

# **POLI 701**

## **Theories of Political Inquiry**

**Professor Harvey Starr**  
**Gambrell 432 (777-7292)**  
**starr-harvey@sc.edu**

**University of South Carolina**  
*Fall 2007*

Office Hours: 9:30-11:00am Wed/Thurs and by appointment.

**Note:** *E-mail is the best way to get in touch with me.*

### **INTRODUCTION**

Almost every graduate program in Political Science requires a course like POLI 701. These courses cover a wide range of topics from philosophy of science and epistemology, through the nature and processes of science and the social sciences, the history of Political Science and its status as a science, questions of theory and causation, how we study the empirical world around us, and how we can pull all of these elements together to develop plans to guide the researcher and let others know exactly how some piece of research was designed and executed, that is, *research design*.

In the introductory sections of this syllabus I have borrowed liberally from the syllabi of others who have taught this course at South Carolina, and at other institutions. I wish to acknowledge the material taken from the syllabi of: Don Songer, Sandy Schneider, and Bill Mishler (South Carolina), Bill Dixon (University of Arizona), Jim Garand (Louisiana State University), and Kim Hill (Texas A&M University).

### Background: Course of Study at USC

This is a required seminar that is part of the core curriculum for all Ph.D. students in Political Science, regardless of their subfield specialization. It is generally taken by students in their first semester in the Ph.D. program. The course is generally not recommended for students in the MA program. Students enrolled in Ph.D. courses in other disciplines should consult with the instructor about whether this course is appropriate for your academic program. There are no formal pre-requisites for this course, but all students are expected to have a sufficient background for Ph.D. work in Political Science.

### Description and Objectives

How do we know what we know about politics? What is political knowledge? How is it attained? How do we assess critically the quality of political analysis and the knowledge obtained from such analysis? These are questions we will address in this course. The goal for this course is to provide students with an introduction to the logic of inquiry and the methodology of political research. The course will enhance the ability of students to understand the scientific enterprise generally and as it is pursued in Political Science. While the principal focus will be on the

systematic empirical study of politics (or “neo-positivism,” or the “naturalistic,” or the “scientific” approach), the course should also help students understand different approaches to the systematic study of political phenomena, their theoretical and empirical assumptions, and their different potential contributions to our knowledge and understanding of these phenomena. The course will also help enhance the ability of students to employ different research methods and approaches that are widely used in Political Science, and critically evaluate the theoretical and empirical strengths and weaknesses of research (their own and others). As noted, in pulling these objectives together, this course will help students learn how to design research projects—research you will be expected to carry out in your subsequent graduate seminars, and ultimately for your Ph.D. dissertation. The bottom line is that POLI 701 has been developed to equip each student with the basic concepts, analytical criteria, and research skills that will facilitate participation in later seminars, and allow each student to plan a general course of study at USC. The issues and problems discussed in more general terms in 701 will arise repeatedly in future reading, research, and substantive seminars

### **COURSE READING**

The following, three required-reading books have been ordered and are available at the area bookstores. Two books have also been ordered as recommended for purchase. Note, copies of these books will not be placed on reserve at Thomas Cooper Library.

#### Required

- Earl Babbie, *The Practice of Social Research*, 11<sup>th</sup> ed. (Thomson-Wadsworth, 2007)
- Gary King, Robert Keohane, and Sidney Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry* (Princeton University Press, 1994) [KKV on syllabus]
- D.C. Phillips, *The Expanded Social Scientist's Bestiary* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2000)

#### Recommended

- William R. Shadish, Thomas D. Cook, and Donald T. Campbell, *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference* (Houghton Mifflin, 2002) [SCC on syllabus]
- Kenneth Hoover and Todd Donovan, *The Elements of Social Scientific Thinking*, 8<sup>th</sup> ed. (Thomson-Wadsworth, 2004)

ALL of the other required readings, along with some of the recommended reading (and readings listed for the “Classics” paper) are also available in electronic form on the Blackboard page for POLI 701. These items can be read on-line, down loaded to your own computers, or printed.

Most of these readings will be found by clicking the tab “**eReserve Documents**” in Blackboard—and then the link “POLI701-001-FALL-2007.” Readings on the syllabus marked by a [BB] can be found by clicking on the “**Course Documents**” tab. Any of the recommended or “Classics” readings marked by a double asterisk will be included in this list of electronically available readings (in the “eReserve Document” section). Finally, all books identified by “Reserve Book” in brackets on the syllabus are also available at the Reserves Desk. at Thomas Cooper Library.

Many of the items noted on the syllabus, across the various categories, are articles in professional journals. As such, they will be readily available in the library stacks, or possibly available through JSTOR and INGENTA or other electronic sources. Each week I will take time to discuss the next week's reading in terms of general content, priority, order of reading, etc.

## COURSE REQUIREMENTS/EVALUATION

Each student will be evaluated on the basis of the following calculation of final grades:

- |   |     |
|---|-----|
| 1) class and professional participation | 30% |
| 2) 2 short analytical papers            | 30% |
| 3) Research Design paper                | 40% |

### 1) Participation (30%)

Class participation and preparedness is a major component of evaluation in graduate seminars. Each student will be evaluated on the basis of informed participation and contribution to seminar discussion. *You must come to class prepared to discuss the week's required reading.*

Participation includes your contribution to the presentation and discussion of student research designs at the conclusion of the course. In addition, you will be expected to attend and participate in at least 2-3 of the Political Science Research Workshop colloquia held on Friday afternoons; attend presentations of Ph.D. students preparing to go on job interviews; and participate in recruitment activities of new department faculty.

### 2) Analytical Papers (30%)

Each student will be required to write two short (5 page) papers. These papers may be handed in any time during the semester up to the last due date for each.

**“Classics” Paper:** While not a course on philosophy of science, the syllabus lists a number of “classic” items which focus (mostly) on philosophy of science/epistemology issues. For this paper each student will read one of the suggested “classic” items and write a 5 page paper which analytically links that paper to the required readings for that section of the course. That is, you will indicate how the selected classic item helps build background or context for all (or some) of the required items assigned; use the selected item to indicate strengths and weaknesses of the required reading; and/or use the required readings to indicate strengths and weaknesses of the selected classic item. The last date a classics paper may be submitted is **October 16 (in class)**. Note that there are “classics” listed for weeks beyond October 16. If you are interested in (or already familiar with) those topics/items, you may read ahead and write a paper for “classics” and topics later in the course. Please see the instructor if you have any questions on “classics”/topics.

**Empirical Research Critique Paper:** In discussion with the POLI 701 instructor or instructors in your other courses or in your subfield of interest, you should identify an article published in a political science journal which presents original, empirical research and its findings. You should write a paper in which you critique the article, pointing out what aspects of research design are well done, and which aspects are less well done. Your paper should focus on one or two of the topics covered in Part II of the syllabus, “Research Design and Political Analysis” (topics #6 through #10). The last date an Empirical Research Critique Paper may be submitted is **November 20 (in class)**.

Papers should be written double-spaced, normal margins and normal fonts (Times Roman 12). All written assignments are expected to be submitted by the due dates. Unless accompanied by a legitimate, documented excuse, late papers will receive a zero grade. All paper assignments must be completed in order to receive a passing grade in the course. My policy is not to give incompletes.

### 3) Research Design Paper

A major research design paper (equivalent to a research grant proposal or [brief] thesis or dissertation proposal) will be required of all students. This paper will involve original empirical research on a topic of each student’s choosing that addresses a theoretically-grounded research question of interest to political scientists. Ideally, the finished product should be, subject to some revision, of sufficient quality to be a thesis, dissertation, or grant proposal.

Each student should begin to consider potential research topics (based on individual interests and subfield specialization) as soon as possible, and should consult with the instructor about potential topics and relevant literature. You will probably be advised to see other faculty to consult on topics/literature as well. A timetable for work on the research design paper is provided below. However, **all students must have consulted with the instructor and have the paper topic approved by Friday, September 28.**

The final paper will be due by **4:00 pm on Wednesday, December 12.**

Students will present their research designs in class on November 27 and December 4. In a simulated professional conference panel presentation environment, students will be given 12-15 minutes to present their designs. The other members of the class will act as the audience at the panel, and are expected to ask questions and engage in discussion of the proposal. Further details on presentations will be provided.

## RESEARCH DESIGN ASSIGNMENT

A principal requirement of this course is the development of a formal research design. This assignment integrates in a very practical way the various elements of the course. It provides an opportunity to apply the abstract theoretical lessons of the course to the design of a research project that seeks to address an important, unanswered question in political science

The research design must be typed and may not exceed twenty-five pages (not including references, but including notes), double spaced, with margins (top, bottom, left and right) of at least one inch, and in Times Roman 12. Papers must be written in accordance with the *APSR* manual. The design must be stapled (not paper-clipped or placed in a binder) in the upper left corner. Your paper should be proofread for mistakes, and be professionally presented. HINT: You should get copies of recent articles from the *APSR* (*American Political Science Review*) to use as guides for style.

What is a research design? A substantial part of this course is devoted to answering this question. Indeed, the structure of the course generally follows the structure of a good research design with each week's readings focusing in depth on an important aspect of the research process. Briefly summarized, however, a research design is an intellectual blueprint. It describes and defends a plan of research intended to answer an interesting or important question. A research design does NOT include the execution of the design. Rather, it provides a detailed blueprint of a research project to be conducted in the future. See sections of Babbie, Hoover and Donovan, or Gurr, as examples used in this course, of books devoted to the development of good research design, and the components of such a design. (See also the "Outline of a Research Design" posted on BlackBoard under Course Documents.) HINT: You should read research articles in journals to see real examples of what research designs look like (ignoring the actual reporting of research results).

Although the specific elements of a research design will vary with different topics, there are two fundamental aspects to all designs. First you must identify clearly and precisely the research question you want to answer and justify its importance. Second you must describe in detail how you intend to answer the question you have identified and to justify your choice of strategies. Key to both parts of the process is to be certain that your research is closely tied to existing theory (or theories) and is embedded in the relevant literature (i.e. previous theory and research) on the subject.

**More specifically, a good research design should include all of the following elements:**

1) **A statement of the research question.** A good research question is one that contributes to theory or fundamental knowledge. Good questions are grounded in the existing literature. Frequently they seek to resolve an anomaly in a theory -- to reconcile a theory with an observation that doesn't seem to fit -- or to reconcile competing theories, or to fill in a missing piece or close a gap in existing theory or in the literature. Good research questions frequently begin with the question, "Why ...?" They seek explanations for political actions or events and not

simply descriptions of them (although description often is an important step in the process of explanation).

- 2) A review of the literature.** Good research questions frequently emerge from a review of the literature/existing research on a topic. In reading about a subject you find that you are not convinced by the explanation the author offers because, for example:
- a. you think the author's research methods are flawed, inadequate, or inappropriate to the subject (e.g. the author draws conclusions about adult voters from a study of high school students);
  - b. you believe the authors failed to consider plausible alternative explanations (e.g. in explaining political violence you think the authors made a mistake by failing to consider poverty as a possible cause);
  - c. you think that the author's results are limited by time or space (the author's explanation for political participation in the United States may not be appropriate in your experience for explaining political participation in non-industrialized societies or that the results of a study of voting in 1950 may not be relevant in 1990 when parties are much weaker and campaign spending much greater); or
  - d. there is a "gap" in the literature in that there just does not appear to be any research on what you consider to be an important question.

Even if you have a research question in mind before you start a project, the first step in developing a research design is to review prior research on the topic. This review should summarize, synthesize, and critically evaluate the literature as a whole: where do scholars agree? disagree? where are there gaps? what questions are not asked? NOTE: The focus of a literature review should be on a literature as a whole. A literature review is not an annotated bibliography. Nor is it a series of article and book reviews stuck together one after another. Rather, the focus should be on types of theory and research, along with their strengths and weaknesses. The idea is to concentrate on the forest and not allow yourself to become preoccupied with individual trees. Your discussion of the literature should emphasize the strengths and weaknesses-- both theoretical and methodological-- of existing work. Presumably, the research you propose will attempt to build on these strengths while improving upon the weaknesses. Indeed, the proposed improvements to the literature are what make your work interesting.

**3) A statement of theory and/or hypotheses.** This section should identify the specific propositions and research hypotheses to be "tested" in your research. It also should discuss how these propositions were derived -- a process that typically takes you back to theory and to your literature review. Some scholars feel this is the most crucial aspect of research design. At the very least you should evoke a theory (a set of explicitly stated and logically related ideas about the relationships among the phenomena under consideration). As we will see in the course, research that explicitly considers multiple hypotheses or alternative theories usually produces the richest results. Designs that focus on a single theory or seek to test a single, isolated hypothesis generally are less interesting, though they still can be useful.

**4) A discussion of concepts.** Having identified one or more hypotheses, you need to identify, define and operationalize the central concepts in the hypotheses. Your major task here is to

indicate as clearly as possible what your concepts mean and how you will recognize them when you observe them in your research.

**5) An observation and measurement strategy.** Here, you should discuss how you intend to observe the concepts that are the foci of your hypotheses, how you will operationalize and measure key concepts, and how you plan to collect the data– and on which cases? You must justify your choices keeping in mind issues of validity (and reliability).

**6) A testing strategy.** How will you measure the relationships between the concepts in your hypotheses? What will convince you that the hypothesized relationships exist or do not exist? What will convince you that the theory/hypotheses you are testing are “right” or “wrong”?

**7) A consideration of “threats to validity”.** There is no perfect research design. All research strategies have inherent limitations and you cannot, as a practical matter, control for everything. In this section you summarize these limitations and discuss their likely consequences for the research you propose.

### **A STRONGLY Suggested Schedule of Work on Research Design Paper**

For the major Research Design paper, you will be expected to proceed through several discrete stages. You should be trying to meet the following set of deadlines in order to make sure that you can successfully complete the research design assignment on time. You do not have to submit the “drafts” noted below to the instructor. However, you should feel free to see the instructor during office hours to discuss your progress and any questions you have.

– approval of topic **by September 28.** This should include a 1-2 page proposal which clearly states the research question, provides a partial summary of how it builds on the leading published work in the field (i.e., I expect that you will have started reading for your literature review, but don’t expect that you will have yet read all of the relevant literature), and indicates your initial ideas of how you will obtain and analyze your data.

– draft of introduction sections and literature review, **by October 19**

– draft of theory and research design sections, **by November 9**

– final paper completed and submitted by 4:00pm, **Wednesday, December 12.**

## COURSE OUTLINE AND READINGS

### 1. Introduction: Focus, Contents, and Requirements of Course (Aug.28)

#### Part I THE EMPIRICAL [“SCIENTIFIC”] STUDY OF POLITICS

### 2. Knowledge, Science, and the Social Sciences (Sep.4)

#### Required Reading

Babbie, ch.1 (ch.2)

Hoover & Donovan, ch.1

KKV, ch.1

Phillips, “Preface”

Karl Deutsch, “The Limits of Common Sense,” in Nelson Polsby, et al, eds., *Politics and Social Life* (Houghton Mifflin, 1963), 51-58

Stephen Jay Gould, “The Streak of Streaks,” in Gould, *Bully for Brontosaurus* (Norton, 1991), 463-472

Kenneth Benoit, “How Qualitative Research Really Counts,” *Qualitative Methods*, 3, 1, Spring 2005, 9-12

#### Recommended

Kim Quaile Hill, “Myths About the Physical Sciences and Their Implications for Teaching Political Science,” *P.S.*, 37, 3, July 2004, 467-471

Bruce Bueno de Mesquita, “Toward a Scientific Understanding of International Conflict: A Personal View,” *International Studies Quarterly*, 29, 2, June 1985, 121-136

Fritz Matchlup, “Are the Social Science Really Inferior?” *Society*, 1987\*\*

Terrence Ball, “From Paradigms to Research Programs: Toward A Post-Kuhnian Political Science,” *American Journal of Political Science*, 20, 1, 1976, 151-177\*\*

On the History/Development of Political Science:

Gabriel Almond, “Political Science: The History of the Discipline,” in Robert Goodin and Hans-Dieter Klingemann, eds., *A New Handbook of Political Science* (Oxford U. Press, 1996), 50-96

See: James Garand syllabus, POLI 7961, the section “Historical Debates in Political Science” **[BB]**

#### “Classics”

Donald Moon, “The Logic of Political Inquiry: A Synthesis of Opposed Perspectives,” in Fred Greenstein and Nelson Polsby, eds., *The Handbook of Political Science*, Vol1 (Addison Wesley, 1975), esp. 131-154\*\*

Carl Hempel, *Philosophy of Natural Science*, chs. 2,3,4

Karl Popper, *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*, chs. 4,5,6

Ernst Nagel, *The Structure of Science*, chs. 1,2,13

Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, chs. 2,3,4

### 3. Conceptions of Science: “Naturalism”/”Positivism” and Alternatives (Sept.11)

#### Required Reading

Babbie, ch.2

Phillips, ALL

Michael Lewis, *Moneyball* (Norton, 2003), ch.2, “How to Find A Ballplayer,” 14-42

David Laitin, “Interpretation, “ *Qualitative Methods*, 1, 2, Fall 2003, 6-9 [BB]

#### Recommended

Arnold Brecht, *Political Theory* (Princeton U. Pr., 1959), ch.III, “Theory of Scientific Value Relativism”\*\*

M.H. Salmon, et al., eds., *Introduction to the Philosophy of Science* (Prentice Hall, 1992)

Imre Lakatos, *The Method of Scientific Research Programs* (Cambridge U. Pr, 1978)

[Review last week’s articles by Bueno de Mesquita and by Ball]

#### “Classics”

Donald Moon, “The Logic of Political Inquiry...” 154-182\*\*

Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, chs. 2,3,4

Arnold Brecht, *Political Theory* (Princeton U. Pr., 1959), ch.III, “Theory of Scientific Value Relativism”\*\*

Clifford Geertz, “Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture,” in C. Geertz, ed., *The Interpretation of Cultures* (Basic Books, 1973)

### 4. Theories, Models, and Hypotheses– Developing Research Questions (Sept. 18 & 25)

#### Required

Babbie, chs. 3,4 (review ch.2)

KKV, ch.2 (review ch.1)

Hoover & Donovan, chs.2, 3

James N. Rosenau, “Thinking Theory Thoroughly,” in Rosenau, ed., *The Scientific Study of Foreign Policy*, rev.edition (London: Frances Pinter, 1980), 19-31.

Charles Lave and James G. March, *An Introduction to Models in the Social Sciences* (Harper and Row, 1975), chs. 1,2,3 [also: Reserve Book]

Harvey Starr, “Visions of Global Politics as an Intellectual Enterprise: Three Questions Without Answers,” in Donald Puchala, ed., *Visions of International Relations* (u. South Carolina Pr., 2002), 42-61 [BB]

G. R. Boynton, “On Getting from Here to There,” in Elinor Ostrom, ed., *Strategies of Political Inquiry* (Sage, 1982), 29-68

Duncan Snidal, "Formal Models of International Politics," in D. Sprintz and Y. Wolinsky-Nahmias, eds., *Models, Numbers & Cases* (U. Michigan Pr., 2004), 227-264 [also: Reserve Book]

Benjamin Most, "Getting Started on Political Research," *P.S.*, vol.23, 1990, 592-95 [BB]

John Platt, "Strong Inference," *Science*, 1146, Oct.16, 1964, 347-353

King, Keohane, and Verba, "The Importance of Research Design," in Henry Brady and David Collier, eds., *Rethinking Social Inquiry* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2004), 181-192 [also: Reserve Book]

### Recommended

Review Phillips, ch.12

David Collier, et al, "The Quest for Standards: King, Keohane, and Verba's *Designing Political Inquiry*," in Henry Brady and David Collier, eds., *Rethinking Social Inquiry* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2004), 21-50 [Reserve Book]

Ted Robert Gurr, *Politimetrics* (Prentice Hall, 1972) [Reserve Book]

Howard Becker, *Tricks of the Trade* (U. Chicago Pr., 1998), ch.2, "Imagery"

David Lalman, et al., "'Formal Rational Choice Theory: A Cumulative Science of Politics," in Ada Finifter, ed., *Political Science: The State of the Discipline* (American Political Science Association, 1993), 77-104

*Journal of Theoretical Politics* Symposium, "Rational Choice Explanation," 11,2, 1999

A Wuffle, "Credo of a 'Reasonable Choice' Modeler," *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 11, 2, 1999, 203-206 [BB]

David Laitin, "Ethnography and/or Rational Choice: A Response from David Laitin," *Qualitative Methods*, 4,1, Spring 2006, 26-33\*\*

### "Classics"

Abraham Kaplan, *The Conduct of Inquiry* (1964), ch. VIII, "Theories"

Arthur Stinchcombe, *Constructing Social Theories* (1968), ch.2, "The Logic of Scientific Inference"

## 5. Causality and Causal Inference (Oct. 2)

### Required

KKV, ch.3 (ch.5 recommended)

SCC, ch.1, pp.53-63

Babbie, review ch.4

Hoover & Donovan, ch.4

John Gerring, "Causation: A Unified Framework for the Social Sciences," *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 17, 2, April 2005, 163-198 **[BB]**

Gary Goertz, "Cause, Correlation, and Necessary Conditions," in Gary Goertz and Harvey Starr, eds., *Necessary Conditions: Theory, Methodology, and Applications* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2003, 47-64) [also: Reserve Book]

Bear Braumoeller and Gary Goertz, "The Statistical Methodology of Necessary Conditions," in Gary Goertz and Harvey Starr, eds., *Necessary Conditions* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2003, 197-223) [also: Reserve Book]

Benjamin Most and Harvey Starr, *Inquiry, Logic and International Politics* (U. South Carolina Pr., 1989), ch.3, "Basic Logic and Research Design" [also: Reserve Book]

### Recommended

Charles Ragin, *The Comparative Method*, ch.2, "Heterogeneity and Causal Complexity" [Reserve Book]

David Collier, et al, "The Quest for Standards: King, Keohane, and Verba's *Designing Political Inquiry*," in Henry Brady and David Collier, eds., *Rethinking Social Inquiry* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2004), 21-50 [Reserve Book]

Gary Goertz and Harvey Starr, eds., *Necessary Conditions: Theory, Methodology, and Applications* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2003), ch.1 (Goertz and Starr); ch.2 (Most and Starr) [Reserve Book]

*Qualitative Methods*, 3, 1, Spring 2005, "Symposium II: Necessary Conditions"

### "Classics"

Herbert Simon, *Models of Man* (1957), ch.1

### Research Articles

Gary Goertz and Harvey Starr, eds., *Necessary Conditions: Theory, Methodology, and Applications* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2003): chapter by Tsebelis or the chapter by Mintz [Reserve Book]

## Part II RESEARCH DESIGN AND POLITICAL RESEARCH: DESIGN, DATA COLLECTION, METHOD AND ANALYSIS

### 6) Concepts, Measurement, and Measurement Issues (Oct.9 & 16)

#### Required

Babbie, chs.5, 6 (ch.7)

Hoover & Donovan, ch.5

KKV, ch.5

Goertz, *Social Science Concepts: A User's Guide* (Princeton U. Pr., 2005),

“Introduction,” 1-18 [BB]

Michael Lewis, *Moneyball*, ch.6, “The Science of Winning an Unfair Game”

Robert Adcock and David Collier, “Measurement Validity: A Shared Standard for Qualitative and Quantitative Research,” *American Political Science Review*, 95, 3, September 2001, 529-546 [BB]

David Collier and James Mahon, “Conceptual ‘Stretching’ Revisited: Adapting Categories in Comparative Analysis,” *American Political Science Review*, 87, 4, December 1993, 845-855 [BB]

Keith Jagers and Ted Robert Gurr, “Tracking Democracy’s Third Wave with the Polity III Data,” *Journal of Peace Research*, 32, 4, 1995, 469-482 [BB]

#### Recommended

SCC, chs.2,3

Charles O. Jones, “Doing Before Knowing: Concept Development in Political Science,” *American Journal of Political Science* 18, 1974, 215-228

Benjamin Most and Harvey Starr, *Inquiry, Logic and International Politics* (U. South Carolina Pr., 1989), ch.4, “Conceptualizing War” [Reserve Book]

Joseph Hewitt and Gary Goertz, “Conceptualizing Interstate Conflict,” *International Interactions*, 31, 2, 2005, 163-182

William Jacoby, “Levels of Measurement and Political Research: An Optimistic View,” *American Journal of Political Science*, 43, January 1999, 27-301

#### “Classics”

Paul Kress, “On the Role and Formation of Concepts,” in D. M. Freeman, ed., *Foundations of Political Science*, ch.17\*\*

Thomas Kuhn, *The Essential Tension*, ch.8, “The Function of Measurement in Modern Physical Sciences” \*\*

Eugene Webb, *Unobtrusive Measures*, chs.1,3\*\*

Giovanni Sartori, “Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics,” *American Political Science Review*, 64, 4, 1033-1053

Giovanni Sartori, “Guidelines for Concept Analysis,” *Social Science Concepts* (Sage, 1984), 15-85

## 7. Observation, Units of Analysis, and Issues of Case Selection (Oct.23)

### Required

Babbie, ch.7 (review ch.4)

KKV, ch.4

Most and Starr, *Inquiry, Logic and International Politics*, review chs.3, 4 [also: Reserve Book]

Charles Ragin, *The Comparative Method*, ch.1, "The Distinctiveness of Comparative Social Science" [also: Reserve Book]

J. David Singer, "The Level-of-Analysis Problem in International Relations," in K. Knorr and S. Verba, eds., *The International System* (Princeton U. Pr., 1961), 77-92

Graham Allison, "Conceptual Models and the Cuban Missile Crisis," *American Political Science Review*, 63, 3, September 1969, 689-718 **[BB]**

### Recommended

James Mahoney and Gary Goertz, "The Possibility Principle: Choosing Negative Cases in Comparative Research," *American Political Science Review*, 98, 4, November 2004, 653-669

Kenneth Waltz, *Theory of International Politics* (Addison Wesley, 1979), ch.4, "Reductionist and Systemic Theories"

James Lee Ray, "Integrating Levels of Analysis in World Politics," *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 13, 4, October 2001, 355-388

### "Classics"

May Brodbeck, "Methodological Individualisms: Definition and Reduction," in M. Brodbeck, ed., *Readings in the Philosophy of the Social Sciences* (Macmillan, 1968), 280-303\*\*

William S. Robinson, "Ecological Correlations and the Behavior of Individuals," *American Sociological Review*, 15, June 1950, 351-357

## 8. Observational Methods I: Experimental, Quasi-Experimental, and Non-Experimental Research (Oct.30-Nov.6)

### Required

Babbie, chs. 8,9,12

SCC, chs.4,6

Bear Braumoeller and Anne Sartori, "The Promise and Perils of Statistics in International Relations," in D. Sprintz and Y. Wolinsky-Nahmias, eds., *Models, Numbers & Cases* (U. Michigan Pr., 2004), 129-151 [also: Reserve Book]

J. David Singer, "The Historical Experiment as a Research Strategy in the Study of World Politics," *Political Inquiry*, 2, 1, 1974, 23-52

Donald Green and Alan Gerber, "Reclaiming the Experimental Tradition in Political Science," in Ira Katznelson and Helen Milner, *Political Science: State of the Discipline* (Norton, 2002), 805-832

Donald Campbell and H. L. Ross, "The Connecticut Crackdown on Speeding: Time Series Data in Quasi-Experimental Analysis," *Law and Society Review*, 3, 1, 1968, 33-54 **[BB]**

### Recommended

Larry Bartels and Henry Brady, "The State of Quantitative Political Methodology," in Ada Finifter, ed., *Political Science: The State of the Discipline* (American Political Science Association, 1993), 121-159

John K. Hakes and Raymond D. Sauer, "An Economic Evaluation of the *Moneyball* Hypothesis," *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 20, 3, 2006, 173-185 **[BB]**

Philip A. Schrodt, "Beyond on the Linear Frequentist Orthodoxy," *Political Analysis*, 14, 3, 2006, 335-339 **[BB]**

Most and Starr, *Inquiry, Logic and International Politics*, ch.6 "The Logic of International Structure" [Reserve Book]

Most and Starr, "Diffusion, Reinforcement, Geopolitics, and the Spread of War," *American Political Science Review*, 74, December 1980, 932-946

Philip Tetlock and Aaron Belkin, "Counterfactual Thought Experiments in World Politics: Logical, Methodological, and Psychological Perspectives," in Tetlock and Belkin, eds., *Counterfactual Thought Experiments in World Politics* (Princeton U. Pr., 1996), 3-38.

Jeffery J. Mondak, "Newspapers and Political Awareness," *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 39, No. 2. (May, 1995), 513-527.

Alan Gerber and Donald Green, "The Effects of Canvassing, Direct Mail, and Telephone Contact on Voter Turnout: A Field Experiment," *The American Political Science Review*, 94, 2000, 745-756.

### "Classics"

John Dryzek, "The Mismeasure of Political Man," *Journal of Politics*, 50, 3, 1988, 702-725

Eugene Webb, et al., *Unobtrusive Measures* (Rand McNally, 1966), chs.1,2,3

## 9. Observational Methods II: “Qualitative Methods” (and More on What is ‘Qualitative’ and What is ‘Quantitative’) (November 6-13)

### Required

KKV, ch.6

Babbie, chs.10, 11

SCC, chs. 11, 12

David Collier, “The Comparative Method,” in Ada Finifter, ed., *Political Science: The State of the Discipline* (APSA 1993), 105-19

John Gerring, “What is a Case Study and What is it Good For?” *American Political Science Review*, 98, 2, 2004, 341-354 [BB]

Andrew Bennett, “Case Study Methods: Design, Use, and Comparative Advantages,” in D. Sprintz and Y. Wolinsky-Nahmias, eds., *Models, Numbers & Cases* (U. Michigan Pr., 2004), 19-55 [also: Reserve Book]

Alexander George, "Case Studies and Theoretical Development: The Method of Structured Focused Comparison," in Paul Lauren, ed., *Diplomacy* (Free Press, 1979), 43-68

David Collier, Jason Seawright, and Henry Brady, “Qualitative vs. Quantitative: What Might This Distinction Mean,” *Qualitative Methods*, 1, 1, Spring 2003, 4-8 [BB]

### Recommended

Hoover & Donovan, ch.6

Charles Ragin, *The Comparative Method* (especially review ch.1) [Reserve Book]

Alexander George and Andrew Bennett, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences* (MIT Press, 2005)

John Gerring, *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices* (Cambridge University Press, 2007), especially chs. 1[BB], 2, 5

Harry Eckstein, “Case Study and Theory in Political Science,” in Greenstein and Polsby, *Handbook of Political Science*, Vol.7, ch.3\*\*

Charles Ragin, *Fuzzy-Set Social Science* (U. Chicago Pr., 2000), “Introduction”

Eugene Webb, et al., *Unobtrusive Measures* (Rand McNally, 1966), ch. 2

*Qualitative Methods*, 2,1, Spring 2004– Symposium on “Field Research”; Symposium on “Discourse and Content Analysis”

*American Political Science Review*, 89,6, 1995, “Review Symposium: The Qualitative-Quantitative Disputation”

Stephen Walker, “The Evolution of Operational Code Analysis,” *Political Psychology* 11, 2, 1990, 403-418

Gary Goertz and Harvey Starr, eds., *Necessary Conditions: Theory, Methodology, and Applications* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2003) [Reserve Book]

Henry Brady and David Collier, eds., *Rethinking Social Inquiry* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2004) [Reserve Book]

Paul F. Steinberg, "Causal Assessment in Small-N Policy Studies," *Policy Studies Journal* 35, 2, 2007, 181-204[BB]

"Classics"

Clifford Geertz, "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture," in C. Geertz, ed., *The Interpretation of Cultures* (Basic Books, 1973)

Arend Lijphart, "Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method," *American Political Science Review*, 65, 3, 1971, 682-693

Arend Lijphart, "The Comparable Cases Strategy in Comparative Research," *Comparative Political Studies*, 8, 1975, 158-177

**10. More on Understanding Relationships (Nov.20)**

Required

Babbie, chs. 13, 14, 15, 16

SCC, ch.14

Charles Lave and James G. March, *An Introduction to Models in the Social Sciences* (Harper and Row, 1975), ch.4, "Choice;" ch.5, "Exchange" [Reserve Book]

Charles Ragin, *The Comparative Method*, chs.5,6 [Reserve Book]

Recommended

Charles Ragin and Benoit Rihoux, "Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA): State of the Art and Prospects," *Qualitative Methods* 2, 2, Fall 2004, 3-13\*\*

James Mahoney, "Reflections on Fuzzy-Set/QCA," *Qualitative Methods* 2, 2, Fall 2004, 17-21\*\*

**11. Individual Presentations of Research Designs (November 27)**

**12. Continuation: Individual Presentations of Research Designs (Dec.4)**