

known about, "Sex in the Workplace." Clicking on that gave me four more titles located in my UC Berkeley library. Then I did something that I recommend to everyone who has Internet access:¹² I put that same subject heading into OCLC: WorldCat (a consortium of research university libraries) and got 353 more books. If I were in a more adventuresome mode, I would have moved on to the Library of Congress itself, which by congressional decree holds every book published in the United States, and a lot more besides.

It's a little more complicated, but you can do the same thing with journal articles, sort of. Because journal articles build on the model of normal science, you will find that your key article, if it is as central as you think it is, is cited again and again in subsequent journal articles, most of which will presumably in some way be addressing the material or question which you are interested in and which this article is about.

It turns out that you can track who is citing the article which excites you, provided, of course, that it wasn't published just this month. Using the ISI Web of Knowledge, you can enter what used to be called (and somewhere in this digital terrain, still is) the Social Science Citation Index. You put in the name of the person who wrote the article, the journal where the article was published, and presto, you get a list of all the people who have cited it. Those citations are, in theory, related to what you are interested in. In addition, in my own library at least, I can access the full text of some and maybe many of those citations by just clicking something called "e-links."

In much the same way, when I access the electronic journal database known as JStor (www.jstor.org), which most research libraries subscribe to, a pane to the right of the article accommodatingly shows me, via Google Scholar, all of the articles that cite the article I am reading. Once you have found one way into the forest of "the literature," the job just gets easier and easier. You can follow the trail of bread crumbs (like Hansel and Gretel) to find almost all of the people who are interested in that small center section of your daisy.

Kristin Luter, Salsa Dancing
Reviewing the Literature into the Social Sciences 93

2008. Cambridge, MA: Harvard

U.
 Press

And if you keep good records (see the next tip), before long you will have a very good sense of who the most-cited "experts" in your area of interest are, not to mention a good feel for what the fights and debates are.

6. *Keep good records.* This one should be obvious, but you'd be surprised how long it took me to find it, and how grateful even my graduate students are to be reminded of it. For many years, especially with the explosion of info-glut, I never kept very good records of where and what I searched. Oh, sure, I kept good records of what I found, but not what I was looking for, nor where I had found my prize items.

Big mistake. There are certain elaborate searches that I have done at least three times, if not four. And no one has that kind of time. One of my colleagues told me about a great website, designed by the librarians at UCLA. (Didn't I tell you that librarians are the nicest people on the planet?) It's an incredibly helpful, user-friendly guide to doing research, called "Bruin [that's what UCLAers call themselves] Success with Less Stress."¹³ Along with terrific material on intellectual property, and how to use the various kinds of information you can find on the Web with discernment, they also suggest creating a Search Log to remind yourself of how and what and where you searched, and what worked and what didn't. In short, you need to write down the database, the search terms you put in, whether or not the search was successful, and ideas about what to do next. Start doing this tomorrow and you will thank me later, I promise. (I have provided an example of a blank search log in Appendix Four.)

7. *"Harvard," don't read.* A dear friend of mine went to Harvard, and within the very first week of his time there, he discovered that the faculty gave (and probably still give) poor unsuspecting students more reading assignments than a human person could ever read. It took most of them just about a week to figure out that it couldn't be done (the rest had nervous breakdowns), and the smart ones learned how to work smarter, not harder.

So I married this very dear friend of mine, and that is how I found out about what I call "Harvarding." You cannot imagine how depressed I used to get before I learned how to "Harvard," confronted with stacks of books four feet high, knowing that I would never get around to reading them all, and feeling like a failure. Often enough, confronted with such a huge pile, I just took a nap.

From here on out, you must never, ever read a book again unless you have "Harvarded" it first. If you are like me before I learned to "Harvard," you read a book with painful intensity. You underline things; you put notes in the margins; you take notes on your computer or in longhand. And you move very, very slowly. It was not uncommon for me in the old days to spend the better part of an afternoon on ten pages of a book, unless, of course, I fell asleep first.

This is nonsense! Very few books deserve that kind of attention, probably including this one.

Even the relatively few books that are well written and to the point are often hard to follow, because it's a great leap of imagination for the author, once she has been immersed in an area for many years, to figure out what her reader needs to know. At this point, the author probably knows *everything* there is to know about the topic, and sad to say, most academic authors seem totally incapable of making that leap of imagination. (A mistake you will not make in your own book!)

So here is your mantra, which I want you to repeat before you sit down with any book, including this one: "If I'm not getting it, it's her (or his) fault." If you're like me, you flagellate yourself when you read a dense, badly written book, especially if it's one that your colleagues hold in high regard. Such a book has failed in its most elemental job, namely, that of bringing you to the point where you can understand what's at issue. (In all fairness, in a globalizing world of info-glut, I suspect that *no* author can truly connect with all possible readers, but I'm struck by how rarely most scholarly authors even bother to try to connect to any readers, except three or four that the author considers his or her peers.)

For these reasons, this is the time when you should "Harvard" a book. You know what your question is, because of the previous steps. You know what the adjacent areas are because of your "daisy" diagram. You have found a particular book in one of your searches, and you should not spend very much time on it unless it is totally, entirely, on point for your project. By being on point, I mean two things specifically: it has a theoretical "frame" that could be useful for you at least in one section, and/or it has some empirical data that could be useful.

So how do you find out whether the book has a theory or data that would be relevant to you? You "Harvard" it. You look at the Table of Contents and the Index, focusing your laser-like attention on those topics closest to what you care about. You skim the introduction and conclusion. You skim the chapters that might seem relevant. If, and only if, this book seems to be exactly what you were looking for, come back to it; but for the moment, treat all books as if you had only twenty minutes to get everything useful to your study out of it, and then it will disappear in a puff of smoke. Make a book *earn* more of your precious time.

Sometimes, by the way, a book is held in very high regard, and you can't figure out why. Chances are that it either solved a theoretical problem in the field or advanced the state of play in an area. But it's a little hard to figure that out when you are a newcomer to the territory.

What to do? My advice is to put the title of the book into JStor's search engine, and restrict the search to reviews. Read four or five reviews of this book, if you can find them. A good review will not only tell you what the book is about, but it will also usually tell you why the book matters (or doesn't). However, academics, like everyone else, get tics about things, so it's important to read three or four, or ideally six or seven, reviews. At the end, you will know how this book fits into the literature, and you can come back to it.

Once you're back to it, you can still "Harvard" this highly regarded book, if you like, but you can also use it to clarify how your own

thinking differs from the author's, and whether any of your data contradict hers or his.

While we are on the topic of "Harvarding," I'd like to suggest a great resource. Reading is a key practice in academia, but, as this section has made clear, "reading" a book can mean many things. I advise you to go out this minute and buy yourself a copy of Mortimer Adler and Charles Van Doren's *How to Read a Book*, originally published in 1940.¹⁴ Adler and Van Doren have some great tips. One that I will be forever grateful for is the idea of writing your own index on a blank page in the back of the book or elsewhere for ideas or data that really grab you, so that you can find them again when you need them. How many times have you needed to know where an author discusses (fill in the blank here), and you can't find it in the index and you really, really need it? This will not happen again once you learn to write your own index.

8. *Be kind to your readers.* Let's jump ahead some months into the future. You have carefully refined that neat area within the heart of your daisy; you've got a much clearer sense of the various frames that other people are using to address questions like yours; you are happily corresponding with people who are similarly interested; and you've discovered a number of relevant and exciting books and articles. You have "Harvarded" the relevant books and articles, and you have come back to a very, very few and have read them carefully and thoughtfully.

Congratulations! But keep in mind that this is just the first of many times that you will be doing a review of the literature. As your project progresses, and you gather data, it's entirely possible that your frame will shift as well. (T. H. Huxley speaks of the "tragedy of a fact killing a theory," and the same thing happens to frames. Once you get into the field, and find some actual, factual data, you may well shift your frame.)

But let's say, just for argument, that you haven't shifted that much; you have gone out and gathered your data, and you are now at the

happy place where you want to write up your book. (Remember? You are writing a book, no matter what anyone else says or thinks.)

Eventually you will come to the point where you have to provide an official review of the literature, one that is written up. (In fact, in dissertations, it is traditional to have a whole chapter on the review of the literature. I don't always agree, but I do think that *somewhere* you need to show how your work advances the state of play.) What I'm about to say may seem totally obvious, but you'd be surprised by how many of my very smart students get a block when they come to writing this part up.

Here's the flash: *you don't have to write about every book and/or article ever written that is remotely relevant to your question.* You only have to do what Gene Burns did when I recommended him to you as a model, namely give readers an intellectual road map of the existing literature in a smart and critical way, and show us that, however elaborate or intelligent or extensive it might be, that literature doesn't really answer the question that your book will answer for us.

I also find myself wanting some information in the "review of the literature" that is not considered canonical. Because I argue throughout this book that it's important to talk about our work as an example of something larger, I really want to be situated with respect to that "something larger" early on in your book. I want to know how much, how big, and how often. And I want to know, right at the outset, why I should care. So back to our example of flirting at work. Do we have any idea how much flirting at work goes on? (Probably not, since this is such a fresh take on a topic.) But are there any data, no matter how incomplete, that would give me a sense of the scale of the phenomenon? How many people work in gender-integrated jobs where there are both men and women? (Yes, I know, even when a work force is 99 percent one sex and 1 percent the other, there can still be flirting.) How about sexual harassment cases, which we might think of as flirting gone awry? How many of these are there?