This unusual (!) course is taught by three faculty over the academic year. We keep changing the sequence of materials to respond to student comments and the academic calendar. In the fall this year the first four weeks will be taught by Licklider and the remainder by Leech. In the spring the first five weeks will be taught by Licklider and the remaining by Schochet.

It is fair to ask why this somewhat bizarre sequence is the only course required of all graduate students in the department. It reflects our judgement that graduate students, as opposed to undergraduates, should focus on research, on contributing to the ongoing debates of the discipline and evaluating the contributions of others, and that this process needs to start early rather than late in graduate education. It also reflects our hope that a focus on research design, on how empirical research is and should be conducted, will encourage students to actively enter these debates.

We give particular attention to quantitative methods, not because they are necessarily better than others, but because they are very important in contemporary political science but unfamiliar to many of our students. Thus, after two introductory classes, the remainder of the semester will be devoted to quantitative methods, starting with discussions of their strengths and weaknesses and our first research design, followed by learning about various statistical research techniques. At the beginning of the second semester we will take up small-N analysis and formal theory, followed by more systematic discussions of philosophy of science and epistemology.

Because of the unusual nature of the course, faculty will assign grade for their own sections; they will be combined, weighted by the number of classes taught each semester. Thus for the first semester it will be Licklider 1/3 and Leech 2/3; for the second semester it will be Licklider 1/3 and Schochet 2/3.

Because of the large amount of material to be covered, there will be required reading before the first day of class for both semesters, as noted below.
This section of the course is designed to evaluate three general approaches to empirical research, (a) quantitative or large-N analysis, (b) case studies or small-N analysis, and (c) formal theory. Our goal is to sharpen our understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of each so we can make more informed choices about using them in our own research and judging their use by others. We will begin with a brief discussion of experimentation as an example of a particular approach. At the same time each student will be asked to select an issue in political science which interests them. We will then spend two weeks on each of the main methods. The first week will be a discussion of the major arguments about the utility of each of the three methods and an intensive discussion of some examples of its use taken from the current literature. It is particularly important that you read the example with great care. For the second week of discussion of each method students will prepare short research designs showing how this particular method could usefully be applied to their own issue; these will be presented and discussed in class. A similar approach will be used for qualitative methods and modeling in the second semester. The section will conclude with a discussion of ethical issues in research in the second semester.

The research designs are clearly central to this part of the course. They require you to show how you would apply each method to a single problem within political science with which you are familiar. This problem should be a general, theoretical issue (not a methodological one) on which there is serious dispute within the field. Normally this will have produced at least two conflicting explanations for the same phenomenon. Examples might be the impact of mass media and party membership on elections, the relationship between democracy, wealth, and interstate war, whether a social movement will have more impact by working within one political party or developing a third party in the U.S., or whether legislative votes are driven more by personal ideologies or party loyalties. Pick an issue whose theoretical literature you know fairly well, perhaps something from a previous course. Feel free to discuss it with me. Unfortunately, since I am on leave this year (don’t ask why I’m still teaching) and live in New York, I am not often in Hickman; my e-mail address and home telephone number are given above. Note that you will use the same topic when doing research designs with different methods in the spring.

At the second class meeting, please submit a first draft of a statement of such a problem. I will comment on them and return them to your mailboxes; we should then talk about each one as necessary. At the third class meeting, submit a one to two page revised problem statement which includes (1) a written summary of the dispute (a few sentences), (2) a brief presentation of the different positions within the discipline (a short bibliography is recommended but optional), and (3) a hypothesis (a general, empirical, testable, comparative statement) which, if tested, would help reduce the disagreement between the two sides. Do this by converting the empirical question into a causal statement--A is more likely to occur when B is true than when B is not true. Make your hypothesis as precise as possible. Remember that hypotheses about the future cannot be tested, since we have no
data about the future, so they cannot be used. Therefore hypotheses should be written using the past or present tense. (4) Explain briefly how knowing the truth or falsity of this hypothesis would help reduce the disagreement. This material (or a revised version of it) will become the introduction for all three research designs which you will submit.

On the days that the papers are due, students will summarize their work in five-minute oral presentations, and the class will discuss each separately. Papers may be rewritten for credit; the grade of the last version will be the grade for that paper. Students must talk to me before rewriting them.

REQUIRED BOOKS: (abbreviated by their titles in the syllabus; all paperback and available at the Douglass Bookstore):


Stephen Van Evera, *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*

Because of the nature of the course, most assigned material is not included in the books. Copies of other required materials will be available in the Graduate Reserve Room at Alexander Library and also on electronic reserve; as a backup full citations are given in the syllabus to allow you to get them from the university libraries. It is your responsibility to obtain and read all assigned items before class and come prepared to discuss them; this is not a lecture course. Items listed under “optional additional readings” will not be on reserve but should be readily available from the library; if not, please see me.

A PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE: "INSTRUMENTAL POSITIVISM"

9/5: Roy Licklider, "How Do We Know What We Know?"
*The Elements of Social Scientific Thinking*, chapters 1-2

*Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*, Introduction and chapters 1 and 3

Gary King, Robert Keohane, and Sidney Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*, pp. 3-49

Donald Puchala, "Woe to the Orphans of the Scientific Revolution" in Robert Rothstein, *The Evolution of Theory in International Relations*, pp. 39-60


OPTIONAL ADDITIONAL READINGS:


Charles Ragin, *The Comparative Method*, chapters 1-2

James N. Rosenau, *The Dramas of Political Life*, first edition, pp. 3-7 and 151-251


Pauline Rosenau, *Post-Modernism and the Social Sciences*, esp. chapters 7 & 9

**CAUSATION AND EXPERIMENTS**

9/12: FIRST DRAFT OF PROBLEM STATEMENTS DUE (see discussion above)

Gary King, Robert Keohane, and Sidney Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*, pp. 91-95 and 99-114

*The Elements of Social Science Thinking*, chapter 3


Kathleen McGraw and Valerie Hoekstra, "Experimentation in Political Science: Historical and Future Directions" in Michael X. Delli Carpini, Leonie Huddy, and Robert Shapiro, *Research in Micropolitics: New Directions in Political Psychology*, pp. 3-29

S. Iyengar, M. Peters, and D. Kinder, "Experimental Demonstration of the 'Not-So-Minimal' Consequences of Television News Programs," *American Political Science Review*, 76 (1982), 848-858

*Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*, chapters 4-6

**OPTIONAL READINGS:**

Donald R. Kinder and Thomas R. Palfrey, *Experimental Foundations of Political Science*

**LARGE-N STUDIES (STATISTICAL OR CORRELATIONAL ANALYSIS)**

9/19: FULL PROBLEM STATEMENT DUE

*The Elements of Social Science Thinking*, chapters 4-5 and appendices A & B


**OPTIONAL ADDITIONAL READINGS:**


Stuart Bremer, et. al., *The Scientific Study of War*, parts I-IV

Charles Ragin, *The Comparative Method*, chapters 4-5 and 9


ADDITIONAL READING USING PARTICULAR SIMPLE STATISTICS (source: http://www.clas.ufl.edu/users/martinez/simplesstats.htm with some additions by me):

CROSSTABS:

CHI-SQUARE:

DIFFERENCE OF MEANS TEST:

STANDARD DEVIATIONS:

CORRELATIONS:

**BIVARIATE REGRESSIONS:**


9/26: **PAPER #1:** Create a large-N research design which would help test your hypothesis. Focus on (a) a statement of the theoretical problem, (b) why a large-N study would be useful in confronting this issue, (c) identification of independent, dependent, and control variables, including those you considered but rejected, (d) hypothesis to be tested, (e) operationalization of the variables, (f) identification or creation of appropriate data, (g) what level of data is this likely to be, (h) what analysis techniques might be appropriate and inappropriate, (i) what resources would you need to carry out this work, and (j) the impact of whether the hypothesis is confirmed or disproven on the argument within the discipline.
SMALL-N ANALYSIS (CASE STUDIES)

1/18:  *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*, chapters 1-4, 6, and 10
*Guide to Methodology for Students of Political Science*, chapter 2

OPTIONAL EXTRA READINGS:
*Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*, chapters 5, 7-9, and 11
Gary King, Robert Keohane and Sidney Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry*, pp 208-230
Alexander L. George and Andrew Bennett, *Case Studies and Theory Development*. 

Stanley Lieberson, "Small N's and Big Conclusions: An Examination of the Reasoning in Comparative Studies Based on a Small Number of Cases," Social Forces, 70 (December, 1991), 307-320

Charles Ragin, The Comparative Method, especially chapter 3


Jack S. Levy, “Explaining Events and Developing Theories: History, Political Science and the Analysis of International Relations” in Colin Elman and Mirian Elman (eds), Bridges and Boundaries


D. Michael Shafer, Deadly Paradigms: The Failure of U.S. Counterinsurgency Policy, especially chapters 1, 4-5, and 7-10

Robert Bates et. al., Analytic Narratives

Edward L. Morse, Foreign Policy and Interdependence in Gaullist France

Helen Milner, Resisting Protectionism: Global Industries and the Politics of International Trade


Paul Collier and Nicholas Sambanis, Understanding Civil War, Volume 1 Africa, Volume 2 Europe, Asia and Other Regions


Vincent Boudreau, Resisting Dictatorship: Repression and Protest in Southeast Asia

1/25: PAPER #2: Create a research design using the case study approach which would help resolve the arguments on the same problem as you used in paper #1. Focus on (a) a statement of the theoretical problem (presumably the same as your first paper), (b) why a small-N study would be useful in confronting this issue, (c) identification of independent and dependent, (d) process which the theory predicts will connect independent and dependent variables, (e) explaining how you would
select your cases, both the method you prefer and any methods you considered and rejected, (f) how would you carry out process tracing (specify at least one causal process you would look for), operationalization of the variables, (h) what resources would you need to carry out this work, and (j) the impact of whether the process tracing is successful or not on the argument within the discipline.

FORMAL THEORY

Analyzing Politics, chapters 1-4, 6, 8-9, and either 10 (last name A-J) or 14 (last name K-Z)
Bruce Bueno de Mesquita, Principles of International Politics: People’s Power, Preferences, and Perceptions, Second Edition, pp. 82-113

OPTIONAL EXTRA READINGS:
Charles A. Lave and James G. March, An Introduction to Models in the Social Sciences
Detlef F. Sprinz and Yael Wolinsky-Nahmias, Models, Numbers, and Cases, chapters 10 and 14 and pp. 375-378
Jeffrey Friedman, The Rational Choice Controversy: Economic Models of Politics Reconsidered
Scott Gates and Brian D. Humes, Games, Information, and Politics
Peter Ordeshook, *Game Theory and Political Theory*
Avanish Dixit and Barry Nalebuff, *Thinking Strategically: The Competitive Edge in Business, Politics and Everyday Life*

2/8: **PAPER #3**: Assume that the large-N study you outlined in paper #1 has been completed and has produced the correlation you predicted. State at least three different explanations of this result (presumably one will be the theory you are testing, while your original alternative explanation should now be excluded). Convert each into a formal model. Sketch out a research strategy to persuade a sceptical audience which of these three explanations is the best explanation for your large-N results. Xerox copies of your models and bring enough copies to class for everyone to have.

VALUES IN RESEARCH

*A Guide to Professional Ethics in Political Science*, entire
Roy Licklider, "The Ethics of Research of the Private Nuclear Strategists," paper for Inter-University Seminar on Armed Forces and Society, 1975
*The Elements of Social Scientific Thinking*, chapter 6
Norbert Kerr, letter from FRCRP project, Department of Psychology, Michigan State University, 7/1/94
Sheila Carapico, “No Easy Answers: The Ethics of Field Research in the Arab World,” *P.S. Political Science and Politics*, 39, 3 (July 2006), pp. 429-431
Christopher Shea, “Don’t Talk To The Humans: The Crackdown on Social Science Research,”* Lingua Franca*, 10 (September 2000), pp. 26-34

ASSIGNMENT: Complete the Rutgers Human Subjects Certification Program, either by web test or viewing the film (a detailed explanation is at [http://orsp.rutgers.edu/humans/hscp.php](http://orsp.rutgers.edu/humans/hscp.php); directions to access materials and the test are at [http://orsp.rutgers.edu/humans/HSCPLetter.php](http://orsp.rutgers.edu/humans/HSCPLetter.php); directions for the film are at [http://orsp.rutgers.edu/humans/film.php](http://orsp.rutgers.edu/humans/film.php))

OPTIONAL EXTRA READINGS:
Irving Louis Horowitz, *The Rise & Fall of Project Camelot*, Preface and pp. 3-17, 27-44, and 267-312 (Horowitz, Silvert, Pool, Galtung)