Our panel invites papers that explore questions and concerns above. We also welcome papers presenting results of studies utilizing conceptual, theoretical, and/or methodological innovations borrowed from both Political Science and Anthropology.

PATRON-CLIENT RELATIONSHIP: BETWEEN ANTHROPOLOGY AND POLITICAL SCIENCE

Heddy Shri Ahimsa-Putra
Department of Anthropology, Universitas Gadjah Mada

Since the publication of Foster’s ethnography on patron-client relationships among the Tzintzuntzan in Mexico (1963), many anthropologists had followed his step to study, describe and analyze patron-client relationships within the societies they studied. Various terms have been used for those relationships, such as: clientship, clientelism, clientage and patronage. Studies of this phenomenon flourished further as some political scientists used patron-client model to explain political dynamics in non-western countries, as they found that the model they have used in studying political phenomena in western countries could not cope with the socio-political realities and problems in many non-western settings (Scott, 1972).

Fourteen years after Foster’s patronage ethnography, *Friends, Followers and Factions: A Reader in Political Clientelism* was published. A collection of articles on patron-client relationship ships in anthropology, sociology and political science -mostly from 1960-1970s-, the book is a landmark in patron-client studies. A lot has happened in patron-client studies since then, as anthropologists, sociologists and political scientists continue their research on that topic. The question then is: What perspectives (paradigms) have been used by social scientists in studying patron-client relationships? What kinds of insights have been gained? What kinds of problems have been solved? What kinds of theories have been produced?

In this paper the author attempts to answer those questions. The paper will elucidate further how ideas, views, theories on patron-client relations were developed further by anthropologists, sociologists and political scientists in their studies.

STRADDLING BETWEEN DIFFERENT WORLDS: NAVIGATING DIVERSE FIELDWORK MODES

Iqra Anugrah
New Mandala

Social science fieldwork is often seen as a challenging and often-misunderstood intellectual enterprise. Long seen as the domain of the few, fieldwork – more specifically, its major component, immersion – has made a comeback in social science despite the enduring drive toward quantification in the discipline (Morgenbesser and Weiss, 2018; Schatz, 2009). But misperceptions regarding fieldwork, such as its perceived machismo and inability to offer generalizations, still persist among social science researchers and readers while in reality fieldwork entails different types of work and modes of engagement with local interlocutors and social realities.

This paper therefore aims to debunks the myths surrounding fieldwork and contextualizes it. Focusing on my own fieldwork experience in Indonesia since 2015 as an early-career, anthropologically-inclined political scientist, I will discuss my experience conducting fieldwork for three different types of research: policy, dissertation, and advocacy research. In particular, I will
highlight the serendipities that I encountered on the field, the fieldwork logistics, and my experience in gathering data and dealing with various stakeholders and interlocutors. It is hoped that this self-reflexive narrative will shed some light on the relationship between researchers and their field sites, demystify fieldwork process, and better situate fieldwork within social science methodological arsenals.

**A Multistage Strategy for the Integration Ethnographic and Qualitative Methods in Anthropology and Political Science**

Mark Woodward

*Center for the Study of Religion and Conflict, Arizona State University*

Cultural Anthropology and Political Science typically employ different methods to address similar issues. It is difficult to imagine an article relying entirely on linear regressions appearing in the pages of the *American Ethnologist*. It is equally difficult to image an article describing political advertisements as discursive strategies for marginalizing subaltern subjectivities appearing in the pages of the *American Journal of Political Science*. Since the 1980s the gap between the two disciplines has widened as they moved in nearly opposite methodological and epistemological directions. Some anthropologists moved away from rigorous data collection and analysis and towards interpretive cultural analysis theoretically formulated by David Schneider and popularized by Clifford Geertz. Many are quite content to called unscientific. Political Science moved towards ever more complex statistical methods to demonstrate that it is “genuinely” scientific. At its worst, positivist Political Science confuses correlation with causality, dismisses qualitative data collection and analyses as inherently biased subjectivism and is obsessed with “sciencism” and statistical rigor. At its worst Interpretive Anthropology becomes “anti-sciencism” denying the possibility of explanation and defining the discipline as intersubjective reflection on shared otherness based on what Geertz termed “deep hanging out” research technologies. The result is that inter-disciplinary conversation, let alone collaborative research, has become increasingly difficult. Proponents of extreme position do not, and indeed cannot, talk to each other because the lack a common intellectual language. This has impoverished both disciplines.

There is, however a middle ground between these extremes that many scholars in both fields are comfortable with. This convergent intellectual space is defined by shared concerns with empirical generalization, theoretically driven explanation and recognition of the difference between scientific method and research technologies. Philosophy of science provides a common meta-language that makes collaborative research possible.

**Philosophical Considerations: Theory, Method and Research Technologies**

Empirical generalization, theory driven explanation and falsification are critical components of the scientific method. There is also a critical distinction between scientific method, which is generally applicable and research technologies that are problem and discipline specific. This distinction is particularly important in the case of generalization. There are cases in which scientific method can be applied to a single case or event others in which theoretical insight precedes empirical observation. Einstein’s contributions to physics and astronomy are clear examples. In the social sciences, there are multiple strategies for generalization. Statistical analysis of large data sets is one example. It is typical of Political Science research strategies. Another, more common in ethnographic research, is that when you ask the same question many times in multiple settings