

SYLLABUS
POLITICAL SCIENCE 5075
INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF POLITICS
FALL, 1997

PROFESSOR MARK LICHBACH
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO
BOULDER, COLORADO 80309-0333

Mark.Lichbach@Colorado.Edu

303 492-8601(O)

303 321-2124(H)

303 492-0978(Fax)

December 12, 1997

I. OVERVIEW

Graduate school in political science teaches you how to enter a scholarly community or research tradition. You are instructed how to identify its important questions, propose answers that will interest its members, and design strategies that its members will accept as evaluating those answers. You are also taught how to communicate your ideas to this community in the form of a professional essay. Most graduate level courses cover these issues informally; in this course we

are explicit. We will train you to produce and convey knowledge to those who work in the discipline of political science.

Many of the issues we cover are unique to particular subfields and traditions in political science. Other concerns are common to the entire discipline, and indeed all of the social sciences. Hence, this course discusses the choices available to scholars - the diverse kinds of political science - and the epistemological foundations of all social inquiry. We take a broad view of the human sciences: case-centered approaches, for example interpretive theory and hermeneutics, and theory-centered approaches, for example statistical and mathematical modeling, are covered. We also take a broad view of evidence: quantitative and qualitative, historical and contemporary, ethnographic and statistical data are discussed. Specific methodologies that we explore include survey research, experiments, quasi-experiments, case studies, comparative case studies, aggregate data analyses, archival work, and participant observation.

This course thus considers the question of what makes for good political science. In Part I, we examine exemplars from three major research communities in the social sciences. Mancur Olson's *Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups* is a classic social or rational choice theory. Olson offers a rationalist account of why individuals join groups and why groups mobilize and succeed. Max Weber's *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* is a classic interpretive or culturalist theory. Weber traces the origins of capitalism in the West to a certain set of religious orientations. Kenneth Waltz's *Theory of International Politics* is a classic structural or system theory. Waltz argues that the study of the state system qua system offers great insights into international conflict and cooperation as well as into international stability and change.

Why are these studies exemplars of good social science? One approach to evaluating scholarship employs the criteria developed by philosophers of science. In Part II of the course we therefore discuss alternative philosophies of science. Twenty years ago, graduate scope and methods courses in political science taught the traditional, logical empiricist view of science. We present this view, identify the criticisms that have been raised against it, and offer some alternatives. We also discuss two other important issues: the significance of theory and theory evaluation in scientific change and of discovery and creativity in science.

Research methodologists have also developed approaches for assessing contributions to political science. Part III of the course therefore discusses quantitative and qualitative research designs for testing hypotheses. Quantitative research designs include cross-sectional, longitudinal, contextual, experimental, and quasi-experimental approaches. Qualitative research designs include case studies, comparative case studies, comparative historical, and ideal-type approaches. We survey these designs and identify their strengths and weaknesses.

In Part IV of the course we apply our lessons about philosophy of science and research methodology to our three research communities. This involves a discussion of social theory or the philosophy of social science. What are the assumptions behind rationalist, culturalist, and structuralist approaches? What are their boundaries - what phenomena can they explain and what do they choose to ignore? What combinations of approaches are possible? In pragmatic terms,

what are the characteristic advantages and pitfalls that face the political scientist who chooses to focus on rationality, culture, or structure?

Social scientists study the world and communicate their results to a community of scholars who are only a small part of that world. We conclude the course in Part V by exploring the relationships among social theory, political science, and the world in which we live. We raise questions about a scientist's values, his or her intended audiences, and the interaction of social scientists and the subjects they study.

II. REQUIREMENTS

Students who take this course must satisfy six requirements.

1. Philosophy of science evaluation (10%)

Students must use the standards discussed in the philosophy of science literature to critically evaluate any empirically-oriented *scholarly* article or book in political science published within the last year. Choose an empirical piece, rather than a purely theoretical analysis or literature review. Place the work in context so as to enter into a dialogue with the research community of which it is a part; then critically assess the quality of the author's work. Criticism is more than summary: indicate the work's strengths and weaknesses and suggest areas of improvement. Show how your comments derive from the philosophy of science literature. The philosophy of science evaluation should be approximately five double spaced pages long, or 1500 words. Provide a word count.

2. Research design evaluation (10%)

Students must use the standards discussed in the research design literature to critically evaluate any empirically-oriented *scholarly* article or book in political science published within the last year. Choose, for example, a case study, comparative case study, or experiment and assess the quality of the author's work. Use the research design literature to critically explore the work's central empirical finding or result: What did the author discover? How solid is that result? How could the finding have been strengthened by adopting a different research design? The research design evaluation should be approximately five double spaced pages long, or 1500 words. Provide a word count.

3. Critical analysis of a research community (10%)

Students must use the standards discussed in the philosophy of social science and research methodology literatures to critically evaluate any empirically-oriented *scholarly* article or book

published within the last year that is part of any of the three research communities - rationalist, culturalist, or structuralist - in political science. Use these literatures to explore the work's strengths and weaknesses and to suggest areas of improvement. The philosophy of social science evaluation should be approximately five double spaced pages long, or 1500 words. Provide a word count.

4. Original research proposal (25%)

The best way for students to learn about research in political science is to write a research proposal. You may propose, for example, a case study, comparative case study, or quantitative analysis. The research design must be in principle "do-able." It also must be precise and operational, and hence more than a literature review. Students are permitted to build this research proposal upon the foundations created by the philosophy of science, research design, and philosophy of social science papers. Students may also combine this paper with a paper from a different course. For instance, you might want to link the research proposal required in this course to the data analysis paper required in the introductory statistics course. This would give you a good start toward writing the "first year" paper. If you go this route, permission of both instructors is needed. The research proposal should be approximately ten double spaced pages long, or 3000 words. Provide a word count.

NOTE: I have prepared some guidelines for the four writing assignments. These appear later in this syllabus and will be discussed in class. I will not read preliminary drafts of these papers, because these are usually woefully incomplete and typically generate grievances about grades. However, I will be delighted to discuss your preliminary ideas with you during office hours.

5. Take home final (25%)

Students will have three days to answer questions about the required readings and about the material covered in class. These questions will be broadly similar to the comprehensive exams offered here at CU. The final will thus be good practice for this particular hurdle in your graduate careers.

6. Class participation (20%)

All graduate students must complete each week's readings and must participate in class discussions. Everyone will be called upon to speak at least once each week and asked to reflect on the readings. *This is an important requirement.* Students who repeatedly come to class unprepared do not belong in graduate school.

III. BOOKS TO ACQUIRE

The following books are required reading:

Lichbach, Mark I. and Alan Zuckerman, Eds. (1997). *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture, and Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Olson, Mancur Jr. (1965). *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Weber, Max [1904-5] 1985. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Trans. Talcott Parsons. London: Unwin Paperbacks.

Waltz, Kenneth N. (1979). *Theory of International Politics*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Toulmin, Stephen (1990). *Cosmopolis: The Hidden Agenda of Modernity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hempel, Carl G. (1966). *Philosophy of Natural Science*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Lakatos, Imre (1970). "Falsification and the Methodology of Scientific Research Programs." In Imre Lakatos and Alan Musgrave, Eds. *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kuhn, Thomas S. (1970). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Second Ed., Enlarged. Chicago, Il.: University of Chicago Press.

Feyerabend, Paul (1988). *Against Method*. Rev. Ed. London: Verso.

Spector, Paul E. (1981). *Research Designs*. Sage University Paper Series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, 23-001. Newbury Park, Ca.: Sage.

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba (1994). *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Little, Daniel (1991). *Varieties of Social Explanation: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Science*. Boulder, Co.: Westview.

These books are available for purchase in the CU bookstore. Articles and sections of books that are required reading are xeroxed and available in the reserve room in Norlin Library.

IV. COURSE ORGANIZATION

Class meets on Monday from 9:00 to 11:30 in Ketchum 116. I will hold office hours on Wednesdays and Fridays, 11:00 to 12:00, in the Chair's office, Ketchum 106. If these times are inconvenient, call and make an appointment. I can be reached by phone at 492-8601. It is important for students to get to know faculty and for faculty to get to know students. Stop by for a chat.

LECTURE SEQUENCE

Three types of readings are listed below. A reading denoted by "***" means that it is required for this course. You will find it available for purchase in the bookstore or on reserve in the library. A reading denoted by "*" means that it is recommended (i.e., for comprehensives). All other readings are additional or background readings that students interested in a particular topic may consult.

PART I. INTRODUCTION

We begin slowly, attempting to introduce students to the course and to the discipline by studying exemplars of great social science and by placing social science in historical context..

WEEK 1 (AUGUST 25) A. ORGANIZATION

The first part of the period is spent summarizing the course. In the second part, the political science bibliographer in Norlin Library, Chris Busick, gives us a tour of our library's resources.

WEEK 2 (SEPTEMBER 8) B. CLASSICS/EXEMPLARS

One of the aims of this course is to teach you about theories in the social sciences, generally, and in political science, specifically. The course focuses on three types of theories: rationalist, culturalist, and structuralist. We refer to an exemplar of each type of theory throughout the course: Olson on rational or social choice theory, Weber on cultural or interpretive theory, and Waltz on structural or institutionalist theory. As you go through these classics, ask yourself the following questions: What do you think about them? How should we evaluate them? Why are they seminal, in the sense of having enduring value and yet displaying deficiencies that generate numerous follow-up studies?

****Olson, Mancur Jr. (1965). *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, chaps. 1-3.**

****Weber, Max [1904-5] 1985. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Trans. Talcott Parsons. London: Unwin Paperbacks, chaps. 1-3, 5.**

****Waltz, Kenneth N. (1979). *Theory of International Politics*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, chaps. 4-6, 8.**

WEEK 3 (SEPTEMBER 15) C. HISTORY AND CONTEXT

How are we to make sense of the "war of the schools" or the "battle of the paradigms" in political science that we studied last week? This week's reading sets the historical context for the theme of the course. After critically evaluating the issues that separate the schools, we turn to an effort at reconciling them: science. We show how questions of science and modernity are closely connected by studying how science emerged in the modern world and by investigating how it has been challenged.

****Lichbach, Mark Irving (1997). "Social Theory and Comparative Politics." In Mark I. Lichbach and Alan S. Zuckerman, *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture, and Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.**

****Toulmin, Stephen (1990). *Cosmopolis: The Hidden Agenda of Modernity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.**

PART II. PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE

We now begin to directly address questions about evaluating scholarship in our discipline. Alternative philosophies of science offer alternative standards by which political science may be judged. We consider competing theories of science, alternative approaches to theory and explanation, and finally questions about discovery and creativity.

A. THEORIES OF SCIENCE

How does science work? Philosophers of science ask fundamental questions about epistemology (the theory of knowledge) and ontology (the nature of things) in order to clarify our understanding of the growth of scientific knowledge. Many political scientists adopt a traditional view of science that they believe characterizes the natural sciences. Others criticize this view and propose alternative philosophies or theories of science.

WEEK 4 (SEPTEMBER 22) 1. THE TRADITIONAL VIEW

The traditional view of the growth of scientific knowledge is rooted in modernist and enlightenment thought. Traditionalists emphasize how an open and democratic scientific community uses reason, the scientific method, and the canons of scientific rationality to discover truth. We discuss logical positivism, logical empiricism, covering-law explanations, theories, concepts, and criteria for theory evaluation.

**Hempel, Carl G. (1966). *Philosophy of Natural Science*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

**Little, Daniel (1991). *Varieties of Social Explanation: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Science*. Boulder, Co.: Westview, chap. 1.

*Hollis, Martin (1994). *The Philosophy of Social Science: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, chaps. 2,3.

*Diesing, Paul (1991). *How Does Social Science Work? Reflections on Practice*. Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh Press, chap. 1.

*Blalock, Hubert M., Jr. (1969). *Theory Construction: From Verbal to Mathematical Formulations*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, chap. 3.

*Blalock, Hubert M., Jr. (1968). "The Measurement Problem: A Gap Between the Languages of Theory and Research." In Hubert M. Blalock, Jr. and Ann B. Blalock, Eds. *Methodology in Social Research*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Platt, John Rader (1966). "Strong Inference." In John Rader Platt, *The Step to Man*. New York: Wiley.

Crouch, Robert (1979). *Human Behavior: An Economic Approach*. Boston, Mass.: Duxbury, chap. 2.

Merton, Robert K. (1948). "The Bearing of Empirical Research Upon the Development of Social Theory." *American Sociological Review* 5 (October): 505-15.

WEEK 5 (SEPTEMBER 29) 2. CRITICISMS

Philosophers, historians, and sociologists of science have offered numerous criticisms of the traditional view of science. Critics challenge all of the demarcations stressed by traditionalists: science vs. nonscience, facts vs. values, nominalism vs. realism, analytic vs. concrete, and the context of discovery vs. the context of verification. Hence, there is a debate over how scientific theories are invented; developed, evaluated, and accepted; and finally displaced as scientific change occurs. Some of these criticisms arise from confronting the traditionalists' idealized and rationalized reconstructions with the actual historical record of scientific practice. Normative and empirical issues are therefore at stake. (*Note:* This week's required readings are relatively light and closely connected with next week's relatively heavy readings; I therefore suggest that you begin the next set of readings.)

1. OVERVIEWS AND EVALUATIONS:

**Laudan, Larry et al. (1986). "Scientific Change: Philosophical Models and Historical Research." *Synthese* 69 (November): 141-223.

*Hollis, Martin (1994). *The Philosophy of Social Science: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, chap. 4.

*Newton-Smith, W. H. (1981). *The Rationality of Science*. London: Routledge.

*Suppe, Frederick, Ed. (1977). *The Structure of Scientific Theories*. Urbana, Il.: University of Illinois.

*Moon, J. Donald (1975). "The Logic of Political Inquiry: A Synthesis of Opposed Perspectives." In Fred I. Greenstein and Nelson W. Polsby, Eds. *Handbook of Political Science. Volume I: Political Science Scope and Theory*. Reading, Ma.: Addison-Wesley.

*Bowen, Elinor R. and Balch, George (1981). "Epistemology, Methodology, and Method in the Study of Political Behavior." In Samuel L. Long, Ed. *Handbook of Political Behavior*. Volume 1. New York: Plenum Press.

Kaplan, Abraham (1964). *The Conduct of Inquiry: Methodology for Behavioral Science*. Scranton, Penn.: Chandler.

Chalmers, A. F. (1982). *What is This Thing Called Science? An Assessment of the Nature and Status of Science and Its Methods*. 2nd ed. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing.

Fetzer, James H. (1993). *Philosophy of Science*. New York: Paragon.

O'Hear, Anthony (1989). *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Science*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Suppe, Frederick (1977). "The Search for Philosophic Understanding of Scientific Theories"; "Afterword." In Frederick Suppe, Ed. *The Structure of Scientific Theories*. 2nd Ed. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Kitcher, Philip (1993). *The Advancement of Science: Science Without Legend, Objectivity Without Illusion*. New York: Oxford.

Klemke, E.D. Robert Hollinger, and A. David Kline, Eds. (1988). *Introductory Readings in the Philosophy of Science*. Rev. Ed. New York: Prometheus.

Salmon, Merrilee H., et al. 1992. *Introduction to the Philosophy of Science*. (1992). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Boyd, Richard, Philip Gasper, and J.D. Trout, Eds. 1991. *The Philosophy of Science*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

2. THEORY DEVELOPMENT IN THE PHYSICAL SCIENCES:

Watson, James D. (1968). *The Double Helix: A Personal Account of the Discovery of DNA*. New York.: Mentor.

Feynman, Richard P. (1985). *Surely You're Joking, Mr. Feynman*. New York.: Bantam Books.

3. THEORY DEVELOPMENT IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES:

Wagner, David G. (1984). *The Growth of Sociological Theories*. Beverly Hills, Ca.: Sage.

Wagner, David G. and Berger, Joseph (1985). "Do Sociological Theories Grow?" *American Journal of Sociology* 90 (January): 697-718.

Berger, Joseph and Morris Zelditch, Jr., Eds. (1993). *Theoretical Research Programs: Studies in the Growth of Theory*. Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press.

Riker, William (1982). "The Two-Party System and Duverger's Law: An Essay on the History of Political Science." *American Political Science Review* 76 (December): 753-66.

Ball, Terence (1976). "From Paradigms to Research Programs: Toward Post-Kuhnian Political Science." *American Journal of Political Science* 20 (February): 151-77.

Ball, Terence (1987). "Is There Progress in Political Science?" In Terence Ball, Ed. *Idioms of Inquiry: Critique and Renewal in Political Science*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press.

Farr, James (1988). "The History of Political Science." *American Journal of Political Science* 32 (November): 1175-95.

Eckstein, Harry (1980). *The Natural History of Congruence Theory*. Monograph Series in World Affairs, Volume 18, Book 2. Denver, Co.: Graduate School of International Studies, University of Denver.

Shively, W. Phillips, Ed. (1984). *The Research Process in Political Science*. Itasca, Il.: F. E. Peacock.

4. SOCIAL SCIENTISTS DISPUTING THEORY AND SCIENTIFIC CHANGE:

Knorr, Klaus and Rosenau, James M., Eds. (1969). *Contending Approaches to International Politics*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Gunnell, John G., et al. (1969). "Symposium on 'Deduction, Explanation, and Social Scientific Inquiry'." *American Political Science Review* 63 (December): 1233-63.

Miller, Eugene F., et al. (1972). "Symposium on 'Positivism, Historicism, and Political Inquiry'." *American Political Science Review* 66 (September): 796-873.

WEEK 6 (OCTOBER 6) 3. ALTERNATIVES

In response to the criticisms of the traditional view of science, several alternative philosophies of science have been developed. Popperians stress falsification as the basis of science. Others stress paradigms, research programs, and research traditions. Realist approaches to the philosophy of science have become important and influential. Still others, including research anarchists, critical theorists, feminists, and postmodernists, offer even more radical alternatives to the traditional philosophy of science. All these critics of the traditional view stress the incommensurability of theories and the difficulties of transparadigmatic comparisons.

1. FALSIFICATIONISM - POPPERIANS:

**Popper, Karl (1988). "Science: Conjectures and Refutations." In E. D. Klemke, Robert Hollinger, and A. David Kline, Eds. *Introductory Readings in the Philosophy of Science*. Rev. Ed. New York: Prometheus.

**Popper, Karl (1991). "Selections from *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*." In Richard Boyd, Philip Gasper, and J.D. Trout, Eds. *The Philosophy of Science*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Popper, Karl (1965). *Conjectures and Refutations: The Growth of Scientific Knowledge*. New York: Harper Torchbooks.

Popper, Karl (1968). *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. New York: Harper Torchbooks.

2. THEORIES EMPHASIZING RESEARCH SCHOOLS:

**Kuhn, Thomas S. (1970). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Second Ed., Enlarged. Chicago, Il.: University of Chicago Press.

**Lakatos, Imre (1970). "Falsification and the Methodology of Scientific Research Programs." In Imre Lakatos and Alan Musgrave, Eds. *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*, pp. 91-196 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

*Laudan, Larry (1977). *Progress and Its Problems: Toward a Theory of Scientific Growth*. Berkeley, Ca.: University of California Press.

Hirschman, Albert O. (1970). "The Search for Paradigms as a Hindrance to Understanding." *World Politics* 22 (April): 329-43.

3. REALISM:

**Wendt, Alex (1995). "Scientific Realism and Social Science." Typescript.

**Shapiro, Ian and Alexander Wendt (1992). "The Difference that Realism Makes: Social Science and the Politics of Consent." *Politics and Society* 20 (June): 197-223.

Wendt, Alex and Ian Shapiro. "The Misunderstood Promise of Realist Social Theory." Typescript.

*Bunge, Mario (1993). "Realism and Antirealism in Social Science." *Theory and Decision* 35 (November): 207-35).

*Gunnell, John G. (1995). "Realizing Theory: The Philosophy of Science Revisited." *Journal of Politics* 57 (November): 923-40.

Outhwaite, William (1987). *New Philosophies of Social Science: Realism, Hermeneutics and Critical Theory*. New York: St. Martin's.

Layder, Derek (1990). *The Realist Image in Social Science*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Lloyd, Christopher (1993). *The Structures of History*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Lloyd, Christopher (1986). *Explanation in Social History*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Miller, Richard W. (1987). *Fact and Method: Explanation, Confirmation and Reality in the Natural and the Social Sciences*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Bhaskar, Roy (1997). *A Realist Theory of Science*. London: Verso.

4. POSTMODERNIST/RELATIVIST APPROACHES:

**Feyerabend, Paul (1988). *Against Method*. Rev. Ed. London: Verso.

**Toulmin, Stephen (1990). *Cosmopolis: The Hidden Agenda of Modernity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

*Beer, Francis A. (1993). "Validities: A Political Science Perspective." *Social Epistemology* 7 (No. 1): 85-105.

Rosenau, Pauline Marie (1992). *Post-Modernism and the Social Sciences: Insights, Inroads, and Intrusions*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Sassower, Raphael (1993). "Postmodernism and Philosophy of Science: A Critical Engagement." *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 23 (December): 426-45.

Symposium on the possibilities for a postmodern philosophy of science. *Social Epistemology* 5 (No. 4, 1991): 247-99.

Harding, Sandra (1991). *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge? Thinking from Women's Lives*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cambridge University Press.

Laudan, Larry (1990). *Science and Relativism: Some Key Controversies in the Philosophy of Science*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

WEEK 7 (OCTOBER 13) B. THEORY AND EXPLANATION

Almost every social scientist claims that he or she is a theorist. Given the diversity of our discipline, what could "theory" possibly mean? We discuss the differences between several types of theory: general and middle range (or islands of theory); laws and hypotheses; universalism,

relativism, and contextualism; formal and informal; deductive and inductive; causal and functional; and deterministic and probabilistic.

1. EXPLANATION:

**Little, Daniel (1991). *Varieties of Social Explanation: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Science*. Boulder, Co.: Westview, chaps. 10, 11.

*Stinchcombe, Arthur (1968). *Constructing Social Theories*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Introduction, chap. 1.

*Lane, Ruth (1990). "Concrete Theory: An Emerging Political Method." *American Political Science Review* 84 (September): 927-40.

Henderson, David K. (1993). *Interpretation and Explanation in the Human Sciences*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Waltz, Kenneth N. (1979). *Theory of International Politics*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, chap. 1.

McIntyre, Lee C. (1993). "Complexity and Social Scientific Laws." *Synthese* 97 (November): 209-27.

Kiser, Edgar, and Hechter, Michael (1991). "The Role of General Theory in Comparative-historical Sociology." *American Journal of Sociology* 97 (July): 1-30.

Vayda, Andrew P., McCay, Bonnie J., and Eghenter, Cristina (1991). "Concepts of Process in Social Science Explanations." *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 21 (September): 318-31.

Kincaid, Harold (1990). "Defending Laws in the Social Sciences." *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 20 (March): 56-83.

Little, Daniel (1993). "On the Scope and Limits of Generalizations in the Social Sciences." *Synthese* 97 (November): 183-207.

Stinchcombe, Arthur L. (1991). "The Conditions of Fruitfulness of Theorizing About Mechanisms in Social Science." *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 21 (September): 367-88.

MacIntyre, Alasdair (1973). "Is A Science of Comparative Politics Possible?" In *The Philosophy of Social Explanation*, Alan Ryan, Ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Walker, Henry A., and Cohen, Bernard P. (1985). "Scope Statements: Imperatives for Evaluating Theory." *American Sociological Review* 50 (June): 288-301.

2. PREDICTION:

Symposium on Prediction in the Social Sciences, *American Journal of Sociology* (May, 1995): 1520-1615.

Hechter, Michael (1995). "Introduction: Reflections on Historical Prophecy in the Social Sciences." *American Journal of Sociology* 100 (May): 1520-27.

Kuran, Tim (1995). "The Inevitability of Future Revolutionary Surprises." *American Journal of Sociology* 100 (May): 1528-51

Collins, Randall (1995). "Prediction in Macrosociology: The Case of the Soviet Collapse." *American Journal of Sociology* 100 (May): 1552-93.

Tilly, Charles (1995). "To Explain Political Processes." *American Journal of Sociology* 100 (May): 1594-1610.

Portes, Alejandro (1995). "On Grand Surprises and Modest Certainties: Comment on Kuran, Collins, and Tilly." *American Journal of Sociology* 100 (May): 1620-26.

Coleman, James S. (1995). "Comment on Kuran and Collins." *American Journal of Sociology* 100 (May): 1616-19.

Kiser, Edgar (1995). "What Can Sociological Theories Predict? Comment on Collins, Kuran, and Tilly." *American Journal of Sociology* 100 (May): 1611-15.

3. FORMAL/MATHEMATICAL/AXIOMATIC MODELS:

*Lave, Charles A. and March, James G. (1975). *An Introduction to Models in the Social Sciences*. New York: Harper & Row, chap. 1-3.

*Zinnes, Dina A. (1980). "Three Puzzles in Search of a Researcher." *International Studies Quarterly* 24 (September): 315-42.

*Riker, William H. (1977). "The Future of a Science of Politics." *American Behavioral Scientist* 21 (September/October): 11-38.

WEEK 8 (OCTOBER 20) C. DISCOVERY AND CREATIVITY

Where does one locate interesting and important problems and puzzles? Where do ideas come from? In short, how is research motivated? The issues of scientific creativity and the context of discovery are clouded in mystery. We know a lot more about how research methodologies address existing questions than we know about how those questions arise in the first place.

1. SCIENCE:

*Oliver, Jack E. (1991). *The Incomplete Guide to the Art of Discovery*. New York: Columbia University.

Watson, James D. (1968). *The Double Helix*. New York: Mentor.

2. SOCIAL SCIENCE:

**Mills, C. Wright (1959). *The Sociological Imagination*. London: Oxford University Press, chap. 1.

**Most, Benjamin A. (1990). "Getting Started on Political Research." *PS* (December): 592-96.

Shively, W. Phillips (1984). *The Research Process in Political Science*. Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock.

3. STUDIES OF CREATIVITY:

Langley, Pat, Herbert A. Simon, Gary L. Bradshaw and Jan M. Zytkow (1987). *Scientific Discovery: Computational Explorations of the Creative Processes*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

PART III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Political scientists also evaluate scholarship by examining how arguments are empirically verified and falsified. Good research, that is, often employs a research design that allows the researcher to probe hypotheses and establish causality. We explore quantitative and qualitative designs.

WEEK 9 (OCTOBER 27) A. THE PROBLEM OF RESEARCH DESIGN

This section makes a transition from philosophy of science considerations to research methodology considerations.

**King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba (1994). *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, chap 1, 2.1.

**Symposium on "The Qualitative-Quantitative Disputation." *American Political Science Review* 89 (June, 1995): 454-81.

Laitin, David (1995). "Disciplining Political Science." *American Political Science Review* 89 (June): 454-56.

Caporaso, James A. (1995). "Research Design, Falsification, and the Qualitative-Quantitative Divide." *American Political Science Review* 89 (June): 457-60.

Collier, David (1995). "Translating Quantitative Methods for Qualitative Researchers: The Case of Selection Bias." *American Political Science Review* 89 (June): 461-66.

Rogowski, Ronald (1995). "The Role of Theory and Anomaly in Social-Scientific Inference." *American Political Science Review* 89 (June): 467-70.

Tarrow, Sidney (1995). "Bridging the Quantitative-Qualitative Divide in Political Science." *American Political Science Review* 89 (June): 471-74.

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba (1995). "The Importance of Research Design in Political Science." *American Political Science Review* 89 (June): 475-81.

WEEK 10 (NOVEMBER 3) B. THE PRINCIPLES OF RESEARCH DESIGN

This section discusses the basic principles behind research design by following KKV's text. We discuss goals and criteria, procedures, design problems, sampling problems, other problems of research, and an important solution to research problems - increasing observations.

**King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba (1994). *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, chaps 2.2-6.

WEEK 11 (NOVEMBER 10) C. QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH DESIGNS

We evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of common quantitative research designs: cross-sectional, longitudinal, contextual, experimental, and quasi-experimental approaches.

1. OVERVIEW:

**Spector, Paul E. (1981). *Research Designs*. Sage University Paper Series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, 23-001. Newbury Park, Ca.: Sage.

**Little, Daniel (1991). *Varieties of Social Explanation: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Science*. Boulder, Co.: Westview, chaps. 2, 8.

*Cook, T. D. and D. T. Campbell (1979). *Quasi-Experimentation: Design & Analysis: Issues for Field Settings*. Skokie, Il.: Rand McNally.

Campbell, D. T. and J. C. Stanley (1963). *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research*. Skokie, Il.: Rand McNally.

2. EXPERIMENTAL DESIGNS:

**Marwell, Gerald, and Ruth E. Ames (1981). "Economists Free Ride, Does Anyone Else? Experiments on the Provision of Public Goods, IV." *Journal of Public Economics* 15 (June): 295-310.

3. QUASI-EXPERIMENTAL DESIGNS:

**Campbell, Donald T. (1973). "Reforms as Experiments." In James A. Caporaso and Leslie L. Roos, Jr., Eds. *Quasi-Experimental Approaches: Testing Theory and Evaluating Policy*. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press.

4. NONEXPERIMENTAL DESIGNS:

A. CROSS-SECTIONAL (SURVEY RESEARCH AND AGGREGATE DATA):

**Stimson, James A. (1984). "Belief Systems: Constraint, Complexity, and the 1972 Election." In W. Phillips Shively, Ed. *The Research Process in Political Science*. Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock.

**Gurr, Ted Robert (1972). *Politimetrics: An Introduction to Quantitative Macropolitics*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, chaps. 1-5, 8.

B. LONGITUDINAL:

**Ward, Michael D. and David R. Davis (1992). "Sizing Up the Peace Dividend: Economic Growth and Military Spending in the United States, 1948-1996." *American Political Science Review* 86 (September): 748-55.

C. CONTEXTUAL/MULTILEVEL:

**Przeworski, Adam and Teune, Henry (1970). *The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry*. N.Y.: Wiley, pp. 3-87.

Meckstroth, Theodore W. (1975). "'Most Different Systems' and 'Most Similar Systems': A Study in the Logic of Comparative Inquiry." *Comparative Political Studies* 8 (July): 132-57.

Eulau, Heinz (1977). "Multilevel Methods in Comparative Politics." *American Behavioral Scientist* 21 (September/October): 39-62.

Teune, Henry (1973). "Political Systems as Residual Variables: Explaining Differences Within Systems." *Comparative Political Studies* 6 (April): 3-21.

Teune, Henry (1975). "Comparative Research, Experimental Design, and the Comparative Method." *Comparative Political Studies* 8 (July): 195-99.

Iversen, Gudmund R. (1991). *Contextual Analysis*. Sage University Paper Series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, 07-081. Newbury Park, Ca.: Sage.

5. MEASUREMENT:

Blalock, Hubert M. (1974). *Measurement in the Social Sciences: Theories and Strategies*. Chicago, Il.: Aldine

Miller, Delbert C. (1983). *Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement*. Fourth Ed. New York: Longman.

Webb, Eugene J., et al. (1981). *Nonreactive Measures in the Social Sciences*. Boston, Ma.: Houghton Mifflin.

6. GREAT QUANTITATIVE SOCIAL SCIENCE:

Verba, Sidney, Kay Lehman Schlozman and Henry E. Brady (1995). *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Powell, G. Bingham, Jr. (1982). *Contemporary Democracies: Participation, Stability, and Violence*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Putnam, Robert D. (1993). *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Simmons, Beth A. (1994). *Who Adjusts? Domestic Sources of Foreign Economic Policy During the Interwar Years*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

7. QUESTIONABLE QUANTITATIVE SOCIAL SCIENCE:

**Orme-Johnson, David W., et al. (1988). "International Peace Project in the Middle East: The Effects of the Maharishi Technology of the Unified Field." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 32 (December): 776-812.

**Schrodt, Philip A. (1990). "A Methodological Critique of a Test of the Effects of the Maharishi Technology of the Unified Field." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 34 (December): 745-55.

WEEKS 12 (NOVEMBER 17) D. QUALITATIVE RESEARCH DESIGNS

We evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of common qualitative research designs: case studies, comparative case studies, comparative historical, and ideal-type approaches.

1. OVERVIEW:

Denzin, Norman K. and Yvonna S. Lincoln, Eds. (1994). *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Marshall, Catherine and Gretchen B. Rossman (1989). *Designing Qualitative Research*. Newbury Park: Sage.

Berg, Bruce L. (1989). *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

2. CASE STUDY:

**Eckstein, Harry (1975). "Case Study and Theory in Political Science." In Fred I. Greenstein and Nelson W. Polsby, Eds. *Handbook of Political Science. Volume 7: Strategies of Inquiry*. Reading, Ma.: Addison-Wesley.

*Campbell, Donald T. (1975). "'Degrees of Freedom' and the Case Study." *Comparative Political Studies* 8 (July): 178-93.

*George, Alexander (1979). "Case Study and Theory Development." In Paul Gordon Lauren, Ed. *Diplomacy: New Approaches in History, Theory, and Policy*. New York: Free Press.

Ragin, Charles C. and Becker, Howard S. (1992). *What Is A Case? Exploring the Foundations of Social Inquiry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Feagin, Joe. R., Orum, Anthony M., and Sjoberg, Gideon, Eds. (1991). *A Case for the Case Study*. Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press.

3. COMPARATIVE CASE STUDY:

**Lijphart, Arend (1975). "The Comparable-Cases Strategy in Comparative Research." *Comparative Political Studies* 8 (July): 158-77.

*Lijphart, Arend (1971). "Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method." *American Political Science Review* 65 (September): 682-93.

Lichbach, Mark Irving (1981). "Regime Change: A Test of Structuralist and Functionalist Explanations." *Comparative Political Studies* 14 (April): 49-73.

Charles C. Ragin (1987). *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. Berkeley, Ca.: University of California Press.

4. COMPARATIVE HISTORY:

**Skocpol, Theda (1984). "Sociology's Historical Imagination." In Theda Skocpol, Ed. *Vision and Method in Historical Sociology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Skocpol, Theda (1984). "Emergent Agendas and Recurrent Strategies in Historical Sociology." In Theda Skocpol, Ed. *Vision and Method in Historical Sociology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Bloch, Marc (1967). "A Contribution Towards a Comparative History of European Societies." In Marc Bloch, *Land And Work in Medieval Europe*. Berkeley, Ca.: University of California Press.

*Tilly, Charles (1984). *Big Structures, Large Processes, Huge Comparisons*. New York: Russell Sage.

*Skocpol, Theda and Somers, Margaret (1980). "The Uses of Comparative History in Macrosociological Theory." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 22 (April): 174-97.

Abrams, Philip (1982). *Historical Sociology*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Mills, C. Wright. 1959. *The Sociological Imagination*. London: Oxford University Press.

Smelser, Neil (1976). *Comparative Methods in the Social Sciences*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Stinchcombe, Arthur L. (1978). *Theoretical Methods in Social History*. N.Y.: Academic Press.

5. THE COMPARATIVE METHOD:

**Frendreis, John P. (1983). "Explanation of Variation and Detection of Covariation: The Purpose and Logic of Comparative Analysis." *Comparative Political Studies* 16 (July): 255-72.

DeFeliz, E. Gene (1986). "Causal Inference and Comparative Methods." *Comparative Political Studies* 19 (October): 415-37.

Ragin, Charles and David Zaret (1983). "Theory and Method in Comparative Research: Two Strategies." *Social Forces* 61 (March): 731-55.

Vallier, Ivan, Ed. (1971). *Comparative Methods in Sociology: Essays on Trends and Applications*. Berkeley, Ca.: University of California Press.

Collier, David (1993). "The Comparative Method." *In Political Science: The State of the Discipline, II*, Ada W. Finifter, Ed. Washington, D.C.: APSA.

Fearon, James D. (1991). "Counterfactuals and Hypothesis Testing in Political Science." *World Politics* 43 (January): 169-95.

Lieberson, Stanley (1991). "Small *N*'s and Big Conclusions: An Examination of the Reasoning in Comparative Studies Based on a Small Number of Cases." *Social Forces* 70 (No. 2): 307-20.

Ragin, Charles C., Ed. (1991). *Issues and Alternatives in Comparative Social Research*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Janoski, Thomas and Hicks, Alexander M., Eds. (1994). *The Comparative Political Economy of the Welfare State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

6. CONCEPT FORMATION:

*Sartori, Giovanni (1970). "Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics." *American Political Science Review* 64 (December): 1033-53.

7. IDEAL TYPES/TYPOLOGIES/CLASSIFICATIONS:

Kalberg, Stephen (1994). *Max Weber's Comparative Historical Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Burger, Thomas (1987). *Max Weber's Theory of Concept Formation: History, Laws, and Ideal Types*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

Hekman, Susan J. (1983). *Weber, the Ideal Type, and Contemporary Social Theory*. Notre Dame, In.: University of Notre Dame Press.

8. RAGIN'S BOOLEAN ALGEBRA

Ragin, Charles C. (1987). *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

9. COUNTERFACTUALS:

Tetlock, Philip and Aaron Belkin (1996). *Counterfactual Thought Experiments in World Politics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

10. NARRATIVES:

Stone, Lawrence. (1979). "The Revival of Narrative: Reflections on a New Old History." *Past and Present* 85 (November): 3-24.

Griffin, Larry J. (1993). "Narrative, Event-Structure Analysis, and Causal Interpretation in Historical Sociology" *American Journal of Sociology* 98 (March): 1094-1133.

11. HISTORIOGRAPHY AND ARCHIVAL WORK:

Lustick, Ian S. (1996). "History, Historiography, and Political Science: Multiple Historical Records and the Problem of Selection Bias." *American Political Science Review* 90 (September): 605-18.

12. FIELD RESEARCH - OBSERVING, LISTENING, AND INTERVIEWING:

Adler, Patricia A. and Peter Adler (1987). *Membership Roles in Field Research*. Newbury Park: Sage.

Spradley, James P. (1980). *Participant Observation*. Fort Worth: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

13. GREAT QUALITATIVE SOCIAL SCIENCE:

Scott, James (1985). *Weapons of the Weak*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press

14. QUESTIONABLE QUALITATIVE SOCIAL SCIENCE:

**Sokal, Alan D. (1996). "Transgressing the Boundaries: Toward a Transformative Hermeneutics of Quantum Gravity." *Social Text* 46/47 (Spring/Summer): 217-52.

PART IV. PHILOSOPHY OF SOCIAL SCIENCE

There are many different models, types, and approaches to social analysis. This part of the course evaluates three of the most prominent research communities in political science: rational choice

theorists, cultural theorists, and structural theorists. Each poses distinctive problems in the philosophy of the social sciences. Given that you will reread the classics, Olson, Weber, and Waltz, you can test your intellectual progress in this course: Has the material we covered on the philosophy of science and research methodology improved your analytical skills?

Here are some background readings to get you started on these critical issues.

1. OVERVIEWS OF THE PHILOSOPHY OF SOCIAL SCIENCE:

**Little, Daniel (1991). *Varieties of Social Explanation: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Science*. Boulder, Co.: Westview.

Hollis, Martin (1994). *The Philosophy of Social Science: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kincaid, Harold (1996). *Philosophical Foundations of the Social Sciences: Analyzing Controversies in Social Research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fay, Brian (1996). *Contemporary Philosophy of Social Science*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Rule, James B. (1997). *Theory and Progress in Social Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bunge, Mario (1996). *Finding Philosophy in Social Science*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Rosenberg, Alexander (1995). *Philosophy of Social Science*. 2nd ed. Boulder, Co.: Westview.

Mohr, Lawrence B. (1996). *The Causes of Human Behavior: Implications for Theory and Method in the Social Sciences*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Diesing, Paul (1991). *How Does Social Science Work? Reflections on Practice*. Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Pratt, Vernon (1978). *The Philosophy of the Social Sciences*. London: Methuen.

Mandelbaum, Maurice (1987). *Purpose and Necessity in Social Theory*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Braybrooke, David (1987). *Philosophy of Social Science*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Lloyd, Christopher (1986). *Explanation in Social History*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Rhoads, John K. (1991). *Critical Issues in Social Theory*. University Park, Penn.: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Little, Daniel (1989). *Understanding Peasant China: Case Studies in the Philosophy of Social Science*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

Rudner, Richard S. (1966). *Philosophy of Social Science*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Brodbeck, May, Ed. (1968). *Readings in the Philosophy of the Social Sciences*. London: Macmillan.

2. CRITICAL STUDIES IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF SOCIAL SCIENCE:

Bernstein, Richard J. (1976). *The Restructuring of Social and Political Theory*. Philadelphia, Penn.: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Bohman, James (1993). *New Philosophy of Social Science: Problems of Indeterminacy*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Roth, Paul A. (1987). *Meaning and Method in the Social Sciences: A Case for Methodological Pluralism*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

3. COMPETING RESEARCH SCHOOLS IN POLITICAL SCIENCE:

**Lichbach, Mark Irving (1997). "Social Theory and Comparative Politics." In Mark I. Lichbach and Alan S. Zuckerman, *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture, and Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

*Almond, Gabriel (1988). "Separate Tables: Schools and Sects in Political Science." *PS* 21 (Fall): 828-42.

Parenti, Michael (1983). "The State of the Discipline: One Interpretation of Everyone's Favorite Controversy." *PS* 16 (Spring): 189-96.

Monroe, Kristen, et al. (1990). "The Nature of Contemporary Political Science: A Roundtable Discussion." *PS* (March): 34-43.

4. COMPETING RESEARCH SCHOOLS IN SOCIOLOGY:

*Alexander, Jeffrey C. (1987). *Twenty Lectures: Sociological Theory Since World War II*. N.Y.: Columbia University Press.

Levine, Donald N. (1995). *Visions of the Sociological Tradition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Craib, Ian (1984). *Modern Social Theory: From Parsons to Habermas*. N.Y.: St. Martin's.

Giddens, Anthony and Turner, Johnson, Eds. (1987). *Social Theory Today*. Stanford, Ca.: Stanford University Press.

Skidmore, William (1979). *Theoretical Thinking in Sociology*. 2nd Ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Turner, Jonathan H. (1986). *The Structure of Sociological Theory*. Fourth Ed. Belmont, Ca.: Wadsworth.

Collins, Randall (1988). *Theoretical Sociology*. San Diego, Ca.: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Nisbet, Robert A. (1966). *The Sociological Tradition*. New York: Basic Books.

Ritzer, George, Ed. (1990). *Frontiers of Social Theory: The New Syntheses*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Collins, Randall (1988). *Theoretical Sociology*. San Diego, Ca.: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Turner, Jonathan H. (1993). *Classical Sociological Theory: A Positivist's Perspective*. Chicago: Nelson Hall.

Munch, Richard (1994). *Sociological Theory*. Three Volumes. Chicago: Nelson Hall.

Collins, Randall (1994). *Four Sociological Traditions*. New York: Oxford.

WEEK 13 (NOVEMBER 24) A. RATIONALITY

Social science is about people. Micro approaches focus on the individual. One assumption is that humans are goal oriented and situation interpreting: desires and beliefs guide action. Rational actor and social choice theorists use this assumption about individuals to derive conclusions about social outcomes. Critics of social choice theories question the nature of rationality.

1. THE MICROFOUNDATIONS OF MACRO-OUTCOMES:

**Coleman, James S. (1987). "Microfoundations and Macrosocial Behavior." In Jeffrey C. Alexander, Bernhard Giesen, Richard Münch and Neil J. Smelser, Eds. *The Micro-Macro Link*. Berkeley, Ca.: University of California Press.

*Nozick, Robert (1974). *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*. New York: Basic Books, chap. 2.

2. COLLECTIVE ACTION:

**Olson, Mancur, Jr. (1971). *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, chap. 1-3.

**Lichbach, Mark Irving (1995). *The Rebel's Dilemma*. Ann Arbor, Mi.: University of Michigan Press, preface, chaps. 1, 2.

*Lichbach, Mark Irving (1996). *The Cooperator's Dilemma*. Ann Arbor, Mi.: University of Michigan Press.

3. COLLECTIVE CHOICE:

**Schwartz, Thomas (1987). "Votes, Strategies, and Institutions: An Introduction to the Theory of Collective Choice." In Matthew D. McCubbins and Terry Sullivan, Eds. *Congress: Structure and Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

*Riker, William H. (1982). *Liberalism Against Populism: A Confrontation Between the Theory of Democracy and The Theory of Social Choice*. San Francisco, Ca.: Freeman.

*Downs, Anthony (1957). *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: Harper and Row.

4. INSTITUTIONS:

*Bates, Robert H. (1989). *Beyond the Miracle of the Market: The Political Economy of Development in Kenya*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mitchell, William C. (1983). "Fiscal Behavior of the Modern Democratic State: Public Choice Perspectives and Contributions." In Larry L. Wade, Ed. *Political Economy: Recent Views*. Boston, Ma.: Kluwer-Nijhoff.

Aranson, Peter H. and Ordeshook, Peter C. (1985). "Public Interest, Private Interest, and the Democratic Polity." In Roger Benjamin and Stephen L. Elkin, Eds. *The Democratic State*. Kansas: University of Kansas Press.

North, Douglass C. (1990). *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

5. EVALUATIONS:

**Levi, Margaret (1997). "A Model, A Method, and a Map: Rational Choice in Comparative and Historical Analyses." In Mark I. Lichbach and Alan S. Zuckerman, *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture, and Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Little, Daniel (1991). *Varieties of Social Explanation: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Science*. Boulder, Co.: Westview, chap. 3

*Hollis, Martin (1994). *The Philosophy of Social Science: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, chap. 6

Moe, Terry M. (1979). "On the Scientific Status of Rational Models." *American Journal of Political Science* 23 (February): 215-43.

WEEK 14 (DECEMBER 1) B. CULTURE

One may adopt a different micro assumption: People are motivated by culturally defined values, norms, and rules. Hermeneutic perspectives on identity and consciousness have always been important in the social sciences. They have seen a considerable revival in recent years. The study of interpretive theories raise several important controversies in the philosophy of the social sciences: explanation and understanding, idealism and materialism, subject and object (the insider/outsider problem), and nature and nurture.

1. INTERPRETIVE THEORY:

**Geertz, Clifford (1973). "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture." In Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.

Winch, Peter (1990). *The Idea of a Social Science and its Relation to Philosophy*. Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanities Press International.

Berger, Peter L. and Luckman, Thomas (1966). *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. New York: Doubleday.

Pressler, Charles A. and Fabio B. Dasilva (1996). *Sociology and Interpretation: From Weber to Habermas*. New York: State University of New York Press.

2. COGNITION:

*Sniderman, Paul M., Brody, Richard A., and Tetlock, Philip E. (1991). *Reasoning and Choice: Explorations in Political Psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

3. CULTURE:

Wuthnow, Robert (1987). *Meaning and Moral Order: Explorations in Cultural Analysis*. Berkeley, Ca.: University of California Press.

Berger, Bennett M. (1995). *An Essay on Culture: Symbolic Structure and Social Structure*. Berkeley, Ca.: University of California Press.

Archer, Margaret S. (1988). *Culture and Agency: The Place of Culture in Social Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Alexander, Jeffrey C. and Seidman, Steven, Eds. (1990). *Culture and Society: Contemporary Debates*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Munch, Richard and Smelser, Neil J., Eds. (1992). *Theory of Culture*. Berkeley, Ca.: University of California Press.

Wuthrow, Robert, et al., Eds. (1984). *Cultural Analysis*. London: Routledge.

Calhoun, Craig, Ed. (1994). *Social Theory and the Politics of Identity*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Douglas, Mary (1986). *How Institutions Think*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.

Bohannon, Paul (1995). *How Culture Works*. New York: Free Press.

Thompson, Michael, Richard Ellis and Aaron Wildavsky (1990). *Culture Theory*. Boulder: Westview.

4. POLITICAL CULTURE:

Rosenbaum, Walter A. (1975). *Political Culture*. New York: Praeger.

5. COMPARATIVE POLITICAL CULTURE:

Kim, Young C. (1964). "The Concept of Political Culture in Comparative Politics." *Journal of Politics* 26 (May): 313-36.

Bill, James A. and Hardgrave, Robert L. (1973). *Comparative Politics: The Quest for Theory*. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, chap. 3.

Chilcote, Ronald H. (1994). *Theories of Comparative Politics: The Search for a Paradigm Reconsidered*. Second Ed. Boulder, Co.: Westview, chap. 6.

Merkel, Peter H. (1970). *Modern Comparative Politics*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, chap. 3.

Mayer, Lawrence C. (1972). *Comparative Political Inquiry: A Methodological Survey*. Homewood, Il: Dorsey, chap. 9.

*Elkins, David and Simeon, Richard (1979). "A Cause of Its Effect, or What Does Political Culture Explain?" *Comparative Politics* 11 (January): 127-43.

*Eckstein, Harry (1988). "A Culturalist Theory of Political Change." *American Political Science Review* 82 (September): 789-804.

*Inglehart, Ronald (1988). "The Renaissance of Political Culture." *American Political Science Review* 82 (December): 1203-30.

6. EXEMPLARS/CLASSICS:

**Weber, Max [1904-5] 1985. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Trans. Talcott Parsons. London: Unwin Paperbacks, chaps. 1-3, 5 (reread).

Banfield, Edward G. (1958). *The Moral Basis of a Backward Society*. New York: Free Press.

Habermas, Jurgen (1973). *Legitimation Crisis*. Boston, Mass.: Beacon Press, Part III.

7. EVALUATIONS:

**Ross, Marc Howard (1997). "Culture and Identity in Comparative Political Analysis." In Mark I. Lichbach and Alan S. Zuckerman, *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture, and Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Little, Daniel (1991). *Varieties of Social Explanation: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Science*. Boulder, Co.: Westview, chap. 4.

*Hollis, Martin (1994). *The Philosophy of Social Science: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, chaps. 7-9.

*Wildavsky, Aaron (1987). "Choosing Preferences by Constructing Institutions." *American Political Science Review* 81 (March): 3-21.

*Laitin, David and Wildavsky, Aaron (1988). "Political Culture and Political Preferences." *American Political Science Review* 82 (June): 589-96.

*Chilton, Stephen (1988). "Defining Political Culture." *Western Political Quarterly* 41 (September): 420-45.

Sahlins, Marshall (1976). *Culture and Practical Reason*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

WEEK 15 (DECEMBER 8) C. STRUCTURE

Structuralists take a more macro or holistic view of social science. They see systems and institutions as real entities that structure social outcomes. Structural approaches raise several important controversies in the philosophy of the social sciences: methodological individualism and methodological structuralism; structure and action; micro, meso, and macro levels of analysis; and holism and reductionism.

1. STRUCTURAL THEORY:

**Little, Daniel (1991). *Varieties of Social Explanation: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Science*. Boulder, Co.: Westview, chaps. 5, 6, 9.

*Hollis, Martin (1994). *The Philosophy of Social Science: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, chap. 5.

2. EXEMPLARS/CLASSICS:

**Waltz, Kenneth N. (1979). *Theory of International Politics*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, chaps. 4-6, 8 (reread).

*Skocpol, Theda (1979). *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of Russia, France, and China*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, chap. 1.

3. THE MICRO-MACRO PROBLEM:

Alexander, Jeffrey C., et al., Eds. (1987). *The Micro-Macro Link*. Berkeley, Ca.: University of California Press.

4. CONTEXTS AND NETWORKS:

Huckfeldt, Robert and John Sprague (1993). "Citizens, Contexts, and Politics." In Ada W. Finifter, Ed. *Political Science: State of the Discipline, II*. Washington, D.C.: APSA

5. AMERICAN POLITICS AND INSTITUTIONS:

Robertson, David Brian (1993). "The Return to History and the New Institutionalism in American Political Science." *Social Science History* 17 (Spring): 1-36.

Orren, Karen and Stephen Skowronek (1993). "Beyond the Iconography of Order: Notes for a 'New Institutionalism.'" Lawrence C. Dodd and Calvin Jillson, Eds. *The Dynamics of American Politics*. Boulder: Westview.

6. HISTORY AND COMPARISON:

Steinmo, Sven, Kathleen Thelen, and Frank Longstreth, Eds. (1992). *Structuring Politics: Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lloyd, Christopher (1993). *The Structures of History*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Lloyd, Christopher (1986). *Explanation in Social History*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Lloyd, Christopher (1991). "The Methodologies of Social History: A Critical Survey and Defense of Structuralism." *History and Theory* 30 (No. 2): 180-219.

7. SOCIOLOGY AND INSTITUTIONS:

Powell, Walter W. and Paul J. DiMaggio (1991). *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

8. POLITICAL SCIENCE AND THE STATE

*Skocpol, Theda (1985). "Bringing the State Back In: Strategies of Analysis in Current Research." In Peter B. Evans, Dietrich Rueschemeyer and Theda Skocpol, Eds. *Bringing the State Back In*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

*Evans, Peter B., Rueschemeyer, Dietrich and Skocpol, Theda (1985). "On the Road toward a More Adequate Understanding of the State." In Peter B. Evans, Dietrich Rueschemeyer and Theda Skocpol, Eds. *Bringing the State Back In*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

*Krasner, Stephen (1984). "Approaches to the State: Alternative Conceptions and Historical Dynamics." *Comparative Politics* 16 (January): 223-46.

*Nettl, J. P. (1968). "The State as a Conceptual Variable." *World Politics* 20 (July): 559-91.

*Almond, Gabriel A. (1988). "The Return to the State." *American Political Science Review* 82 (September): 853-874. (also see the rejoinders)

Cammack, Paul (1989). "Review Article: Bringing the State Back In?" *British Journal of Political Science* 19 (April): 261-90.

March, J. G. and Olsen, J. P. (1984). "The New Institutionalism: Organizational Factors in Political Life." *American Political Science Review* (September): 734-49.

Easton, David (1983). "The Political System Beseiged by the State." *Political Theory* 9 (August): 303-25.

Pedersen, Ove K. (1991). "Nine Questions to a Neo-institutional Theory in Political Science." *Scandinavian Political Studies* 14 (No. 2): 125-48.

Dearlove, John (1989). "Bringing the Constitution Back In: Political Science and the State." *Political Studies* 37 (December): 521-39.

Lentner, Howard H. (1984). "The Concept of the State: A Response to Stephen Krasner." *Comparative Politics* 16 (April): 367-77.

Andrews, Bruce (1975). "Social Rules and the State as a Social Actor." *World Politics* 27 (July): 521-40.

Deutsch, Karl W. (1981). "The Crisis of the State." *Government and Opposition* 16 (Summer): 331-43.

Eckstein, Harry (1979). "On the 'Science' of the State." *Daedalus* 108 (Fall): 1-20.

Frankel, Boris (1979). "On the State of the State: Marxist Theories of the State after Leninism." *Theory and Society* 7 (January-May): 199-242.

Nordlinger, Eric A. (1987). "Taking the State Seriously." In Myron Weiner and Samuel Huntington, Eds. *Understanding Political Development*. Boston, Ma.: Little, Brown & Co.

Alford, Robert R. and Friedland, Roger (1985). *Powers of Theory: Capitalism, the State and Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Badie, Bertrand and Birnbaum, Pierre (1983). *The Sociology of the State*. Chicago, Il.: University of Chicago Press.

Nordlinger, Eric (1981). *On the Autonomy of the Democratic State*. Cambridge, Ma.: Harvard University Press.

Hall, John A. and Ikenberry, G. John (1989). *The State*. Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press.

Jessop, Bob (1982). *The Capitalist State*. N.Y.: NYU Press.

Vincent, Andrew (1987). *Theories of the State*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Jordan, Bill (1985). *The State: Authority and Autonomy*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Carnoy, Martin (1984). *The State and Political Theory*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Benjamin, Roger and Elkins, Stephen L., Eds. (1985). *The Democratic State*. Kansas: University of Kansas Press.

Poggi, Gianfranco (1990). *The State: Its Nature, Development and Prospects*. Stanford, Ca.: Stanford University Press.

Cerney, Philip G. (1990). *The Changing Architecture of Politics: Structure, Agency, and the Future of the State*. London: Sage.

9. EVALUATIONS:

**Katznelson, Ira (1997). "Structure and Configuration in Comparative Politics." In Mark I. Lichbach and Alan S. Zuckerman, *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture, and Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kontopoulos, Kyriakos M. (1993). *The Logics of Social Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

March, James G. and Johan P. Olsen (1989). *Rediscovering Institutions: The Organizational Basis of Politics*. New York: Free Press.

March, James G. and Johan P. Olsen (1984). "The New Institutionalism: Organizational Factors in Political Life." *American Political Science Review* 78 (September): 734-49.

Hall, Peter A. and Rosemary C. R. Taylor. "Political Science and the Three New Institutionalisms." Typescript.

Koelble, Thomas A. (1995). "The New Institutionalism in Political Science and Sociology." *Comparative Politics* 27 (January): 231-43.

Symposium on "Institutions and Institutionalism" *Polity* 28 (Fall, 1995): 83-140.

Kato, Junko (1996). "Review Article: Institutions and Rationality in Politics - Three Varieties of Neo-Institutionalists." *British Journal of Political Science* 26 (October): 553-82.

Sewell, William H. (1992). "A Theory of Structure: Duality, Agency, and Transformation." *American Journal of Sociology* 98 (July): 1-29.

Porpora, Douglas V. (1989). "Four Concepts of Social Structure." *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior* 19 (July): 195-211.

PART V. CONCLUSION

WEEK 16 (DECEMBER 15) THEORY, DISCIPLINE, AND SOCIETY

We conclude the course by considering the relationship between political science and the larger society of which it is a part. We raise questions about normative and positive analysis, theory and practice, and activism and criticism.

**Mills, C. Wright (1959). *The Sociological Imagination*. London: Oxford University Press, chap. 1.

**Weber, Max (1946). "Politics as a Vocation." *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, Eds. New York: Oxford.

**Weber, Max (1946). "Science as a Vocation." *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, Eds. New York: Oxford.

*Fay, Brian (1987). *Critical Social Science: Liberation and its Limits*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

WEEK 17 (DECEMBER 18) FINAL

HOW TO WRITE A RESEARCH PAPER

If you look closely at articles that appear in scholarly journals in the social sciences you will discover that most of the articles follow a similar style. There are six parts to the typical research paper.

Part No. 1: Introduction

The first part of a research paper typically explores what you are studying and why. Here are some questions that you should try to address.

1. What is your general goal?
 - a. What subject do you wish to explore?
 - b. What problem do you wish to investigate?
 - c. What topic do you wish to study?
2. What is your specific purpose?
 - a. What puzzle is to be resolved?
 - b. What issue is to be confronted?
 - c. What is your particular point of view?
 - i. The theme of this paper is ...
 - ii. The argument to be investigated is ...
 - iii. I aim to ...
 - iv. I would like to demonstrate the point that ...
 - v. My solution to the problem of ... is ...
3. Why are there issues worthy of investigation?
 - a. What motivates your analysis?
 - b. What justifies your interest?
 - c. What justifies your interest?
 - d. What makes the subject important?
 - e. What contributions will your study make?

Your introduction, in short, should contain a clear motivation and a well-defined thesis statement.

Part No. 2: Literature Review

The second part of a research paper typically discusses what is known and unknown, settled and debated, about the subject under study. Here are some questions that you should try to address.

1. What is the current state of our knowledge?
 - a. How does your problem relate to existing scholarship?
 - b. What does the research record on your problem look like?
 - c. What do existing studies on your topic tell us?
2. What does the journal literature look like? (You must track down journal articles as well as books. Much of the good empirical work in our discipline occurs in the journals and not in books.)
3. What do we know about your
 - a. Research program?
 - b. Theories?
 - c. Hypotheses?
 - d. Methodologies?
 - c. Evidence?
4. What are the literature's major limitations?
 - a. Is there progress or stagnation in this field?
 - b. What are the shortcomings in theory and method?
 - c. What are the major roadblocks to progress?
 - d. What are scholars fighting about (i.e., what don't we know)?
 - e. What do scholars agree upon (i.e., what do we think we know)?
5. What are the literature's major themes?

- a. What are the Big Questions that scholars are asking?
- b. What are the key issues scholars are debating?

Your literature review, in short, should be based on a carefully compiled sample of the professional literature. You then need to reflect upon that literature. Summarize thematically and avoid summarizing article by article. If you refer to theories, methods, or data, you must cite specific sources.

Part No. 3: The Theory To Be Tested

The third part of a research paper typically states the theoretical arguments to be explored. Here are some questions that you should try to address.

1. What is the research program under which you are working?
 - a. What are its core assumptions?
 - b. What are its operating rules?
2. For each hypothesis that you derive from that research program:
 - a. What is the bivariate linkage among the variables?
 - i. Can you offer a verbal statement of the causal argument?
 - ii. Can you offer a formal statement, an if-then hypothesis?
 - b. What do you want to explain?
 - i. What is your dependent variable?
 - ii. How do you define it?
 - c. What is your explanation?
 - i. What is your independent variable?
 - ii. How do you define it?
 - d. Under what conditions is the hypothesis true?
 - i. What are your control variables?

- ii. What is the context under which the relationship holds?
 - iii. Where and when are the independent and dependent variables related?
- e. Why do you believe that the hypothesis is true?
- i. What assumptions lead you to propose the hypothesis?
 - ii. Why is the hypothesis plausible?
 - iii. What is the reasoning behind the hypothesized relationship?

Your theory section, in short, should contain clearly stated ideas. You may or may not choose to put your ideas in terms of hypotheses, independent variables, dependent variables, etc. However, you must be precise about what you are trying to explain and how you are trying to explain it.

Part No. 4: The Research Design

The fourth part of a research paper typically proposes a research design to probe the theoretical arguments you have advanced. Here are some questions that you should try to address.

1. What methodological guidelines will you follow?
 - a. What is your study design or research plan?
 - i. How will you confront the issues you raised?
 - ii. How will you answer the questions you posed?
 - b. How does your research design address the problem?
 - i. Why have you chosen your approach to the problem?
 - ii. How would you justify your research choices and decisions?
2. How will you choose cases to examine?
 - a. Why were your cases selected?
 - b. Why were other cases not selected?
 - c. What type of sample are you drawing?
 - i. Individual level data or aggregate data?
 - ii. Cross-sectional or time series data?

3. How will you choose your indicators?
 - a. What is your measurement strategy?
 - b. Will you use nominal, ordinal, or interval variables?
 - c. What sources of evidence will you use?
 - i. Survey research - questionnaires, interviews
 - ii. Fieldwork - participant and non-participant observation
 - iii. Secondary analysis of statistical sources
 - iv. Content analysis of archives and historical records

4. How will you eliminate plausible rival hypotheses?
 - a. What test implications lend support to your hypotheses?
 - b. What test implications lead to the rejection of your hypotheses?
 - c. What challenges to falsification exist?

Your research design, in short, should contain clear procedures. You should state how you will evaluate your ideas.

Part No. 5: Findings

The fifth part of a research paper typically discusses and interprets findings. Here are some questions that you should try to address.

1. What was your purpose in analyzing the data?
 - a. Why present the data?
 - b. Why conduct the analysis?
2. What speculations follow from the data?
 - a. Where do the results lead us?
 - b. What do the results tell us about the hypotheses?

- b. What indirect implications can be drawn?
- c. What is the larger importance of your findings?

This part of your paper is the punch line. You must demonstrate that all your careful preparation paid off. Explore your evidence. Think about what you have found.

Part No. 6: Conclusions

The final part of a research paper typically evaluates the research. Here are some questions that you should try to address.

1. What is a succinct summary of your paper?
 - a. Purposes?
 - b. Arguments?
 - c. Methods?
 - d. Findings?
 - e. Implications?

2. What has your research accomplished?
 - a. So what?
 - b. How would you assess your work?
 - c. Did you satisfy your original motives and purposes?
 - d. What was the significance of your investigation?

3. What are the limitations of your analysis?
 - a. How adequate was your work?
 - b. What self-criticisms would you raise?
 - c. How firm were your conclusions?

- d. What shortcomings exist?
- e. What problems remain?
- 4. What does your research imply about future work?
 - a. What new theoretical speculations should be investigated?
 - b. What new policy recommendations should be developed?
 - c. What new research strategies should be explored?

In sum, the final section of your paper allows you to move beyond the data. You can offer a mini-research agenda for your upcoming honors thesis.

The Specific Requirements

Your papers must be done professionally. They must be written as if you were going to submit them to a professional journal in political science, such as the *American Political Science Review*. More specifically, your papers must meet the following requirements:

1. Typed (presumably on a word processor)
2. Stapled (no clips)
3. Double-spaced
4. Cover sheet (no plastic research covers)
5. Title page contains
 - name
 - date
 - title
 - who the paper is submitted to
 - course name and number
6. 8-1/2" x 11" paper
7. 1.5" margins on top and bottom, left and right

8. Pages numbered

9. APSA (American Political Science Association) referencing style

On Writing

You must do more than get the form right. You must write clearly and effectively. Social scientists who write well get their ideas across. Social scientists who write poorly tend to have their ideas ignored.

I can offer two suggestions for improving your writing skills. First, take a few days off and read a couple of books on writing and composition.

1. Some References on How to Write a Research Paper:

University of Chicago Press (1969). *A Manual of Style*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Mullins, Carolyn J. (1983). *A Guide to Writing and Publishing in the Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 3rd. Ed. New York: Wiley.

2. Some References on How to Compose Readable Prose:

Strunk, William Jr. and White, E. B. (1972). *The Elements of Style*. 2nd Ed. New York: Macmillan.

Flesch, Rudolf (1949). *The Art of Readable Writing*. New York: Collier

Barrass, Robert (1978). *Scientists Must Write: A Guide to Better Writing for Scientists, Engineers and Students*. London: Chapman and Hall.

Tichy, H. J. (1966). *Effective Writing For Engineers, Managers, Scientists*. New York: Wiley.

Van Leunen, Mary-Claire (1992). *A Handbook for Scholars*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Second, try using a grammar checker. Many are available as an auxiliary "tool" that supplements your word processor. You should know, however, that some people like grammar checkers and others hate them. My view is that grammar checkers are not perfect but do assist the novice writer by forcing him or her think about sentence structure and paragraph construction. As your writing improves, grammar checkers tend to slow you down and generally become a hindrance.

One final note. If you use a word processor, you should think about using its related tools: a spell checker, thesaurus, and bibliographic compiler. You should at least run a spell check on your papers. A paper with numerous typos and other spelling errors is unprofessional.

Sample Final

This is the final exam for our introductory graduate course, Introduction to the Study of Politics. You may pick up the exam at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, December 12 and must return it by 9:00 a.m. Friday, December 15. Answer **one** question from each of the three parts. You may use books and notes, but please work alone. Each response should take the form of a professional essay: it should be well reasoned, documented, and include scholarly references to specific illustrations of your arguments. Limit your response to **five** pages per question, or 1500 words. Provide a word count.

Part I (Philosophy of Science)

1. "One cannot reduce theory to data. There is more to a case than the observable implications of one or more theories." Comment on the meaning and significance of this argument.
2. Compare and contrast Hempel's logical positivism with Lakatos's research programs.

Part II (Research Methodology)

1. "Strong on external validity, weak on internal validity; strong on internal validity, weak on external validity." Comment on this charge with respect to sample surveys, aggregate data, experimental work, and quasi-experimental designs.
2. Compare and contrast the relative strengths and weaknesses of a single case study and comparative case study. How may both be designed to increase the likelihood of valid inferences?

Part III (Philosophy of Social Science)

1. "Thick versions of the rational/social choice approach start to look like the culturalist approach." Comment on the meaning and significance of this argument.
2. All social scientific theories must confront the structure-action problem of reconciling individuals and collectivities. Choose any research school - rationalist, culturalist, or structuralist - and show how it addresses the structure-action problem.

Sample Final

This is the final exam for our introductory graduate course, Introduction to the Study of Politics. You may pick up the exam at 9:00 a.m. on Friday, December 13 and must return it by 9:00 a.m. Tuesday, December 17. Answer **one** question from each of the three parts. You may use books and notes, but please work alone. Each response should take the form of a professional essay: it should be well reasoned, documented, and include scholarly references to specific illustrations of your arguments. Limit your response to **five** pages per question, or 1500 words. Provide a word count.

Part I (Philosophy of Science)

1. Ernest Gellner, in *Conditions of Liberty: Civil Society and Its Rivals* (1994, Penguin Press, p. 138) suggests that "Theories are underdetermined by facts, as philosophers like to tell us; what they generally fail to add is that coercion and social pressure take up the slack. Nothing else can possibly do it. The leeway allowed by the lack of logical compulsion is made up by social compulsion." Comment on the meaning and significance of this argument
2. Compare and contrast Feyerabend's "anything goes" approach with Kuhn's paradigms.

Part II (Research Methodology)

1. Discuss the relative strengths and weaknesses of sampling on the dependent variable, independent variable, or some combination of both.
2. Compare and contrast the relative strengths and weaknesses of experimental and statistical research designs with respect to the ability to make causal inferences. How may both designs be improved to increase the likelihood of valid causal inferences?

Part III (Philosophy of Social Science)

1. "Culturalists are really structuralists because they always look at culture as structured; structuralists are really culturalists because they always consider the meaning and significance of structures." Comment on the meaning and significance of this argument.
2. "Rational choice theories are untestable and untested." Comment on the meaning and significance of this argument.

Sample Final

This is the final exam for our introductory graduate course, Introduction to the Study of Politics. You may pick up the exam at 9:00 a.m. on Monday, December 15 and must return it by 9:00 a.m. Thursday, December 18. Answer **one** question from each of the three parts. You may use books and notes, but please work alone. Each response should take the form of a professional essay: it should be well reasoned, documented, and include scholarly references to specific illustrations of your arguments. Limit your response to **five** pages per question, or 1500 words. Provide a word count.

Part I (Philosophy of Science)

1. "Paradigms come and go but a good experiment remains. The bedrock of science is evidence and not ideas." Comment on the meaning and significance of this argument
2. Compare and contrast Wendt's realism with Popper's falsificationism.

Part II (Research Methodology)

1. Demonstrate how multicollinearity, endogeneity, and omitted variable bias present problems for causal inference in qualitative research. Use concrete examples.
2. Compare and contrast the relative strengths and weaknesses of single case study and large-n statistical research designs with respect to the ability to make causal inferences. How may both designs be improved to increase the likelihood of valid causal inferences?

Part III (Philosophy of Social Science)

1. Culture has been looked at as constitutive, contextual, and causal. Compare and contrast the relative strengths and weaknesses of these alternative approaches to cultural analysis.
2. "Structural theorizing culminates in typologies." Comment on the meaning and significance of this argument.

SUMMARY OF MEETINGS

WEEK TOPIC

I. INTRODUCTION

1 (August 25) A. ORGANIZATION

2 (September 8) B. CLASSICS/EXEMPLARS

1. RATIONAL CHOICE THEORY: OLSON

2. CULTURAL THEORY: WEBER

3. STRUCTURAL THEORY: WALTZ

3 (September 15) C. HISTORY/CONTEXT

II. PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE

A. THEORIES OF SCIENCE

4 (September 22) 1. THE TRADITIONAL VIEW

5 (September 29) 2. CRITICISMS

6 (October 6) 3. ALTERNATIVES

7 (October 13) B. PARTS OF SCIENCE

1. THEORY AND EXPLANATION

8 (October 20) 2. DISCOVERY AND EXPERIMENT

**(these last two are an
analytical summary
of the key issues)**

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

9 (October 27)* A. THE PROBLEM OF RESEARCH DESIGN

10 (November 3) B. THE PRINCIPLES OF RESEARCH DESIGN

11 (November 10) C. QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH DESIGNS

12 (November 17) D. QUALITATIVE RESEARCH DESIGNS

IV. PHILOSOPHY OF SOCIAL SCIENCE

13 (November 24) A. RATIONALITY**

14 (December 1) B. CULTURE

15 (December 8) C. STRUCTURE

16 (December 15)* V. CONCLUSION: THEORY, DISCIPLINE, AND
SOCIETY**

17 (December 18)** FINAL**

*** = philosophy of science paper is due**

**** = research design paper is due**

***** = philosophy of social science paper is due**

****** = research proposal is due**