

September 22, 2007

POS 5736: Methods I

Will H. Moore

Fall 2007

Fri 9:00-11:30, Bellamy 113

Office Hours: Tue 10:30-11:30 am, Thu 1:00-1:55 pm <http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~whmoore/>

Office: Bellamy 561

voice: 644-6924

will.moore@fsu.edu

Course Description

This course is an introduction to the profession of political science. In it we will explore the practice of political inquiry. Put differently, we will explore how one can acquire understanding about political phenomena. More specifically, we will investigate the following topics.

1. Philosophy of Science: Ontology and Epistemology
2. Puzzles, Questions, Research Agendas & Writing a Paper
3. Causal Claims
 - Causation
 - Conceptualization
 - Hypotheses
4. What is a Theory and How does One Create One?
 - Logic: Deduction
 - From Assumptions to Implications
 - Modeling
 - Non-formal Models
 - Formal Models
5. Evaluating Theories
 - Overview
 - Hypothesis Testing
 - Measuring Concepts
 - Inference
 - Experiments
 - Empiricism: Ad Hoc Hypothesis Testing

- Observations (or Cases)
 - * Large-N: Randomization
 - * Small-N: Case Selection
 - * Quasi-Experiments: Assigning Treatments

Evaluation (aka Grades)

You will be evaluated over three criteria:

- (1) Class participation which will account for 40% of your final grade.
- (2) A research proposal that will account for 30% of your final grade.
- (3) A final exam that will account for 30% of your grade.

Class Participation

This is a seminar, not a lecture course. As such, you are expected to [1] do the reading and arrive prepared to discuss it, and [2] actively participate in the seminar. To be more explicit, for each class meeting I will assign you a participation grade as follows:

A (excellent): The student participated strongly and frequently, making insightful comments that contributed to our collective understanding.

A- (very good): The student contributed frequently with a mix of excellent and average quality of comments, or student spoke infrequently, but made excellent comments.

B+ (good): The student contributed meaningfully to the class discussion by asking good questions and/or exhibiting a grasp of the material s/he discussed, but did not make excellent comments or spoke infrequently.

B (satisfactory): The student participated, but discussion exhibited a limited grasp of the material, or a good grasp of material, but only spoke once

C (poor): The student spoke, but did not address the assigned material.

F (unsatisfactory): The student did not speak in class.

I advise those of you who are shy or reserved to check that personality trait at the door as I cannot give you credit for class participation unless you participate. However, there will also be an opportunity to earn participation credit by posting on the Discussion Board on the Blackboard course site—in advance of class—questions requesting clarification on points you did not understand in the assigned reading. Posting questions is a supplement to, but not a whole replacement for, participation in seminar discussion.

I will only count the top 12 scores when calculating your participation grade (i.e., I will drop the three lowest scores).

Research Design Paper

For the research design paper assignment you must outline a specific research question in the study of politics, make the case that this is something that warrants study, generate one

or more empirically falsifiable hypotheses, and present a research design and the method(s) and data you will use to test the hypothesis or hypotheses. The key here is to focus on the following:

1. The puzzle or question that motivates the proposed research
 - Identify the place of your proposed research in the literature
2. The theory that provides an answer to the question
 - Domain of theory
 - Concepts
 - Assumptions
 - Causal Mechanisms
3. The hypotheses implied by the theory
4. The research design that will enable you to draw inferences about your hypotheses
 - Spatial-temporal domain
 - Sample
 - Operational definitions
 - Inferential method

Please note that this is not a research paper, it is a research proposal. Please do not **focus** on the specific data set you plan to use or the estimation technique you will employ. These are important **parts** of the paper; they are not the main emphasis.

You might think of this as a trial run for your dissertation prospectus, as that will be a similar document. However, this is actually the proposal for a research project you will complete in your second semester as part of the Methods III course.

I will take the lead helping you with the research design portion of the paper (assuming you stop by and seek such assistance, which I recommend). You need to find a faculty member with whom to work on the substantive/theoretical portion of the paper.¹ In the past we have organized a series of faculty presentations that first year students were required to attend, but that was rather a grind for all involved, so this year we are asking you to make appointments with faculty who you think you may want to work with so that you can discuss their research and your interests. Send her/him an email message requesting a meeting to discuss your 1st year paper project. You may want to bring to that meeting ideas of your own that connect to or build on the research s/he is doing, or you may simply ask her/him to suggest a project.

¹If you have an interest in political violence you might work with me.

Once you have settled on a research topic, the question that motivates the project, and a theory that implies one or more hypotheses, send me an email message briefly describing those three elements, and copy the faculty member who will be supervising the substantive/theoretical portion of the project. You must send me such an email message by Friday 13 October at the latest.

With respect to style, please refer to the *Style Manual for Political Science* (American Political Science Association, 2001). The papers are required to comply with that guide.

The paper is due at 9:00 am on Monday 10 December. Late papers will receive a $2/3^{rd}$ grade deduction per day late (i.e., an A will become a B). While it is not required, I **strongly recommend** that you get a draft of the paper to both myself and your supervisor by Wednesday 7 November.

Final Exam

The final exam is a cumulative, in class short answer and essay exam. The exam is scheduled for Wed 12 Dec from 9:00 am - 12:00 pm. I will pass out a study sheet for the exam toward the end of the semester.

Grading Scale

A+ 98-100	A 93-97	A- 90-92
B+ 88-89	B 83-87	B- 80-82
C+ 78-79	C 73-77	C- 70-72
D+ 68-69	D 63-67	D- 60-62
F 0-59		

Posting Grades

After the term is complete, grades will be posted using the last 6 digits of the student's ID #. If you would prefer that your grade not be posted, please notify me and I will remove it from the sheet that is posted.

Academic Honesty

With respect to academic honesty, FSU students are governed by an honor code and you are advised to familiarize yourself with this policy (see the Student Handbook which is available in paper or via the WWW). Cheating and plagiarism will not be tolerated: it will lead to a zero on the assignment, and will likely lead to dismissal from the program.

Accommodating Challenges

Students with challenges who require individualized testing or other accommodations should identify themselves to the instructor and express their needs during the first week of class. Where the challenge is not immediately apparent, verification will be required. The Department of Political Science is happy to do whatever it can to assure each student a full and rewarding participation in our courses.

Reading

You will want to purchase the following books at your favorite online vendor (NB: I did not order them for the bookstore):

- Chalmers, A.F. 1999. *What is This Thing Called Science?*, 3rd ed., Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing.
- Becker, Howard S. 1986. *Writing for Social Scientists*, University of Chicago Press.
- Cohen, Morris R. & Ernest Nagel. 2002[1934]. *An Introduction to Logic and Scientific Method*, Simon Publications [Harcourt, Brace & World].
- King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Shadish, William R., Thomas D. Cook, & Donald T. Campbell. 2002. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*, Houghton Mifflin.
- Lane, Michael K. 2002. *Style Manual for Political Science*, Revised ed, Washington: American Political Science Association.

The other reading materials will be available on the BlackBoard site for the course or online. The readings available on the BlackBoard site are marked with the ‡ symbol. To find the others I recommend going to <http://scholar.google.com/> or the Electronic Journals page of the FSU Library website.

Reading Assignments

1 Philosophy of Science: Ontology & Epistemology

Fri 31 Aug:

- Moore, Will H. 2001. "Observing the Political World: Ontology, Truth, and Science," available online at: <http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~whmoore/ontology.pdf>.
- Cohen & Nagel. 2002[1934]. *An Introduction to Logic and Scientific Method*, chap XX.
- Chalmers, A.F. 1999. *What is This Thing Called Science?*, chaps. 1-7.

Fri 7 Sep:

- Chalmers, A.F. 1999, chaps. 8-15.
- Clark, William, Matt Golder & Sona Golder. 2006. “What is Science?” ‡
- Additional Recommended Reading:
 - Gunnell, John G. 1995. “Realizing Theory: The Philosophy of Science Revisited.” *Journal of Politics* 57:923-40.
 - Lustick, Ian. 1997. “Lijphart, Lakatos, and Consociationalism: Almond and Lijphart: Competing Research Programs in an Early-Lakatosian Mode,” *World Politics* Vol. 50, No. 1 (Oct.), pp. 88-117.
 - Vasquez, John A. 1997. “The Realist Paradigm and Degenerative versus Progressive Research Programs: An Appraisal of Neotraditional Research on Waltz’s Balancing Proposition,” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 91, No. 4 (Dec.), pp. 899-912
 - Waltz, Kenneth N. 1997. “Evaluating Theories,” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 91, No. 4 (Dec.), pp. 913-917
 - Walt, Stephen M. 1997. “The Progressive Power of Realism,” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 91, No. 4 (Dec.), pp. 931-935
 - Elman, Colin & Miriam F. Elman. 2002. “How Not to Be Lakatos Intolerant: Appraising Progress in IR Research,” *International Studies Quarterly*, Volume 46, Number 2, June, pp. 231-262.

2 Puzzles, Questions, Research Agendas & Writing a Paper

Fri 14 Sep:

- Cohen & Nagel. 2002[1934], pp. 197-200.
- Zinnes, Dina A. 1980. “Three Puzzles in Search of a Researcher: Presidential Address,” *International Studies Quarterly*, 24(3):315-319, 337-339.
- Morton, Rebecca. 1999. *Methods and Models: A Guide to the Empirical Analysis of Formal Models in Political Science*, sect 2.2.1, pp. 33-4. ‡
- Examples:

- Skocpol, Theda. 1979. *States and Social Revolutions*, Cambridge University Press, pp. xii-xiii.‡
 - Putnam, Robert. 1993. *Making Democracy Work*, Princeton University Press, pp. 3-7.‡
 - Maltzman, Forrest & Paul J. Wahlbeck. 1996. “Strategic Policy Considerations and Voting Fluidity on the Burger Court,” *American Political Science Review*, 90(3):581.
 - Krehbiel, Keith. 1998. *Pivotal Politics: A Theory of US Lawmaking*, University of Chicago Press, pp. xiii-xiv, 3-6, 8-19.‡
 - Hiscox, Michael J. 2006. “Through a Glass and Darkly: Attitudes Toward International Trade and the Curious Effects of Issue Framing,” *International Organization*, 60(3):755-56.
- Becker, Howard S. 1986. *Writing for Social Scientists*, University of Chicago Press.
 - Additional Recommended Reading:
 - Miller, Jane E. 2004. *The Chicago Guide to Writing about Numbers*, University of Chicago Press.

First year paper assignment distributed in class.

3 Causal Claims

3.1 Causation

Fri 21 Sep:

- De Vaus, David. 2001. *Research Design in Social Research*, pp. 1-8.‡
- Little, Daniel. 1991. *Varieties of Social Explanation: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Social Science*, Boulder: Westview, ch. 2.‡
- King, Keohane & Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry*, pp. 3-12.
- Blalock, Hubert M. Jr. 1964. *Causal Inferences in Nonexperimental Research* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, pp. 1-21. ‡
- Shadish, Cook & Campbell. 2002. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*, pp. 3-12.

- Moore, Will H. 2006. “Necessary, Sufficient, and Probabilistic Causal Claims,” available online at: <http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~whmoore/courses/NecSuffProb.pdf>.
- Recommended Additional Reading:
 - Gerring, John. 2005. “Causation: A Unified Framework for the Social Sciences,” *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 17(2):163-198.
 - Ragin, Charles C. 2000. *Fuzzy Set Social Science*, University of Chicago Press.
 - Clark, William Roberts, Michael J. Gilligan & Matt Golder. 2006. “A Simple Multivariate Test for Asymmetric Hypotheses,” *Political Analysis*, 14(3):311-331.
 - Hitchcock, Christopher, “Probabilistic Causation”, The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall 2002 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2002/entries/causation-probabilistic/>.
 - Dowe, Phil, “Causal Processes,” The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Winter 2004 Edition), Edward N Zalta (ed.), URL = <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2004/entries/causation-process/>.

3.2 Conceptualization

Fri 28 Sep:²

- Moore (2006) “A Concepts Primer,” available online at: <http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~whmoore/courses/ConceptsPrimer.pdf>.
- Cohen & Nagel. 2002[1934], pp. 30-33, 223-33, 238-44.
- Bailey, Kenneth D. 1994. *Typologies and Taxonomies*, Thousand Oaks: Sage, pp. 1-6, 11-16.‡
- Becker, Howard. 1997. “Concepts,” in *Tricks of the Trade*, University of Chicago Press, pp. 109-145.‡
- Goertz, Gary. 2005. *Social Science Concepts: A User’s Guide*, Princeton UP, pp. 69-94.‡
- Examples:
 - Eckstein, Harry. 1966[1961]. “A Theory of Stable Democracy,” Research Monograph #10, Center for International Studies, Princeton University, reprinted in *Division and Cohesion in Democracy*, Princeton University Press, pp. 227-30.‡
 - Gurr, Ted Robert. 1970. *Why Men Rebel*, Princeton University Press, pp. 22-30.‡

²NB: we are covering two sub-sections today: “Conceptualization” and “Hypotheses.” Do not forget to do the reading for the “Hypotheses” sub-section.

- Tilly, Charles. 1978. *From Mobilization to Revolution*, Random House, pp. 52-55.‡
 - Krehbiel, Keith. 1998. *Pivotal Politics: A Theory of US Lawmaking*, University of Chicago Press, pp. 6-8.‡
 - Munck, Gerardo L. & Jay Verkuilen. 2002. “Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy,” *Comparative Political Studies*, 35(1):5-34.
- Additional Recommended Readings:
 - Sartori, Giovanni. 1984. “Guidelines for Concept Analysis,” in G. Sartori (ed.) *Social Science Concepts: A Systematic Analysis*, Beverly Hills: Sage.
 - Goertz, Gary. 2005. *Social Science Concepts: A User’s Guide*, Princeton UP.
 - Alt, James E., Gary King, and Curtis S. Signorino. 2001. “Aggregation Among Binary, Count, and Duration Models: Estimating the Same Quantities from Different Levels of Data,” *Political Analysis*, 9(1):21-44.

3.3 Hypotheses

- Hypothesis, available online at: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hypothesis>
- Cohen & Nagel. 2002[1934], pp. 200-02, 207-15.

4 What is a Theory and How does one Create One?

Fri 5 Oct:³

- Theory, online at: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Theory>

4.1 Logic: Deduction & Induction

- Moore, Will H. 2006. “A Primer on Inference and Logic for Political Researchers,” available online at: <http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~whmoore/courses/Inference&Logic.pdf>.
- Cohen & Nagel. 2002[1934], pp. 3-16, 21-23, 27-30.
- Gensler, Harry J. 2002. “Inductive Reasoning,” in *Introduction to Logic*, New York: Routledge, pp. 267-69.‡

³NB: This week we are reading two sub-sections in addition to the wikipedia entry: “Logic: Deduction & Induction” and “From Assumptions (axioms) to Implications (hypotheses).”

- Gensler, Harry J. 2002. “Analogical Reasoning,” in *Introduction to Logic*, New York: Routledge, pp. 283-87.‡
- Gensler, Harry J. 2002. “Problems with Induction,” in *Introduction to Logic*, New York: Routledge, pp. 299-304.‡
- Additional Recommended Reading:
 - Gensler, Harry J. 2002. *Introduction to Logic*, New York: Routledge.
 - Gunnell, John G. 1969. “Deduction, Explanation, and Social Scientific Inquiry,” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 63, No. 4 (Dec.), pp. 1233-1246.

4.2 From Assumptions (axioms) to Implications (hypotheses)

- Zuckerman, Alan. 1991. *Doing Political Science*, Boulder: Westview, pp. 6-13, 115-22.‡
- Cohen & Nagel. 2002[1934], pp. 129-33, 202-06, chap XI.
- Blalock, Hubert M. Jr. 1964. *Causal Inferences in Nonexperimental Research* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, pp. 22-44. ‡
- Blalock, Hubert M. Jr. 1969. *Theory Construction*, Prentice Hall, pp. 1-9.‡

4.3 Modeling

Fri 12 Oct:⁴

- Souva, Mark. 2007. “Fostering Theoretical Thinking in Undergraduate Classes,” *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 40: 557-561, available online at: <http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=1182676&fulltextType=RA&fileId=S1049096507070849>.
- Recommended Additional Readings:
 - Blalock, Hubert M. Jr. 1964. *Causal Inferences in Nonexperimental Research* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, pp. 44-60.

⁴NB: This week we are reading two sub-sub-sections: one on “Non-Formal Models” (aka verbal or natural language models) and one on “Formal Models.”

4.3.1 Non-Formal Models

- Lave, Charles A. and James G. March. 1975. *An Introduction to Models in the Social Sciences*, New York: Harper and Row, pp. 3-4, 10-29, 40-42, 52-78.‡
- Morton, Rebecca. 1999. *Methods and Models: A Guide to the Empirical Analysis of Formal Models in Political Science*, sect. 2.2.2, pp. 34-6.‡
- Blalock, Hubert M. Jr. 1969. *Theory Construction*, Prentice Hall, pp. 10-47.‡
- Examples:
 - Dahl, Robert A. 1956. *A Preface to Democratic Theory*, University of Chicago Press, pp. 4-33.‡
 - Eckstein, Harry. 1966[1961]. “A Theory of Stable Democracy,” Research Monograph #10, Center for International Studies, Princeton University, reprinted in *Division and Cohesion in Democracy*, Princeton University Press, pp. 230-41, 262-63.‡

4.3.2 Formal Models

- Morton, Rebecca. 1999. *Methods and Models: A Guide to the Empirical Analysis of Formal Models in Political Science*, pp. 36-43.‡
- Mathematical Model, available online at: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mathematical_model
- Miller, John H. & Scott E. Page. 2007. *Complex Adaptive Systems: An Introduction to Computational Models of Social Life*, Princeton University Press, pp. 35-43, 57-62.
- Examples:
 - Mondak, Jeffery J. & Shannon Ishiyama Smithey. 1997. “The Dynamics of Public Support for the Supreme Court,” *Journal of Politics* Vol. 59, No. 4 (Nov), pp. 1114-1142.
 - Krehbiel, Keith. 1998. *Pivotal Politics: A Theory of US Lawmaking*, University of Chicago Press, pp. 20-48.‡
- Recommended Additional Readings:
 - de Marchi, Scott. 2005. *Computational and Mathematical Modeling in the Social Sciences*, pp. 1-5, 144-75.

5 Evaluating Theories

5.1 Overview

Fri 19 Oct:

- Moore, Will H. 2001. "Evaluating Theory in Political Science," available online at: <http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~whmoore/theoryeval.pdf>
- De Vaus, David. 2001. *Research Design in Social Research*, pp. 8-27, 29-32.‡
- Zuckerman, Alan. 1991. *Doing Political Science*, Boulder: Westview, pp. 17-41.‡
- Lichbach, Mark Irving. 1989. "An Evaluation of 'Does Economic Inequality Breed Political Conflict?' Studies," *World Politics*, 41:431-470.
- Moore, Will H. 1995. "Rational Rebels: Overcoming the Free-Rider Problem," *Political Research Quarterly*, 48(2):417-454.
- Lustick, Ian S. 1997. "Lijphart, Lakatos, and Consociationalism," *World Politics*, 50(1):88-117.

5.2 Hypothesis Testing

5.2.1 Measuring Concepts

- Operationalization, available online at: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Operationalization>
- Manheim, Jarol B., Richard C. Rich & Lars Wilnat. 2002. *Empirical Political Analysis*, 5th ed., ch. 4.‡
- Cohen & Nagel. 2002[1934], pp. 289-298.
- King, Keohane & Verba. 1994, pp. 109-114 and ch. 5.
- Carmines, Edward G. & Richard E. Zeller. 1979. *Reliability and Validity Assessment*, Sage, pp. 9-51.‡
- Recommended Additional Readings:
 - Blalock, Hubert M, Jr. 1982. *Conceptualization and Measurement*, Beverly Hills: Sage, pp. 7-55.

5.2.2 Inference

Fri 26 Oct:

- Cohen & Nagel. 2002[1934], pp. 133-38.
- King, Keohane & Verba. 1994, pp. 12-109.
- Gensler, Harry J. 2002. “Reasoning from a Sample,” in *Introduction to Logic*, New York: Routledge, pp. 280-82.‡
- De Vaus, David. 2001. *Research Design in Social Research*, pp. 34-52, 89-99.‡
- Blalock, Hubert M. Jr. 1964. *Causal Inferences in Nonexperimental Research* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, pp. 95-126. ‡
- Internal Validity of Inferences
 - De Vaus, David. 2001. *Research Design in Social Research*, pp. 27-29.‡
 - Shadish, Cook & Campbell. 2002. pp. 33-63.
 - Zuckerman, Alan. 1991. *Doing Political Science*, Boulder: Westview, pp. 122-50.‡
 - Zorn, Christopher. 2001. “Estimating Between- and Within-Cluster Covariate Effects, With an Application to Models Of International Disputes,” *International Interactions*, 27:433-445.
- External Validity of Inferences
 - Shadish, Cook & Campbell. 2002. pp. 64-102.
- Additional Recommended Readings:
 - King, Gary. 1995. “Replication, Replication *PS*, Fall, 444-452
 - Blalock, Hubert M. Jr. 1964. *Causal Inferences in Nonexperimental Research* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, pp. 61-94.

5.2.3 Experiments

Fri 2 Nov: Peace Science Meeting// Class moved to Wed 31 Oct at time TBD.

- Cohen & Nagel. 2002[1934], chap XIII.

- de Vaus, David. 2001. *Research Design in Social Research*, ch. 4.‡
- Shadish, Cook & Campbell. 2002. pp. 12-32.
- Examples:
 - Peffley, Mark, Todd Shields & Bruce Williams. 1996. “The Intersection of Race and Crime in Television News Stories: An Experimental Study,” *Political Communication*, 13:309-327.‡

5.2.4 Empiricism: ad hoc hypothesis testing

Fri 9 Nov:

- Zinnes, Dina A. 1976. *Contemporary Research in International Relations: A Perspective and a Critical Appraisal*, The Free Press, pp. 1-5, 111-12.‡
- Morton, Rebecca. 1999. *Methods and Models: A Guide to the Empirical Analysis of Formal Models in Political Science*, pp. 13-24 and 43-4.‡
- de Marchi, Scott. 2005. *Computational and Mathematical Modeling in the Social Sciences*, pp. 10-12.‡
- Platt, John R. 1964. “Strong Inference,” *Science*, 146(3642), pp. 347-51, 352.
- Example:
 - Abstract for Frank C. Thames & Martin S. Edwards. 2006. “Differentiating Mixed-Member Electoral Systems: Mixed-Member Majoritarian and Mixed-Member Proportional Systems and Government Expenditures,” *Comparative Political Studies*, Vol. 39, No. 7, 905-927, DOI: 10.1177/0010414005282383.
Abstract:⁵ The increasing use of mixed-member electoral systems has led to an explosion of research attempting to specify their effects. Yet there has been no work on the economic policy effects of such systems, even though this has been a significant subject of debate for scholars analyzing other electoral systems. An analysis of mixed-member system policy effects is problematic, given the wide variation in institutional rules among different systems. This article attempts to determine whether the institutional differences between mixed-member majoritarian (MMM) and mixed-member proportional (MMP) systems lead to differences in policy outputs. The political economy literature finds that government expenditures are positively correlated with electoral system proportionality. Our statistical analysis of government expenditures in 17 mixed-member systems between 1990 and 2000 shows that MMP systems, which are more proportional than

⁵NB: I am only assigning the abstract for this article. You need not read the article itself.

MMM systems, are correlated with higher levels of government spending. Thus the MMM-MMP distinction produces significant policy differences.

In addition to discussing the reading we will do some in-class exercises. Come prepared to describe at least two studies from the core seminar you are taking that you would describe as exercises in ad hoc hypothesis testing.

5.2.5 Observations (or Cases)

5.2.5.1 Large-N: Randomization & Control Variables

Fri 16 Nov:

- Manheim, Jarol B., Richard C. Rich & Lars Wilnat. 2002. *Empirical Political Analysis*, 5th ed., ch 6.‡
- King, Keohane & Verba. 1994, ch. 4.
- Shadish, Cook & Campbell. 2002. pp. 246-57.
- Lieberman, Stanley. 1985. “Selectivity,” in *Making it Count: The Improvement of Social Research and Theory*, Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 14-43.‡
- Leamer, Edward E. 1983. “Let’s Take the Con Out of Econometrics,” *American Economic Review* 73(1):31-34.
- Achen, Christopher H. 2002. “Toward A New Political Methodology: Microfoundations and ART,” *Annual Review of Political Science*, 5:423-25, 437, 441-44, 445-50.

Fri 23 Nov: Thanksgiving

Class moved to Tue 20 or Wed 21 Nov at time TBD.

5.2.5.2 Small-N: Case Selection

- de Vaus, David. 2001. *Research Design in Social Research*, chs. 13 & 14.‡
- Gensler, Harry J. 2002. “Mills’ Methods,” in *Introduction to Logic*, New York: Routledge, pp. 287-90.‡
- Lieberman, 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(2):307-20.

- Lieberman, Stanley. 1994. “More on the Uneasy Case for Using Mill-Type Methods in Small-N Comparative Studies,” *Social Forces*, 72(4):1225-1237.
- King, Keohane, & Verba. 1994, ch. 6.
- Rogowski, Ronald. 1995. “The Role of Theory and Anomaly in Social-Scientific Inference,” *American Political Science Review*, 89: 467-470.
- Additional Recommended Readings:
 - George, Alexander L. & Andrew Bennett. 2005. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*, Cambridge: MIT Press, pp. 17-34, 67-88, and 210-216.
 - Munck, Gerardo L. 1998. “Canons of Research Design in Qualitative Analysis,” *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 33(3): 18-45.
 - Goertz, Gary & James Mahoney. 2005. “Negative Case Selection: The Possibility Principle,” in G. Goertz *Social Science Concepts: A User’s Guide*, Princeton UP, pp. 177-211.‡

5.2.5.3 Quasi-Experiments: Assigning Treatments

Fri 30 Nov:

- de Vaus, David. 2001. *Research Design in Social Research*, ch. 5.‡
- Shadish, Cook & Campbell. 2002. pp. 103-34.
- Example:
 - Mondak, Jeffery J. 1995. “Newspapers and Political Awareness,” *American Journal of Political Science* Vol. 39, No. 2 (May), pp. 513-527.
- Shadish, Cook & Campbell. 2002. pp. 135-61.
- Example:
 - Turner, Joel. 2006. “The Messenger Overwhelming the Message: Ideological Source Cues and Perception of Bias in Television News,” working paper, Florida State University.‡

5.2.5.4 Survey Research

Fri 7 Dec:

- Sampling: Definitions
 - Simple Random Sampling, available online at: <http://www.ryerson.ca/~mjoppe/ResearchProcess/SimpleRandomSampling.htm>
 - Cluster Sampling, available online at: <http://www.ryerson.ca/~mjoppe/ResearchProcess/ClusterSampling.htm>
 - Stratified Sampling, available online at: <http://www.ryerson.ca/~mjoppe/ResearchProcess/StratifiedSampling.htm>
 - Sampling, available online at: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sampling_\(statistics\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sampling_(statistics))
- Manheim, Jarol B., Richard C. Rich & Lars Wilnat. 2002. *Empirical Political Analysis*, 5th ed., ch 7.
- Margin of Error, available online at: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Margin_of_error

Mon 10 Dec: First Year Papers due, 9:00 am.

6 Things We Should Have Covered

6.1 The Scope of Political Science

- Almond, Gabriel. “Political Science: The History of the Discipline.” In *A New Handbook of Political Science*, OSO Monographs.
- Moon, JD. 1975. “The Logic of Political Inquiry: A Synthesis of Opposed Perspectives,” in FI Greenstein & NW Polsby (eds.). 1975. *Handbook of political science*, Addison-Wesley.
- Little, Daniel. 1991. *Varieties of Social Explanation: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Social Science*, Boulder: Westview.
- Greenstein, FI & NW Polsby (eds.). 1975. *Handbook of political science*, Addison-Wesley.
- Finifter, A. (ed.). 1983. *Political science: the state of the discipline*, American Political Science Association.
- Finifter, A. (ed.). 1993. *Political science: the state of the discipline*, American Political Science Association.
- Katznelson, I & HV Milner (eds.). 2002. *Political science: the state of the discipline*, WW Norton.

- Almond, GA. 1990. *A Discipline Divided: Schools and Sects in Political Science*, Sage.
- G Kasza, G. 2001. “Perestroika: For an Ecumenical Science of Politics,” *PS: Political Science and Politics*
- Bennett, SE. 2000. “ ‘Perestroika’ Lost: Why the Latest ‘Reform’ Movement in Political Science Should Fail,” *PS: Political Science & Politics*
- Schram, S. 2003. “Return to politics: Perestroika and post-paradigmatic political science.” *Political Theory*, 31(6), 835-851.
- Johnson, James. 2006. “Consequences of Positivism: A Pragmatist Assessment” *Comparative Political Studies*, Vol. 39, No. 2, 224-252.
- Searle, John R. 1995. *The Construction of Social Reality*, The Free Press.
- Taylor, Charles. 1971. “Interpretation and the Sciences of Man,” *The Review of Metaphysics*, 25(1): 1-51.
- Harding, Sandra. 1991 *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge?*, Cornell UP.
- Tickner, JA. 1997. “You Just Dont Understand: Troubled Engagements Between Feminists and IR Theorists,” *International Studies Quarterly*.
- Cox, RW. 1981. “Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory,” *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*.
- Ashley, RK & RBJ Walker. 1990. “Reading Dissidence/Writing the Discipline,” *International Studies Quarterly*.
- Bates, RH. 1997. “Comparative Politics and Rational Choice: A Review Essay” *American Political Science Review*
- Milner, HV. 2005. “Rationalizing Politics: The Emerging Synthesis of International, American, and Comparative Politics,” *International Organization*

6.2 The Status of Assumptions

- Friedman, Milton. 1953. “The Methodology of Positive Economics,” in *Essays in Positive Economics*, University of Chicago Press.
- Rotwein, E. 1959. “On ‘The Methodology of Positive Economics.’” *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 73: 554-75.
- Nagel, Ernest. 1963. “Assumptions in Economic Theory.” *American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings* 53 (2): 211-219.
- Simon, Herbert A. 1963. “Problems of Methodology Discussion.” *American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings* 53 (2): 229-231

- Samuelson, P. 1963. "Problems of Methodology Discussion." *American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings* 53: 232-36.
- Samuelson, P. 1964. "Theory and Realism: A Reply, *American Economic Review* 54: 736-40.
- Samuelson, P. 1965. "Professor Samuelson on Theory and Realism: Reply, *American Economic Review* 55: 1162-72.
- Bear, D. and D. Orr. 1967. "Logic and Expediency in Economic Theorizing, *Journal of Political Economy* 75: 188-96.
- Boland, L. 1979. "A Critique of Friedman's Critics, *Journal of Economic Literature* 17: 503-22.
- Blaug, Marc. 1992 [1980]. *The Methodology of Economics: Or How Economists Explain*. Cambridge University Press.
- Aldrich, John H. 1983. "Rational Choice and Turnout," *American Journal of Political Science*.
- Mäki, U. 1990. "Friedman and Realism, *Research in the History of Economic Thought and Methodology* 10.
- Hirsch, A. and N. de Marchi. 1990. *Milton Friedman: Economics in Theory and Practice*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Hammond, J.D. 1992. "An Interview with Milton Friedman on Methodology, in Samuels 1992, pp. 91-118.
- Green, David P. & Ian Shapiro. 1994. *Pathologies of rational choice theory: a critique of applications in political science*, Yale University Press.
- Hausman, D. 1994. "Why Look Under the Hood? pp. 217-21 of Hausman 1994.
- Quackenbush, Stephen L. 2004. "The Rationality of Rational Choice Assumptions," *International Interactions*, 30:87-107.
- de Marchi, Scott. 2005. *Computational and Mathematical Modeling in the Social Sciences*, New York: Cambridge UP, pp. 18-32.
- Vanberg, Victor J. 2004. "The Rationality Postulate in Economics: Its Ambiguity, its Deficiency and its Evolutionary Alternative," *Journal of Economic Methodology*, 11(1): 129.
- Frohlich, Norman & Joe Oppenheimer. 2006. "Skating on Thin Ice: Cracks in the Public Choice Foundation," *Public Choice*, 18(3):235-66.

6.3 Case Studies, etc.

- Lijphart, Arend. 1971. “Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method,” *American Political Science Review*.
- Eckstein, Harry. 1975. “Case Study and Theory in Political Science,” in Greenstein & Polsby (eds.) *Handbook of Political Science*, Addison-Wesley.
- Mahoney, James. 2000. “Strategies of Causal Inference in Small-N Analysis,” *Sociological Methods & Research*
- Gerring, John. 2004. “What is a Case Study and What is it Good for?” *American Political Science Review*
- Popular Nonsense⁶
 - Przeworski, Adam & Henry Teune. 1975. *Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry*.
 - Van Evera, Steven. 1997. *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*, Cornell UP.
 - George, Alexander L. 1979. “Case Studies and Theory Development: The Method of Structured, Focused Comparison,” in *Diplomacy: New Approaches in History, Theory, and Policy*, The Free Press.
 - George, Alexander & Andrew Bennet. 2005. *Case Studies and Theory Development* MIT Press.

6.4 Modeling

- McLaughlin, Michael P. 1999. “A Tutorial on Mathematical Modeling,” available online at: http://www.causascientia.org/math_stat/Tutorial.pdf
- de Marchi, Scott. 2005. *Computational and Mathematical Modeling in the Social Sciences*, New York: Cambridge UP.

⁶Given the popularity of this work it will not surprise you that my view that it is nonsense is controversial. I will be happy to defend the claim should you familiarize yourself with the work and then visit my office and ask me to do so (once you have completed the course and are prepared to engage in such a conversation).