice and sentence construction. The overall effect is plodding and pedestrian.

Criterion 4: The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

The plan of work is realistic, and it appears likely that the applicant will complete the project within the proposed time frame.

Recommendation for Funding:

The panel does not recommend funding.

Michele Feist, Exploring Time, Metaphor, and Language

Project Summary: Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

This is a wide-ranging theoretical treatment of the metaphoric representation of time, one that draws on its connections to the domain of space but also on its reliance on the embodied mental simulation of the language user.

Criterion 1: The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

Of all the metaphors that ground or inform human cognition, “time is space” is a central interest of cognitive scientists, psychologists, and linguists. Referencing time involves simulating physical experiences, often at the cost of understanding temporal dynamics more abstractly. There are several analytical concerns here concerning “the metaphoric representation of time which draws not only on its connections to the source domain of space, but also on its connections to the embodied mental simulation of the language user.” Feist proposes a collaborative approach that will generate theoretical advances leading to “new insights into the processing of metaphor and, by extension, into the interpretation of language.” The ramifications of such an attention to this crucial conceptual metaphor are wide-ranging.

Criterion 2: The strength of the proposal’s conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

Feist’s proposal rests upon a great deal of collaborative work conducted over the past six years, which has already resulted in articles in top-tier journals. She lays out a well-developed intellectual foundation for the co-authored monograph she aims to produce on metaphors of time. Feist effectively sketches the overarching thematic coherence of the volume, while also detailing the content and argument of individual chapters. Feist envisions a book that conveys a theory of metaphor in relation to cognitive systems concerned with mapping space to time, yet also exploring larger philosophical concerns related to “the intrusion of space on temporal thinking.” These are big ideas, deeply researched and rendered in an accessible manner, likely to appeal to a variety of researchers.

Criterion 3: The quality of the applicant’s previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant’s preparations for the current project

Feist has a solid record of publications, featuring both single-authored and collaborative articles in journals such as *Cognition*, *Cognitive Science*, and *Cognitive Linguistics*. She has presented in research in international forums and developed a well-earned reputation for her work on motion language and cognition. Her collaborative work extends her range of expertise and also affirms the quality and strength of her core intellectual concerns.

Criterion 4: The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

Feist has already compiled the data require of this publication venture; as well, she has a contract in hand for it from Cambridge University Press. The remaining work to see this project through to publication can be completed during the grant period. Feist breaks down the preparation of the monograph into six short phases, each clearly feeding into the next, culminating in the completed volume. Each of the book's chapters is well delineated and draws upon a considerable amount of material, ranging from synthetic treatment of various literature to original perspectives generated by Feist and her co-author. The final product promises "to expand upon prior theories of metaphor to produce a novel perspective on the metaphoric representation of time."

Recommendation for Funding:

The panel recommends full funding.

D. Gray, New Orleans Archaeology at the Tricentennial

Project Summary: Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

Gray intends to produce a co-authored, comprehensive book on the archaeology of urban New Orleans. Gray intends this work to raise the profile of public archaeology and to be used as an educational tool for post-secondary students.

Criterion 1: The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

There are decades' worth of archaeological manuscripts on sites within New Orleans, largely inaccessible to scholars or the public in general. Gray aims to synthesize these in a book spanning from the prehistory of Orleans Parish to the present. Such compendiums have been produced for the state of Louisiana, but not its most iconic city. But the significance of this undertaking is hard to evaluate because so little of its intellectual rationale or configuration is addressed.

Criterion 2: The strength of the proposal's conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

The idea of generating a synthetic compendium of New Orleans archaeology is warranted on disciplinary grounds, but the greater strength in such an undertaking would lie in a substantive set of scholarly engagements. Does the shifting work in the city speak to how archaeologists conceptualize their subjects and audience; does it provide a means for analyzing changing racial, class and gender dynamics? Addressing these questions would represent a significant contribution. Gray perhaps intuits this, suggesting that the material "bears on issues of urban development and sustainability, race, ethnicity, immigration, class, religion, gender, and sexuality, and it has potential significance at the national level." But this confidence needs to be borne out through detailed attention to how this tangle would be addressed in specific chapters in the book and its overall structure and argument. Gray, however, spends more time envisioning "activities that will generate public interest in the book."

Criterion 3: The quality of the applicant's previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant's preparations for the current project

Gray has a book manuscript under review and he is working up material from previous projects to convert into journal articles. His publication record is brief, at the moment, but is developing. He is clearly knowledgeable and experienced in this field but he is also relying heavily on the expertise of his proposed co-author, Dr. Shannon Dawdy, of the University of Chicago.

Criterion 4: The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

Gray offers very little detail on how he plans to proceed. Really, just the claim that “At the halfway point of the project (1 January 2019), there will be at least 5 completed chapters of the manuscript.” Out of how many; what sequence do they fall in; do they convey a cumulative perspective or argument; who will be writing each chapter and how will they edit each other’s work? With so many questions unaddressed it is not possible to assess accurately the feasibility of this work. Given the focus of ATLAS on completion of major works within a limited timeframe, this application seems premature.

Recommendation for Funding:

The panel does not recommend funding at this time.

Nathan Kalmoe, *With Ballots & Bullets: Partisanship and Violence in the American Civil War*

Project Summary: Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

Professor Kalmoe is seeking ATLAS support for the completion of a single-authored book titled *With Ballots and Bullets: Partisanship and Violence in the American Civil War*. The book has the potential to revolutionize the way we think about individual and community-based partisanship in voting and war as well Civil War-era politics.

Criterion 1: The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

The primary audience consists of academic political scientists in two subfields of political science, namely, American political development and political behavior. The larger audience consists of just about everybody concerned with the state of current American politics as well as readers interested in the American Civil War (which is a lot of people in the United States).

Historically, the project will address the partisan politics surrounding the American Civil War. Conceptually, it will explore how partisanship mobilizes men into killing and dying and how partisanship colors voters' responses to hundreds of thousands of dead.

Partisanship is arguably the most potent force in mass political behavior. For example, currently in American politics people tend to hate opposing partisans, and they segregate themselves socially by partisanship. Professor Kalmoe suggests, provocatively, that the survey-based view of American partisanship—which is the standard view in the political behavior subfield over the last 60 years—blinds us to the truly awesome power of partisanship, namely, that it can motivate mass killing and rationalize even extreme violent outcomes to fit preconceived partisan views. It is only by incorporating insights from the partisan politics surrounding the American Civil war that we will be able to recognize “what lurks beneath,” so to speak.

Professor Kalmoe lists several specific insights about the partisan politics surrounding the American Civil War, all of which are interesting and many of which come across as novel. He employs a mixed-method approach on massive amounts of data. Overall, the impression one gets is of an intensely exciting and ambitious project.

The project is also very timely. Partisanship is currently at a high that is often compared to the time just before the American Civil War, which makes it all the more urgent and important for political scientists to spell out the way ordinary partisanship can turn dangerous and deadly.

Criterion 2: The strength of the proposal’s conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

The project is well conceptualized and well organized, and the plans for project execution are well thought out. The work sample is powerful and persuasive.

Criterion 3: The quality of the applicant’s previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant’s preparations for the current project

Professor Kalmoe holds a PhD from a leading political science program at the University of Michigan, arguably the leading department in the subfields that relate to the proposed topic (American politics, quantitative research methods with a focus on public opinion, psychology, and communication).

Relative to his career to date (he joined LSU as an assistant professor in Fall 2016) Professor Kalmoe is extraordinarily accomplished. His resume includes a book (coauthored with Donald Kinder) published by the University of Chicago Press, which is a leading university press in political science. His resume includes about half a dozen articles published in peer-reviewed journals—not leading journals necessarily, but still: we are talking about a scholar who at the time of the submission of the ATLAS application had been out for a mere year. His work is well cited and has attracted media attention.

It is clear that Professor Kalmoe’s project, once it takes the form of a sole-authored book, will be snapped up by a leading university press, and it may well turn out to be a path-breaking book, both in political science and in the larger culture.

Criterion 4: The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

The proposed plan of work is realistic, and it appears likely that the applicant will complete the project within the proposed timeframe.

Recommendation for Funding:

The panel strongly recommends full funding for this project.

**Nina Lam, Assessing and Enhancing Community Resilience to Coastal Hazards:
Methods and Applications**

Project Summary: Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

Lam aims to integrate her previous research on community resilience analysis into a book-length manuscript. The intended audience is not specified but the work will presumably attract the attention of other researchers in the field.

Criterion 1: The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

Objectifying and analyzing “community resilience” in the face of natural disaster is challenging because of the highly varied and uneven impact of events such as hurricanes on particular regions and habitations. Ideally, the concept should concisely and uniformly “represent the complex dynamic human environment interactions.” But this concept is distinctly framed and articulated across a “substantial literature in the broad field of resilience, vulnerability, hazards, disaster risk assessments, and sustainability, which cut across many disciplines.” Lam discerns that, “Despite the abundant literature in the broad field of resilience, relatively few studies have focused on the actual measurement of community resilience or developing resilience measurement frameworks and approaches.” Her project aims to address two main challenges in developing useful resilience indices: the lack of consensus on the definition of resilience and the deficit of modes of empirical validation for the many existing resilience indices. Based on her command of this wide literature and a considerable quantity of already completed research on this subject, Lam sets out to address a series of pressing questions: “what are the indicators of community resilience, how do they interact dynamically to make the community more resilient, and how to measure them so that we can monitor the progress through time?” If she can indeed answer all these questions, this project will make a substantial contribution to understanding community resilience.

Criterion 2: The strength of the proposal’s conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

As Lam surveys her scholarly publications, she draws attention to unpublished material, which she characterizes as “a lot of highly relevant, original research materials, data, and methods that could be processed and synthesized into a cohesive volume to better illustrate the concept, theory, methods, and applications of community resilience analysis.” The broad subject areas that this material covers include 1) business recovery in New Orleans after Katrina; 2) developing an empirical model for measuring community resilience along the Gulf of Mexico; 3) coupled natural-human dynamics in a vulnerable coastal system. While she conveys a good deal about these distinct subject matters, she does not address at length the intellectual synthesis she hopes to achieve with this research material. There is very little here about the theoretical contours of the

conceptualization of community resilience and how that will be communicated in the final book. Nor does Lam spend much time on how her “teaching materials will be added and integrated” into the book’s argument.

Criterion 3: The quality of the applicant’s previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant’s preparations for the current project

Lam has an impressive record of scholarship and service. She has authored 99 refereed articles and co-authored two books; just as impressive the range of subjects on which she has published “including spatial interpolation, fractals, cancer mortality, scale and uncertainties, AIDS in America, business recovery in New Orleans after Katrina, community resilience assessment, coastal vulnerability modeling using a coupled natural-human system approach, and lately social media and disaster resilience.” Lam’s accomplishments and publications speak to her substantial energy and expertise in approach this subject and the likely high quality of the final product.

Criterion 4: The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

Lam reports that her substantial compiled materials require “much more additional work” in order to render them into a volume that is “cohesive, comprehensive, and easy to follow.” Given that she has not clearly sketched out how she will synthesize her substantial research to date, it is not entirely clear she will be able to complete the considerable work this ambitious project entails during the grant period.

Recommendation for Funding:

The panel does not recommend funding.

Amy Lesen, Oral Histories of Scientists at the Boundary: Interdisciplinarity, Public Engagement, and Transformation

Project Summary: Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

Lesen proposes to write about environmental scientists as they grapple with the challenges of interdisciplinary research and addressing their work to diverse audiences. She is right to assert that her work will be of interest to “biophysical scientists, to sociologists of science and STS scholars, to historians of science and environmental historians, to policy makers, and also to academic institutions that are seriously pursuing a change in how they train environmental scientists or reward their work.”

Criterion 1: The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

Lesen aims to account for current environmental science at a moment of tumult and transition, as this varied discipline struggles to contend with shifting methods and analytics amidst charged political contestation over its central claims and findings. Lesen approaches this task via a collection of life histories of researchers, generated by asking them to reflect on their experiences contending with interdisciplinary challenges and the difficulties of pursuing value-neutral work in an era of heightened partisanship. Guided by ideals of making scientific findings accessible and intelligible to a wider public, these scientists confront disparate politicized receptions of their research. Lesen recognizes we can learn a great deal from their experiences—in terms of career trajectory and public understanding of science—through close analysis of their social and institutional dimensions. Her approach is geared to address policy and social impacts from “the way climate and environmental change research and policy is carried out in the future.” Lesen’s work should “contribute to the growing body of research in science and civic engagement, as well as how the scientific community views the boundaries of disciplinarity”; further, this research speaks to “our understanding of how to nurture communication between scientists, policy makers, community members, and other stakeholders.”

Criterion 2: The strength of the proposal’s conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

Lesen has assembled an impressive collection life history interviews from a range of scientists, targeting those who work at the edges of particular disciplines; those who encounter various interdictions and opportunities for investigating complex ecological phenomena. Her sample is well selected, featuring diverse social and gender perspectives. In these accounts of these scientists’ career choices and objectives, Lesen is convinced that their “stories of why and how they do their work will give evidence that environmental scientists have as much of a personal stake in this information as anyone else, and a crucial stake in helping transform the way their research is translated to the public.” Lesen is savvy concerning how to treat these as distinct case studies but also as evidencing patterned

interactions that reflect challenges facing ecological researchers in institutional settings that alternately hamper, enable and structure scientists' undertakings. Importantly, she is cognizant of "how the environmental and scientific problems of our time are influencing scientific social and cultural practices and institutions"; she is astute about these dynamic relationships and recognizes that the ways scientific problems are studied, analyzed, and addressed to various audiences warrant as much attention as the findings themselves. Lesen applied previously for an ATLAS grant, and this version of her proposal features a fuller elaboration of the larger theoretical and analytical concerns informing this project.

Criterion 3: The quality of the applicant's previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant's preparations for the current project

Lesen's research record is strong. Her work has been supported multiple times by the National Science Foundation, National Oceanographic and Atmosphere Administration, and Louisiana Board of Regents, for projects centered around environmental change in Louisiana. She recently co-edited a book (*Scientists, Experts, and Civic Engagement*) that sets an intellectual foundation for the project she has proposed here. Lesen has also co-authored articles in *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, *Sustainability*, and *Aquatic Microbial Ecology*, along with a single-authored article in *Journal of Environmental Studies and Sciences*. She is well positioned to complete this work at a very high level of quality.

Criterion 4: The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe.

Lesen's proposed plan of work is entirely feasible. Since she has completed the life histories research, drafted the book's introduction and outlined the chapters, she has only to write the manuscript. Her goal of completing the writing by the end of 2018 is reasonable.

Recommendation for Funding:

I strongly recommend that this project should be funded. The budget request appears entirely reasonable and sufficient to supporting Lesen's undertaking.

**Wei Long, An Investigation of the Ferguson Effect and How Publicized Events
Impact Behaviors of Law Enforcement and Criminals**

Project Summary: Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

Professor Long is seeking ATLAS support for a coauthored paper on the policing, trust, and crime effects of highly publicized police use-of-force incidents. He will employ sophisticated econometric methods that exploit patterns in data arising from the 2014 fatal shooting of Michael Brown in Ferguson, Missouri.

Criterion 1: The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

This paper will contribute to two literatures within the economics discipline, namely, urban economics and the economics of crime. The audiences include both academic economists and policy-oriented scholars and policymakers in the criminal justice field. On top of getting published in a peer-reviewed economics journal, it appears likely that the paper will attract media attention. The topic is timely and of great practical importance.

Criterion 2: The strength of the proposal's conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

The project is well conceptualized and well organized, and the plans for project execution are well thought out. Though it is a high-quality project, it is important to note that the ATLAS program is extremely competitive, and generally more projects are recommended for funding than can be funded. For this reason it is not enough for a proposal to be merely very good—it has to be perfect. Professor Long's project is competent and outlines well what he is seeking to achieve, and it is clear that his project is important and worthy of funding. At the same time, the narrative is somewhat rambling, the proposal contains spelling and grammatical errors, there is the occasional awkward wording or sentence construction, and so forth. If the project cannot be funded in this cycle, the panel suggests that Professor Long revise and resubmit the project next year.

If Professor Long decides to revise and resubmit, it would be helpful to include a more detailed description of how sophisticated econometrics methods make a difference for extracting information and understanding from police use-of-force incidents. In other words, if we just casually look at the data and then we apply sophisticated econometric methods to that same data, what is the value added of the latter approach? What is the nature of the “hiddenness” of the information that requires sophisticated econometric methods?

Criterion 3: The quality of the applicant's previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant's preparations for the current project

Professor Long holds a PhD in economics from Texas A&M. He joined Tulane as an assistant professor of economics in 2015. Relatively to his short career, his list of publications is reasonably impressive. His publication record shows that he started out doing econometrics-in-the-abstract (a co-authored article of his appeared in the *Journal of Econometrics*, which is a leading econometrics journal) and recently has pivoted to applying econometrics methods to the applied topic of crime. The proposed project fits nicely into his career trajectory.

Criterion 4: The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

The proposed plan of work is realistic, and it appears likely that the applicant will complete the project within the proposed time frame.

Recommendation for Funding:

The panel recommends this project for full funding.

Brian Marks, Socio-economic Effects of the BP Oil Spill

Project Summary: Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

Professor Marks is seeking ATLAS support to publish results about the BP Oil Spill in the academic literature.

Criterion 1: The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

The results in question were compiled in 2010-2012 by a research team studying the socio-economic effects of the BP oil spill using ethnographic methods. The results were documented in an agency report, and they played a role in the civil litigation against BP, but they haven't yet shown up in the academic literature. In a reverse of standard practice, by which academic researchers figure something out and only then do policy and legal audiences hear about it, in this case broader audiences are aware of something of which academic researchers are unaware.

Professor Marks, who was a member of the research team, proposes to write up four articles. The first article will be multi-authored. It will review the project as a whole, its ethnographic methodology, its team challenges, its principal findings, and its implications for the social science of technological disaster and recovery.

The second article will be single-authored. It will cover the claims process, which became a secondary source of harm and controversy over and above the oil spill itself. We're talking—in Professor Marks's words—about “the tragi-comical ways the handling of BP spill subsistence claims were misinterpreted, denied, and eventually transformed through concerted advocacy, legal action, and learning by the claims processing agencies involved.” It isn't entirely clear from the proposal, but it sounds as if this second article would constitute original research rather than just presentation of preexisting results (a good thing!). Moreover, the proposed research covers a topic that has not been widely explored in the social sciences and is ill-understood by society. From the perspective of a social scientist, this is the most exciting part of Professor Marks's proposal.

The third article, also single-authored, will cover the subsistence use of natural resources. The paragraph describing this article was somewhat opaque and difficult to understand.

The fourth article will analyze the way ethnicity shaped the effects of and responses to the oil spill. The coastal communities include Vietnamese-Americans, African-Americans, and Hispanic Americans. Professor Marks, who is fluent in Vietnamese, was assigned to interview the Vietnamese-Americans. He will cover Vietnamese-American livelihood transitions and within-group and across-group differentiation processes. For example, you might think that nail salon workers would be unaffected by the oil spill, but in fact they were indirectly affected by virtue of their clients being directly affected by the loss of seafood work, offshore oilfield work, and tourism.

Criterion 2: The strength of the proposal's conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

This is an interesting project, though the panel has two concerns. First, it is not entirely clear from the proposal which parts of the project constitute a writeup of preexisting results from 2010-2012 for the academic literature and which parts constitute new research. Both are valuable—new research is arguably more valuable—but Professor Marks needs to be clearer about which components fit where. Professor Marks, as he pitches his project to social science audiences, should present the new research as the core of his project, and then might mention in passing that he will be doing science a service by moving results from the non-peer-reviewed realm to the peer-reviewed realm.

Second, the writing style is rambling, and the argument is often unclear. To give but one very small example of sloppy writing, Professor Marks mentions BOEM, and it took me some searching around in the proposal until I ran across a footnote that let me guess that BOEM stands for the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. To give a larger example, pick just about any paragraph—say the paragraph that starts “The significance of the work to its field(s)”—and you’ll find yourself getting bogged down in a tangle of sentences. The ATLAS award is very competitive, and a proposal needs to be perfect for the proposal to be a serious contender.

Criterion 3: The quality of the applicant's previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant's preparations for the current project

Professor Marks holds a PhD in geography from the University of Arizona dating back to 2010. He served on the above-mentioned research team in 2011 and served as a principal data analyst and author of the two-volume Bureau of Ocean Energy Management report. He is the recipient of various grants (to learn Vietnamese, to do field research in Vietnam, and so forth) and has published about a dozen pieces. Though there is something of a dearth of publications in peer-reviewed journals in his record, one can reasonably say that the whole point of his proposal is to move results from the non-peer-reviewed realm to the peer-reviewed realm. Professor Marks is currently a university instructor at LSU A&M and has won a teaching award.

Overall, Professor Marks comes across as a scholar who is deeply invested in and knowledgeable about the communities that were affected by the BP oil spill. He sounds like the perfect person to write an ethnographic account of what happened.

Criterion 4: The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

The proposed plan of work is realistic, and it appears likely that the applicant will complete the project within the proposed timeframe.

Recommendation for Funding:

The panel does not recommend funding.

Lori Martin, The Untold Story of Abe Hawkins: Horse Racing, Romanticizing, and the Myth of Privilege on Southern Plantations

Project Summary: Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

Martin proposes to write a book, *The Untold Story of Abe Hawkins*, about a “race rider” jockey, whose biography conveys “how the system of slavery impacted the lives of persons treated as chattel on plantations.” The audience for this book is principally scholars in sociology and African and African American Studies, but possibly also reaching a more general readership.

Criterion 1: The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

Martin has chosen an individual, Abe Hawkins, who opens up debate about the relative forms of privilege in slave life on Louisiana plantations. Hawkins and his owner, Duncan Kenner, figure into shifting historical interpretations relationships between whites and blacks during and after the Civil War. Too often this relationship has been romanticized; Martin argues that historians “mistakenly characterize the experiences of slaves, such as Abe Hawkins, as representing various forms of privilege.” Her studiously researched account aims to correct this misinterpretation. As Martin explains, “There is a need to unpack and address the complexity of the relationship between slave owners and slaves and this can be accomplished quite well by looking at the life of Abe Hawkins and other black jockeys.” She characterizes these jockeys as race riders: “one who must navigate within an oppressive multilevel and multidimensional system of oppression where their very humanity is disregarded and he/she is forced to contribute to their own oppression and to that of others with membership in their racial group, all the while seeking to challenge and dismantle the structures underpinning said system.” Martin’s choice of Hawkins and her ability to orient his story in a larger context will likely make a significant contribution to the study of slave/owner relations.

Criterion 2: The strength of the proposal’s conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

One strength of Martin’s proposal lies in her keen sense of the larger context revealed by Hawkins’ life, while another lies in her clear account of the book she plans to write. Martin delineates the book’s argument in detail and conveys its overall scope and depth. Martin’s book will deftly treat current interest in plantation life before turning to the historical particulars that disrupt romanticized images of slave life. Martin’s approach is to frame myths pertaining to Hawkins and then subsequently dismantle their distortions through careful historical research. Notably, Hawkins’ life is revealing because he was a prominent figure in horse racing, which during antebellum America, offers “a microcosm of American society, especially at it relates to intergroup relations between blacks and whites.” Martin makes the case for seeing jockeys like Hawkins, as well as black athletes, as “rebel sojourners,” “figures who traveled around the country and the globe exposing white

supremacy, particularly after the Civil War.” Martin’s last chapter mirrors the book’s opening by orienting this history to current concerns by speaking “to perceptions about black people, including black athletes today, and the need for contemporary race riders and the challenges they face.”

Criterion 3: The quality of the applicant’s previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant’s preparations for the current project.

Martin is an accomplished scholar. She has authored two books (*Black Asset Poverty and the Enduring Racial Divide* and *White Sports Black Sports*), co-authored another (*Pay to Play*, exploring “the linkages between the historic criminalization of black male bodies to the unwillingness to pay athletes in high-revenue generating sports”), and just edited, *Color Struck*, “a collection of essays about role skin tone plays in determining the life chances and opportunities.” This strong record of scholarship testifies to the likely high quality of her proposed book.

Criterion 4: The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

Martin reports that she has already written much of the manuscript. The remaining chapters she plans to write (five and six) still “require a great deal of time spent in state and local archives.” Given uncertainties of archival research, this may present a challenge for Martin, but her publishing record suggests her confidence that she can complete this during the grant period is well founded.

Recommendation for Funding:

The panel recommends full funding for this project.

Kent Mathewson, From Afro-Diasporic Weed to WMD: The Curious Case of the Castor Bean Plant

Project Summary: Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

Mathewson aims to write a cultural history of the castor bean plant, focusing on its uses by slaves in preparing poisons. The principal audience is students in geography or related fields.

Criterion 1: The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

Mathewson characterizes the significance of the project in demonstrating that a “biographic” approach to “a single plant species can shed light on a number of seemingly disparate cultural, social, political, and economic processes through a long span of human history, and across much of the globe.” It is a bold gambit but one that draws from an increasing attention by anthropologists and historians to the social lives of nonhumans, whether as commodities or unruly “weeds,” in the case of *Ricinus communis*, the species at the heart of Mathewson’s project. This plant has multiple uses, extending back as much 20,000 years, so he has chosen an excellent subject to make this larger case. Importantly, as well, its use by African slaves in the Americas was highly developed, and its trans-Atlantic trails promise to be quite revealing of lifeways that eluded or were shunted aside by the historical record.

Criterion 2: The strength of the proposal’s conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

The strength of Mathewson’s proposal lays in its wide-ranging attention to this curious, pervasive plant. Yet this is also the proposal’s central weakness. Mathewson chronicles “notorious appearances” of this plant’s byproducts (castor oil and ricin) but many of these instances seem to have little or no bearing on the narrative he wants to craft (e.g. KGB, Saddam Hussein, Kim Jung-un, etc). The focus needs to be narrowed, perhaps by focusing solely on slave poisons and the prohibitions against their preparation and applications.

Criterion 3: The quality of the applicant’s previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant’s preparations for the current project

Mathewson is an established scholar in the field, with several edited volumes to his credit. *Dangerous Harvest: Drug Plants and the Transformation of Indigenous Landscapes* (Oxford), seems to have provided an intellectual foundation or jumping off point for the work he plans to undertake with *Ricinus communis*. This record of scholarship speaks to his preparedness for this undertaking.

Criterion 4: The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

Mathewson's plan of work is overly ambitious for this grant period, incorporating "archival, library, and field research (beyond what has been accomplished to date) and the time for writing to complete a book length manuscript on the culture history of the castor bean plant." This is simply not feasible, and it is certainly doubtful that he can "write a chapter a month," while also conducting research.

Recommendation for Funding:

The panel does not recommend funding.

Heather McKillop, Presenting the Ancient Maya in 3D

Project Summary: Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

McKillop proposes to write a digital book on the use of 3D technology in archaeological research, using a case study of the Underwater Maya project as its frame. The intended audience for this book “will be archaeologists, including students, as well as a broader academic and public audience interested in 3D digital imaging and 3D printing.”

Criterion 1: The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

McKillop is convinced that “3D technology is critical to the future of archaeology research in general”; this project offers a glimpse of its potential in underwater contexts in relation to sites in Belize that date to the height of Classic Maya Civilization. The proposal lays heavy emphasis on McKillop’s technical expertise but it pays little attention to the intellectual dimensions revealed through this technique. The resulting book will certainly showcase 3D digital images, but its impact on academic or lay audiences is unclear.

Criterion 2: The strength of the proposal’s conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

McKillop is clearly an expert Mayanist, so the techniques this project will showcase are likely relevant both to understanding the Maya and perhaps other archaeological endeavors. McKillop has compiled an impressive amount of visual material (e.g. 4042 mapped wooden architectural posts) and she understands their illustrative potential. As well, this will be a digital book, a new and potentially influential trend in academic publishing. But it is not clear that the framing of this project—“Presenting the Ancient Maya in 3D”—will either reach a larger audience or even appeal to Mayanists more generally who do not have underwater projects. In the “project goals” section, McKillop suggests “each chapter will focus on a different research question”—but does not spell them out in detail. Her outlined chapters each feature an attention to particular artifacts (figurine whistles, stone tools, pottery samples, etc.) without explaining their significance to larger arguments or concerns in Maya archaeology.

Criterion 3: The quality of the applicant’s previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant’s preparations for the current project

As noted above, McKillop is an established expert on the Maya, and this project follows on the heels of her other books: *Salt: White Gold of the Ancient Maya* and *In Search of Maya Sea Traders*, as well as her forthcoming work, “Salt, A Mover and Shaker in Ancient Maya Society.” This record of publication speaks both to McKillop’s strengths as a researcher and her clear understanding of what is entailed by writing a book and addressing it to a scholarly audience. This is a favorable track record for considering the promise of her current proposal.

Criterion 4: The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

McKillop specifies a manageable schedule for writing and completing ten chapters. Roughly one quarter of the text is already completed. Still, the scope of this project is ambitious and it is not entirely clear all of the planned work can be completed during the course of the grant period.

Recommendation for Funding:

The panel does not recommend funding.

Jason Nesbitt, Chavín de Huántar and its Neighbors: Reconsidering the Chavín Phenomenon

Project Summary: Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

Nesbitt proposes to complete an edited book entitled *Chavín de Huántar and its Neighbors: Reconsidering the Chavín Phenomenon*. The intended audience is archaeologists working in the Central Andes but may also interest those working on the development of sociopolitical complexity.

Criterion 1: The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

Nesbitt proposes to complete an edited volume on an Andean ceremonial center, Chavín de Huántar, one that played an outsized role as an early urban center in ancient Peru. The research for this project will be showcased in a Dumbarton Oaks symposium in October concerning work on Pre-Columbian archaeology and art history, indicating this project has already been vetted and regarded as superior. The edited volume aims to showcase recent research on Chavin-related centers in Peru, which amount to “a critical reassessment of models of interregional interaction during the late second and early first millennia B.C.” Themes in this research highlight the development of inequality and the impacts of long-distance trade. Nesbitt envisions the audience for this volume as expanding beyond area specialists, extending to “archaeologists interested in the development of sociopolitical complexity.”

Criterion 2: The strength of the proposal’s conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

The strength of this project lies in the culmination of new, developing perspectives on how ceremonial centers played outsized role in shaping core-periphery dynamics of empires. Nesbitt is clearly steeped in the particular history of Chavín de Huántar, but he is also seeking to develop a wider comparative frame of analysis. However, he does not sketch the contours of those comparisons in this proposal. Nesbitt’s contribution to this edited volume will be foundational; he will co-author two of the fifteen chapters (an introduction and one on the site of Campanayuq Rumi) and write a single-author treatment of additional sites in the Chavin heartland. But he offers little in the way of outlining the subject matter in the other twelve chapters, so it is not possible to discern whether there will be a strong thematic coherence to the volume or whether its core concerns will truly speak to larger interests in ceremonial centers via comprehensive argument or narrative.

Criterion 3: The quality of the applicant’s previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant’s preparations for the current project

Nesbitt directs the “Chavin Hinterlands Project,” a ten-year study examining broader

settlement patterns involving environing small-scale settlements. He is also co-director of a project focusing on Chavin in relation to its role in interregional interactions and developing social inequality, involving Japanese and Peruvian archaeologists. Nesbitt is a young scholar and has a number of articles listed as in press, accepted and in review. He has published his research in journals with regional focus (*Peruvian Archaeology* and *Andean Past*) but also in the more general journal, *Antiquity*.

Criterion 4: The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe.

Since this proposal largely features editing the work of other scholars participating in the Dumbarton Oaks symposium, it will quite likely be completed within the timeframe of this grant. The one uncertainty is that it is not clear how much thematic coherence is anticipated from the conference participants. If there is a diversity of perspectives and approaches, it may take Nesbitt longer than expected to make the individual chapters cohere into a unified volume.

Recommendation for Funding:

The panel does not recommend funding.

**Andrew Sluyter, Publication of an Online Database of Colonial Maps for the
Analysis of Social and Environmental Change in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth
Centuries**

Project Summary: Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

This project aims to publish an online analytical database and front-end website with interactive features for accessing Louisiana's colonial land survey maps. The audience would be university and high school instructors aiming to engage their students with primary research material.

Criterion 1: The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

There is a great deal of archival material (particularly maps) on land-use patterns in Louisiana, potentially bearing on "our understanding of differences in the acquisition and use of land by people of African, French, Spanish, English, German, and mixed origin." The problem is accessing this material and navigating it in a comprehensive manner. Sluyter envisions that colonial maps offer insights into "environmental changes such as coastal erosion, social changes such as ethnic settlement patterns, political changes related to territorial integration, family genealogy, and other topics." This is a significant array of subjects and concerns. The database Sluyter aims to produce will likely be of great interest to historians, geographers, and anthropologists. But its actual significance will remain something of an open question, depending on whether scholars in these disciplines access this resource.

Criterion 2: The strength of the proposal's conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

The matter of conceptualization and organization here is not so much an intellectual matter as one of digitizing large quantities of historical materials. In that regard, Sluyter's project is quite well organized. He has targeted important materials (some 1,400 colonial maps) and discerned their possible relevance to researchers; and he has diagnosed a notable problem: "The Louisiana Digital Library does not have any analytical functionality...and cannot perform the analyses necessary to use the survey maps and documents to understand spatial-temporal patterns of colonial land acquisition and use by people of varied ethnic origins." This is the problem Sluyter's project aims to address by georeferencing already-scanned items in GIS so they relate readily to modern base maps, while also translating text features and making all this available through an open-access website. He has a well-aligned problem and digital solution.

Criterion 3: The quality of the applicant's previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant's preparations for the current project

Sluyter is an accomplished historian of the Atlantic world, with an impressive record of publication (37 articles in leading journals), which includes a book with Yale University Press based upon research that was supported by a previous ATLAS grant (2009-10). Just as importantly, he is digitally dexterous and astute, as manifest in such online projects as *Hispanic and Latino New Orleans* and *The Atlantic Network Project*, which was supported by a fellowship from the American Council of Learned Societies (2012-2013). This record attests to the likely high quality of this finished project.

Criterion 4: The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

Sluyter's plan of work is ambitious but it is based on a good deal of previous digitizing work, though there remain the tasks of locating and scanning 1,000 land grants (the "Pintado Papers") and developing the web platform for *Landscape Louisiane*. Still, Sluyter has sketched out a reasonable schedule of "tasks to be completed," which indicate he will likely complete this project within the grant's timeframe.

Recommendation for Funding:

The panel recommends full funding for this project, if sufficient monies are available.

Benjamin Sperisen, Optimal Policy Under Collusion

Project Summary: Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

Professor Sperisen is seeking ATLAS support to work on a multi-authored research project that will develop a game-theoretic methodology to analyze the case of a policy designer (e.g., a government or a manager) and some number of agents (e.g., firms or employees) who can collude in ways that might aid or undermine the policy designer's goals.

Criterion 1: The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

The potential applications of the proposed research include a government organizing a competitive procurement auction on a road building contract; a government seeking to reduce drug violence in the face of competing—and possibly colluding—drug cartels; and a US-led coalition fighting to expel the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria. The examples illustrate the potential practical use of the game-theoretic approach; but the proposed research is not about examples or applications, it is about developing the game-theoretic approach itself.

What is at issue here is that repeated games often rely on simplifying assumptions to ensure that the models in question are solvable “by hand” (that is, by a game theorist with pen and pencil). Professor Sperisen's purpose is to allow for richer assumptions by allowing for repeated games to be solved with the help of computer algorithms rather than “by hand.”

This project will appeal to a game-theoretic audience within the economics discipline. The topic comes across as highly specialized and it seems unlikely that the project will appeal to a larger audience within the economics discipline, let alone a broader policy or lay audiences. The project is not a good fit for an ATLAS grant; it is—in some sense that is not meant to be pejorative—too narrowly focused. ATLAS grants are very competitive, and an excellent project that speaks both to a specialized audience and a broader interdisciplinary or lay audience will tend to trump an excellent project that speaks to a specialized audience. That is the reason why I recommend not funding the project; there is nothing wrong with the project per se, which almost certainly will be published in a peer-reviewed economics journal, perhaps even a leading journal.

Criterion 2: The strength of the proposal's conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

The project is well conceptualized and well organized, and the plans for project execution are well thought out.

Criterion 3: The quality of the applicant's previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant's preparations for the current project

Professor Sperisen holds a PhD in economics from the University of Texas, Austin dating back to 2015. That same year he joined Tulane as an assistant professor of economics. His list of publications and working papers is somewhat short, but not unusually so for someone in his second year as an assistant professor of economics. Overall Professor Sperisen comes across as an accomplished young scholar.

Criterion 4: The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

The proposed plan of work is realistic, and it appears likely that the applicant will complete the project within the proposed time frame.

Recommendation for Funding:

The panel does not recommend funding.

Christopher Sullivan, Why not rebel? The micro-foundations of political order

Project Summary: Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

Professor Sullivan is seeking ATLAS support to study the origins and consequences of post-conflict social order.

Criterion 1: The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

How do regimes establish and institutionalize order in the aftermath of sustained civic conflict such as a civil war? We would also like to understand why some post-conflict states backslide into violence and others don't, why the backsliding doesn't necessarily follow the same pattern as the original slide, and so forth. To this end, we need to study the complex relationship between state repression, political competition, and the emergence of social order. Basically, local-level political order emerges to limit political competition and protect elite privilege—the result can be discriminatory or predatory, but is legitimate enough to get the society up and running.

Professor Sullivan's book centers around the case of post-conflict Guatemala. He will apply quantitative methods with unique micro-level process tracing evidence from more than 10 million documents in the Guatemalan police archive.

The project speaks to academic audiences in two subfields of political science, namely, comparative politics and international relations.

Criterion 2: The strength of the proposal's conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

This project is a resubmission from last year and is much improved. The panel continues to have three concerns. First, the case selection (Guatemala primarily; South Africa, Nepal, and Indonesia are mentioned in passing) is insufficiently justified. It is also different from last year's equally unjustified case selection (Guatemala, Northern Ireland, the United States)—whence the change? The proposal's failure to grapple with the issue of case selection is all the more important given that the subfield of comparative politics is famously insistent that its scholars select their cases for good reasons and spell out their reasons.

Second, it would be useful to know more about the quantitative methods—how does one get a grip on textual evidence scattered across 10 million documents? What is “process tracing evidence”? The proposal takes up a lot of space explaining the theoretical framework and almost no space spelling out the empirical methodology.

Third, a strong comparative politics proposal does something very tricky, namely, it gets across a universal truth about (say) the emergence of post-conflict order even as it delves into

the thick case study details of one or more cases such as (say) Guatemala. A reader who isn't particularly interested in Guatemala would nonetheless lap up all the thick detail about Guatemala precisely because the thick details reveals a larger truth which then carries over to post-conflict cases the reader cares about or know a lot about such as (say) the American Civil War or post-World War II Germany and Japan. Professor Sullivan does not quite pull off this trick. As he lays out his theoretical framework, it reads as being about a specific country (presumably Guatemala); it does not seem to convey a universal truth about the emergence of post-conflict order, that is, as I'm perusing his theoretical framework, I don't find myself all of sudden seeing other cases I care about or know a lot about in a fresh light.

Why am I once again recommending that this project not be funded even though the proposal is much improved? ATLAS grants are extremely competitive. Given the large number of excellent proposals, a project that is merely very good falls short even when it is a worthwhile and publishable project. The recommendation to reject is not so much a comment on the proposed project as it is a comment on the ATLAS award budget constraint.

Criterion 3: The quality of the applicant's previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant's preparations for the current project

Last year's positive assessment of the applicant still holds: "The holder of a PhD in Political Science from the University of Michigan, which has a leading graduate program in political science, Professor Sullivan is an Assistant Professor of Political Science at Louisiana State University. Given his relatively short career (his PhD dates 2014), he is extraordinarily well published in peer-reviewed journals, including several of the leading journals in political science, on topics related to his ATLAS project. Professor Sullivan is the recipient of NSF and Social Science Research Council grants, and he recently organized a workshop that attracted scholars in his field of research, all of which are indicative of his status in the field."

Professor Sullivan comes across as superbly qualified and excellently prepared.

Criterion 4: The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

The proposed plan of work is realistic, and it appears likely that the applicant will complete the project within the proposed timeframe.

Recommendation for Funding:

The panel does not recommend funding.

Yejun Wu, Classifying English Verb Phrases as Semantic Relations

Project Summary: Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

This project summarizes and advances work on classifying verb phrases as semantic relations between entities.

Criterion 1: The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

Wu's project develops from an oil spill topic map project funded by the Gulf of Mexico Research Initiative (2011 to 2013) but it expands to a wider consideration of how semantic relationships, are used to express relationships between two concepts. The latter is a far large concern, revealing an intriguing inattention in information science to the classification of verb phrases as semantic entities. Wu's main objective is to expand verb phrase taxonomy "to be a comprehensive taxonomy of semantic relations." The resulting book will appeal to search experts to the Library and Information Sciences community more generally.

Criterion 2: The strength of the proposal's conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

Wu effectively offers a literature review of verb classification schemes that buttresses her claims that this area of inquiry has largely been overlooked by information science researchers. Wu then turns to the task of explaining how certain classes, such as cause-effect relationships inform or emerge in verb phrases. But the relationship between these linguistic taxonomies and broader concerns with search strategies, text retrieval system, and knowledge organization schemas sketched in the "Narrative Account of Career" section are not made clear. The ontological aspects of this subject seem important, too, but are not elaborated upon or developed in detail.

Criterion 3: The quality of the applicant's previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant's preparations for the current project

Wu has a limited record of publications, featuring an edited volume with CRC Press and two co-authored pieces in *Knowledge and Organization*. Her work text retrieval systems has been well regarded by the Text Retrieval Conference, so she clearly has expertise in this area. This all suggests Wu is prepared for this undertaking but is insufficient to speak to the promise of the resulting research.

Criterion 4: The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

Wu's schedule features a great deal of work yet to be accomplished, including processing 10,000 documents to extract verb phrases and then organizing them further into a

consolidated taxonomy, resulting finally in a comprehensive one. Only phase 6, the final one, references the task of writing the actual manuscript. Given that Wu has not previously written a book, it is likely that this plan of work is overly ambitious and not aligned with ATLAS's emphasis on near-term completion.

Recommendation for Funding:

The panel does not recommend funding.

Ferruh Yilmaz, Media, Crisis and Populist Success

Project Summary: Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

Professor Yilmaz is seeking ATLAS support to introduce the concept of moral panic into the analysis of a triad consisting of (1) a societal sense of crisis, (2) the rise of populism, and (3) the media's role in supporting that rise.

Criterion 1: The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

When we look at the rise of populism and the media's role in supporting that rise, we find a striking regularity, namely, the existence of social anxieties that get projected onto a group that is perceived of—indeed, constructed—as deviant. Professor Yilmaz's purpose is to explore how the allegedly deviant group is identified and targeted. His novel idea is to introduce the concept of a moral panic into the analysis.

A moral panic serves to identify a group as deviant, and “they” are then blamed for the breakdown of “our” way of life. A succession of moral panics generates a sense of social malaise. Moral panic researchers have generally studied moral panics in isolation, however, rather than examining their cumulative and embedded nature and larger societal implications. This is the omission that Professor Yilmaz seeks to address.

More specifically, Professor Yilmaz seeks to study the moral panic conception of Muslims as “folk devils” in the context of right-wing populist politics. Two panics will be analyzed in detail: the Ground Zero Mosque in New York City in 2010-2011 and the Danish Cartoon Crisis of 2005-2006. Also relevant is the panic about Syrian refugees in Twin Falls, Idaho who were supposedly raping young American girls (no actual Syrian refugees had settled there) and the Charlie Hebdo shooting in Paris.

Professor Yilmaz's research is of potential interest to academic audiences in the disciplines of communication studies and political science. His topic is very timely, and hence also of interest to lay audiences interested in rise of populism in the United States and elsewhere.

Criterion 2: The strength of the proposal's conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

The overall topic—the idea of introducing the moral panic concept into the analysis of (1) a societal sense of crisis, (2) the rise of populism, and (3) the media's role in supporting that rise—is excellent.

The writeup of the proposal is, however, rambling and sloppy. To give but one example, in the section titled “My book project,” Professor Yilmaz tells us that he will be studying two

moral panics in detail (Ground Zero Mosque and Danish Cartoon Crisis), but then he introduces a third moral panic (Syrian refugees) along with an event that isn't really a moral panic (Charlie Hebdo). Professor Yilmaz does not give us a sense of what exactly he'll be covering, why he selected these particular cases, what theoretical and empirical methodologies he'll be applying, and so forth. At best Professor Yilmaz is hinting at what could be an intensely interesting project. With a much better conceptualization and writeup, this project would have been a real contender for the grant.

Criterion 3: The quality of the applicant's previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant's preparations for the current project

Professor Yilmaz holds a PhD in communication studies from the University of California, San Diego dating back to 2006. He is currently an associate professor at Tulane. His list of publications is on the short side, and there is a dearth of peer-reviewed articles in leading communication journals. The star of his CV is a book on *How the Workers Became Muslim: Immigration, Culture, and Hegemonic Transformation in Europe*, which was published by the University of Michigan Press. Professor Yilmaz has been the recipient of various fellowships and scholarships, a book award, and various grants. He worked as a journalist before he became an academic, and his journalistic expertise will be extremely useful for the proposed project (with its media angle on moral panics and the rise of populism). Overall Professor Yilmaz comes across as the right kind of person to write this kind of book.

Criterion 4: The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

The proposed plan of work as presented is realistic, and it appears likely that the applicant will complete the project within the proposed time frame. More time may be needed if the project is further defined and refined.

Recommendation for Funding:

The panel does not recommend funding.