

Course: Research Design and Methods in Political Science¹

Instructor: Gábor Tóka (Department of Political Science, CEU)

Credits: 4 credits (8 ECTS credits)

Semester: Fall 2009

Level, track: Core course for all tracks in the PhD program in Political Science

Course Objectives

This course is to assist participants in designing dissertation projects and other research activities, and in debating and adjudicating methodological issues in the profession. As a starting point, we shall locate dissertation projects within the broader framework of careers in political science and contemplate how the concept and evaluative criteria of dissertations have evolved in the profession in recent years. We will then review issues in conceptualizing research questions, study design, methodology, data collection, and different strategies in data analysis. In doing so, the course will focus partly on the issues and problems that occur in all fields and methodological traditions in political science, and partly on strategies related to “small-N” qualitative research, for the most part setting aside techniques of large-N statistical analysis that are dealt with in separate statistics courses in the school’s curriculum. The course participants will read and discuss texts related to theory formation, hypothesis testing, and concept formation; creating proxies and measurement; descriptive and causal inference; basics of logical reasoning; longitudinal, comparative and case study research; field data collection; working with texts and analyzing qualitative data; and, finally, dissertation write-up. Throughout the course, we will not avoid issues of epistemology, i.e., how we know what we know and how to adjudicate competing “truth” claims. However, we will set aside or bracket many of the epistemological and ontological debates in order to discuss at a practical level particular techniques for researching and analyzing social phenomena. The course will therefore focus on the following main topics: (1) the goals of dissertations and other scholarly analyses, and elements of research design; (2) selection and application of different methodologies for conducting research; (3) collection of primary and secondary data on the field; (4) analysis and synthesis of data in the dissertation-writing process; (5) professional practices and conventions.

¹ **Acknowledgements:** The general concept of this course was developed in exchanges with Zsolt Enyedi, Erin Jenne, and Carsten Schneider. The section on course objectives is a nearly direct borrowing from the predecessor of this course, i.e Erin Jenne’s ‘Methods and Research Design’ for PhD students in IR and European Studies. Zdenek Kudrna, Elena Stavreska, and Sara Svensson offered a number of thoughts and comments on the initial concept that helped refining and expanding the agenda. Xymena Kurowska was very helpful in selecting readings and developing concepts for the sessions on interpretive methods and discourse analysis. Thilo Bodenstern, Andreas Goldthau, Andrea Krizsán, and Nick Sitter gave valuable advice on readings, methods and topics that may be of particular interest to public policy scholars, while Dorothee Bohle, András Bozóki, Levente Littvay and Carsten Schneider offered various suggestions on readings in the philosophy of science and methodology. Scott Althaus kindly agreed to let his dissertation be used as a course reading. Thanks are due to all of them for the advice and encouragement.

Learning outcome

By the end of this course, participants will be better able to:

- ✓ Identify their central research question
- ✓ Situate their research question in the relevant literature(s)
- ✓ Formulate a theoretically-interesting argument
- ✓ Identify the relevant universe of cases and units of analysis
- ✓ Select appropriate methods best suited for addressing the research question
- ✓ Prepare an executable research plan
- ✓ Apply the method(s) to a research project
- ✓ Assess the empirical support for an argument
- ✓ Make informed decisions on their future academic career path
- ✓ Participate in scholarly discussions and the peer-review system in political science
- ✓ Argue about the relevance and merits of different research methods and study designs in the context of particular research questions

Course requirements: reading, participation, presentations, short assignments, final paper

Readings are listed below in the week-by-week program. Readings marked by a # mark are mandatory and everyone has to cover them before the first class of the respective week. The syllabus also gives shortlists of further useful readings, occasionally showing internet addresses or Dewey numbers (e.g. 300./1) for library shelves where they can be accessed.

Class participation including two presentations (30%): Active participation in discussions throughout the course will be essential and should help in developing a better understanding of your already existing strengths and (soon to be overcome) weaknesses as a researcher, and improving your approach to methods issues as a participant to discussions. Each participant will introduce the discussion on one of the research articles discussed in the course and play the role of the (reasonable and not necessarily uncritical, but nevertheless firm) advocate of the positions taken by that reading while the rest of us will contemplate the merits and possible weaknesses of the given analysis. Presenters must meet the instructor during office hours during the week before their presentation is scheduled, and submit by e-mail their slides by 1 pm on the Wednesday of the presentation's week. The second presentation will be a five-minute outline of a draft dissertation proposal, which we will discuss then at some length. The topic may be something that you just invented merely for the purpose of this course, but ideally it would be the one that you actually intend to develop into your dissertation proposal in the coming months. The two presentations will each count for 10% of the final grade.

Weekly assignments (30%): several times during the term, each course participant will have to turn in a short written assignment by email to the instructor (at ceu.hu). Unless otherwise noted in the syllabus below, the deadline for submission is always at noon on the Wednesday of the given week. For details on the assignments see the week by week program below. Feedback on the assignments will be provided in class as well as in one-to-

one consultations (two times 20 minutes for each participant) organized in weeks 4 and 6 of the course.

Final paper (40%): By 11 January 2010, all course participants will have to submit a maximum 4000 words (plus references) long draft research proposal – ideally, for those planning to do empirical research in their dissertation, a first draft of the participants’ dissertation proposal. This paper should contain (1) the central research question; (2) an identification of the scholarly literature and the debate (if any) that it addresses; (3) the theory and hypotheses/theoretical expectations (the latter have to be stated if the purpose of the study is not purely descriptive); (4) the methodology; (5) a technical discussion of case selection and its substantive and methodological justification; (6) a plan of data collection and analysis; and may add (7) a timetable for the planned research activities and further arguments about the feasibility of the research plan, including write-up.

Rules on late submission: Marks on written assignments submitted after the deadline will be reduced by ten percent for every day passed since the respective deadline unless evidence is provided of a (e.g., medical) condition beyond the student’s control that inhibited work on the assignment. Any such evidence has to be submitted together with the assignment in question.

Class schedule and course structure

As a general rule, we have three time slots for this class every week during the term: Wednesday 17:20-19:00; Thursday 15:30-17:10; and Friday 15:30-17:10. The idea is that we split into two groups for half the classes so that we can have more intense participation in the seminar discussions. Thus, the Wednesday and Thursday classes will normally be dedicated to discussions and you will each attend just one of the two classes, while we will all meet on Friday afternoons to complete and wrap up the topics of the week. The Friday classes will also have some mini-lectures on methods topics that – in a somewhat arbitrary order – were added to the topics to be covered during the various weeks.

The course is divided into four parts. The first two weeks cover various aspects of the profession and should be useful for making prudent choices about your academic targets for the next couple of years. The second section looks at some other factors that you should consider in choosing a dissertation topic, such as: what epistemologies do you feel comfortable with? How can you identify or develop appropriate theories? Where will you get the necessary data for your analysis? Part three surveys some scholarly methods of analysis. The purpose here is neither to organize a crash-course introduction into particular methods nor to have a systematic and comprehensive survey of the most frequently used methodologies in the profession. Instead, the aim is to improve your understanding of (A) general methodological issues in political research and how they occur with respect to just about any method that you may use; and (B) the strengths of particular methods and what their application may require from you in terms of research questions, data, skills, and further training. Part four will consist of two kinds of events. The Friday classes of this period will explore some very practical issues with the help of guest speakers, while the seminars will be devoted to your presentation of your (possibly just

preliminary) ideas for a research proposal, which you will then revise, elaborate and submit as the final assignment for this course in January 2009.

Expected prior knowledge, general and further readings

This course is meant to be taken by a relatively large and heterogeneous group of participants. Many of you took academic writing as well as methods classes like *Qualitative Methods* with Thilo Boldenstein, or *Methods and Research Design* with Erin Jenne or *Scope and Methods in Political Science* with Levi Littvay and Tamas Meszerics during your previous studies, and we cannot revisit here the material covered in those courses (for a good collection of syllabi for similar courses, visit <http://www.maxwell.syr.edu/moynihan/programs/cqrm/syllabi.html>). Instead, this course is organized mostly as a series of seminar discussions about concrete examples of empirical research, and we will merely refer back to the specialist literature on research design and specific methods when issues covered in that literature arise in our discussions. On the questions of greatest relevance for your own work, you will of course want to follow up independently the scholarly discussions of the specific methods, research design, or professional practice issues covered in this course, but the course can only direct you to some further readings on each week's topics, and it may be useful to browse these materials before the seminars, and, maybe, also shortlist for yourself a couple of them for careful reading some time after this semester is over. To take full advantage of this course while it is running, you should, however, never accept having difficulties in following discussions in the class, but either ask for instant clarification or consult some of the following general works (that provide at least some starting points) or other appropriate sources.

Epistemological issues

- 300./1 Martin, Michael, and Lee C. McIntyre, eds. 1994. *Readings in the Philosophy of Social Science*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. (Especially Carl Hempel's "The Function of General Laws in History", Clifford Geertz's "Thick Description: Towards an Interpretive Theory of Culture", Charles Taylor's "Interpretation and the Sciences of Man," and Jon Elster's "The Nature and Scope of Rational Choice Explanation" and "Functional Explanations in the Social Sciences".)
- 300./1 HOL Hollis, Martin. 1994. *The Philosophy of Social Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 501 KUH Kuhn, Thomas S. (1962) 1970. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. 2nd enlarged ed. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- 501 LAK Lakatos, Imre. 1970. "Falsification and the Methodology of Scientific Research Programs." in *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*, ed. Imre Lakatos and Alan Musgrave. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Available at <http://www.philosophy.ru/edu/ref/sci/lakatos.html>
- 501 LAK Motterlini, Matteo, ed. 1999. *For and Against Method: Including Lakatos's Lectures on Scientific Method and the Lakatos-Feyerabend Correspondence*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Newall, Paul *et al.* 2004-. *The Galilean Library on the History and Philosophy of Science*. URL: <http://www.galilean-library.org/hps.php#>

Modes and designs of inquiry. Methodology textbooks and handbooks

- 300./72 GRA Gray, Paul S., John B. Williamson, David A. Karp, John R. Dalphin, with Karen Bettez Halnon and James Carritte. 2007. *The Research Imagination: An Introduction to Qualitative and Quantitative Methods*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 300.1 KIN King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- 300./3 SIL Smelser, Neil J., and Paul B. Baltes, eds. 2001. *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- 300./72 BRA Brady, Henry E., and David Collier. eds. 2004. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- 320.072 Evera, Stephen van. 1997. *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- 300.1 RAG Ragin, Charles C. 1987. *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- 300./72 DEL della Porta, Donatella, and Michael Keating, eds. 2008. *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences: A Pluralist Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 320./072 BOX Box-Steffensmeier, Janet M., Henry E. Brady, and David Collier, eds. 2008. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- King, Gary, Michael Tomz, and Jason Wittenberg. 2000. "Making the Most of Statistical Analyses: Improving Interpretation and Presentation." *American Journal of Political Science* 44 (2): 347–361.
- 300./722 Yin, Robert K. 1994. *Case Study Research: Design and Method*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 300./72 RIT Ritchie, Jane, and Jane Lewis, eds. 2003. *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers*. London: Sage.
- 300./72 SEA Seale, Clive, Giampietro Gobo, Jaber F. Gubrium, and David Silverman, eds. 2003. *Qualitative Research Practice*. London: Sage.
- 300./72 SIL Silverman, David. 2000. *Doing Qualitative Research: A Practical Handbook*. London: Sage.
- 320./015 MORR Morton, Rebecca B. 1999. *Methods and Models: A Guide to the Empirical Analysis of Formal Models in Political Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 320./072 FIN Katznelson, Ira, and Helen Milner, eds. 2002. *The State of the Discipline III*. 3rd ed. Washington, DC: American Political Science Association with W.W. Norton and Co.

Academic Writing, Style Sheets, Prose, Charts, Figures, Reference Managers

- 808./042 Swales, John M., and Christine B. Feak. 2004. *Academic Writing for Graduate Students: Essential Tasks and Skills*. 2nd ed. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- P301.T8 Turabian, Kate L. (revised by Wayne C. Booth, Gregory G. Colomb, Joseph M. Williams, and University of Chicago Press editorial staff). 2007. *A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations: Chicago Style for Students and Researchers*. 7th rev. ed. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- 808./0663 Becker, Howard S., with Pamela Richards. 2007. *Writing for Social Scientists: How to Start and Finish Your Thesis, Book, or Article*. 2nd ed. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- 302.2/3 TUF Tufte, Edward R. 2006. *Beautiful Evidence*. Cheshire, CT: Graphics Press.
- Cleveland, William S. 1993. *Visualizing Data*. Summit, NJ: Hobart Press. (Note that Stata, SAS and R/S-Plus textbook examples for this book are available from the UCLA Academic Technology Services, Statistical Consulting Group at <http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/stata/examples/vizdata/>)
- Kastellec, Jonathan P., and Eduardo L. Leoni. 2007. "Using Graphs Instead of Tables in Political Science." *Perspectives on Politics* 5 (4): 755-771.
- Association of College and Research Libraries. 2000. "Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education." Available from <http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/standards/standards.pdf>. Accessed on 12 August 2009.
- <http://www.academicproductivity.com/> (A specialized site with lots of advice, including reviews of some of the many books about effective academic writing, including:)
- Silvia, Paul J. 2007. *How to Write a Lot: A Practical Guide to Productive Academic Writing*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Muldraw, Jason, and Stephen Yoder. 2009. "Out of Cite! How Reference Managers Are Taking Research to the Next Level." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 42 (1): 167-172.

TOPICS BY WEEK

Zero Week: The plan and scope of the course

All course participants are strongly encouraged to attend the "PhD ZeroWeekend" organized for you by senior PhD students on 18-21 September. That event will be an excellent opportunity for some peer-to-peer exchange of information about how to get by during and after doing a CEU PhD, and to establish contacts that can provide you some of the essential gossip that may be useful in making some big choices, and which you will anyway need if for no other reason than to be a valued information source among your colleagues!

PART I: CHOOSING INSPIRING TARGETS

Week 1: The place and role of the dissertation in a career. Types of PhD programs and the design of ours. The composition and role of dissertation committees. Dissertation topics, attrition rates, placement stats. Managing relations with supervisors. Conference presentations, professional associations, summer schools, soliciting feedback. Criteria for choosing a dissertation topic. Assignment of presentation topics

Readings (just sample and skim some of these before the classes as they will help you contribute questions, observations and theories to our discussions. The titles are all self-explanatory about

the subject matter, except for the first three titles that are really about the choice of your research question):

- Rothman, Steven B. 2008. "Comparatively Evaluating Potential Dissertation and Thesis Projects." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 41 (2): 367-369.
- 300./72 BRE Brewer, John, and Albert Hunter. 2006. *Foundations of Multimethod Research: Synthesizing Styles*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 39-58.
- 300./72 OLE O'Leary, Zina. 2004. *The Essential Guide to Doing Research*. London: Sage, chapter 3.
- 808./02 DUN Dunleavy, Patrick. 2003. *Authoring a PhD Thesis: How to Plan, Draft, Write and Finish a Doctoral Dissertation*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rothgeb, John M., Annemarie Spadafore, and Betsy Burger. 2007. "Faculty Training in Political Science: Results from a Survey of Department Chairs." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 40 (4): 759-763.
- Masuoka, Natalie, Bernard Grofman, and Scott L. Feld. 2007. "The Production and Placement of Political Science Ph.D.s, 1902-2000." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 40 (02): 361-366.
- Stefuriuc, Irina, Peter Mair, Jan Erk, Lori Thorlakson, and Erin K. Jenne. 2009. "Symposium: Building an Academic Profile – Considerations for Graduate Students Embarking on an Academic Career in Political Science in Europe." *European Political Science* 8 (2): 138-74.
- Stone, Diane. 2007. "Market Principles, Philanthropic Ideals, and Public Service Values in International Public Policy Programs." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 40 (3): 545-51.
- Tonge, Jonathan. 2005. "The Last Bastion of Ad Hocery? Research Supervision from Idea to Viva." *European Political Science* 4 (2): 230-7.
- 378 DEL Delamont, Sara, and Paul Atkinson. 2004. *Successful Research Careers: A Practical Guide*. Maidenhead: Open University Press
- Muiznieks, Nils. 2009. "A Political Scientist's Experience in the Real World of Politics." *European Political Science* 8 (1): 68–78.
- Keohane, Robert O. 2009. "Political Science as a Vocation." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 42 (2): 359-363.
- Goldsmith, Michael, ed. 2005. *Doctoral Studies in Political Science – A European Comparison*. Budapest: espNet. Available from http://www.epsnet.org/mem_only/Doctoral%20Studies%20in%20Europe.pdf, accessed on 7 August 2009.
- APSA Task Force on Graduate Education. 2004. "2004 Report to the APSA Council." Washington, DC: The American Political Science Association. Available from <http://www.apsanet.org/imgtest/Final%20Report%20Formatted%20for%20Distribution.pdf>, accessed on 7 August 2009.
- Leijenaar, Monique, and Emiliano Grossman. 2000. "Doing a PhD in Political Science in Europe: Information, Facts, Debate." Paris: Thematic Network Political Science. Available from <http://www.epsnet.org/publications/4%20Brochure%20PhD.pdf>. Accessed on 7 August 2009.
- Thorlakson, Lori, Michael Laver, Max Kaase, Jean-Michel Eymer, and Paul M. Heywood. 2005. "Symposium: Debating the Future of Doctoral Training in European Political Science " *European Political Science* 4 (1): 79-125.

Assignment: Consult at least some of the readings listed above before the classes and come prepared to say what you are contemplating to choose as your dissertation topic. After the classes of this week, think this through again and write down in one or two pages what you are, at this moment, thinking about to pick as your dissertation topic and why. What kind of data and methods of analysis do you think may be needed, and what may be the possible problems or disadvantages of picking this topic? It is more than OK if you are not totally sure about your choice of topic at this point, and in that case list and discuss two or three alternatives rather than just one topic. But in any case, try to think about each possible choice from the multiple perspectives that came up during our discussions, not just in terms of intellectual appeal, and consider as many criteria for a good choice as you can identify. Email me your product by Monday noon of the second week of the semester.

Week 2: Scholarly journals and their central role in regulating the attention and other rewards that your work will receive. Choosing outlets and titles for your papers, writing abstracts. The review process. Journal rankings, impact factors, tracking citations, and why all this matter. Bibliographic performance indicators and their increasing use in administrative decisions. Anticipating publication targets in dissertation, paper and grant proposals. Structuring your argument

Readings:

- # Polsky, Andrew J. 2007. "Seeing Your Name in Print: Unpacking the Mysteries of the Review Process at Political Science Scholarly Journals." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 40 (3): 539-43.
- # Wuffle, A. 1989. "Uncle Wuffle's Advice to the Advanced Graduate Student." *PS: Political Science and Politics*. 22 (4): 838-9.
- # Schmitter, Philippe C. 2002. "The Ideal Research Proposal." Manuscript. Florence: European University Institute.
- # Przeworski, Adam, and Frank Salomon. 1995. "The Art of Writing Proposals." Washington DC: Social Science Research Council. Available from http://www.ssrc.org/workspace/images/crm/new_publication_3/%7B7a9cb4f4-815f-de11-bd80-001cc477ec70%7D.pdf, accessed on 7 August 2009.)
- # Choi, Kwan. 2002. "How to Publish in Top Journals." Manuscript posted at the website of the *Review of International Economics* at <http://www.roie.org/how.htm>.
http://scienceblogs.com/drugmonkey/2009/11/a_videographic_primer_on_how_t.php

Further advice on proposal writing, dissertation writing, and academic writing in general:

- 300./72 SIL Silverman, David. 2000. *Doing Qualitative Research: A Practical Handbook*. London: Sage, pp. 113-8, 221-56, 266-71.
- 808./0663 BEC Becker, Howard S. 1998. *Tricks of the Trade: How to Think About Research While You're Doing It*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Wasby, Stephen J. ed. 2001. "Symposium: Advisors and the Dissertation Proposal." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 34 (December): 841-58.

For some analyses of what gets published, where, by whom, and whether and why academic productivity in Europe is lower than in North America, see²:

- Rogowski, Ronald, and Daniel Treisman. 2009. "Report of the Editors of the American Political Science Review, 2007-2008." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 42 (2): 426-8.
- Breuning, Marijke, and Kathryn Sanders. 2007. "Gender and Journal Authorship in Eight Prestigious Political Science Journals." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 40 (2): 347-51.
- Boncourt, Thibaud. 2008. "Is European Political Science different from European Political Sciences? A Comparative Study of the *European Journal of Political Research*, *Political Studies* and the *Revue française de science politique* 1973–2002." *European Political Science* 7 (3): 366-81.
- Schneider, Gerald, Bernard Steunenberg, Katharina Holzinger, and Nils Petter Gleditsch. 2007. "Symposium: Why European Political Science is So Unproductive and What Should Be Done About It." *European Political Science* 6 (2): 156-191.

Advice on the reasons that may lead editors to reject your manuscript:

- Neuman, W. Russell, Roei Davidson, Sung-Hee Joo, Yong Jin Park, and Ann E. Williams. 2008. "The Seven Deadly Sins of Communication Research." *Journal of Communication* 58 (2): 220-237.
- Johnson, Teresa Pelton. 1991. "Writing for International Security: A Contributors' Guide." *International Security* 16 (2): 171-80.
- Bonjean, Charles M., and Hulum, Jan. 1978. "Reasons for Journal Rejection: An Analysis of 600 Manuscripts." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 11 (4): 480–3.
- Wolfinger, Raymond E. 1993. "Tips for Writing Papers." *PS: Political Science* 26 (1) 87-8.
- Thunder, David. 2004. "Back to Basics: Twelve Rules for Writing a Publishable Article." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 37 (3): 493-5.
- Van Cott, Donna Lee. 2005. "A Graduate Student's Guide to Publishing Scholarly Journal Articles." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 38 (4): 741-3.
- Shatz, David. 2004. *Peer Review: A Critical Inquiry*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield
- Jeydel, Alana S., Julie Dolan, David S. Meyer, Robert J. Spitzer, and Peter Labella. 2005. "A Guide to Publishing Your First Book." *PS: Political Science* 38 (3): 745-8.
- 808./02 Germano, William. 2005. *From Dissertation to Book*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- 808./02 Germano, William. 2001. *Getting It Published: A Guide for Scholars and Anyone Else Serious about Serious Books*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Uses of bibliographic performance indicators³:

² Breuning and Sanders (2007) also show some data on journal articles produced by PhD students.

³ Masuoka et al. (2007) produce a ranking of the academically speaking most influential political scientists of recent times. Note that a correction of their data was published in *PS: Political Science & Politics* 40 (4): 629. Alas, the Hix data underestimated our performance – he counted 30 full time political scientists at CEU in a period when there were only 20, which reduced our per capita scores and CEU's position in the ranking by 20 places. But never mind, the point is the illustration that when other academics try to evaluate you 'objectively' within a European context, where placement stats are unavailable, there is little else that they can do than looking at your publication output.

- Masuoka, Natalie, Bernard Grofman, and Scott L. Feld. 2007. "The Political Science 400: A 20-Year Update." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 40 (1): 133-45.
- Hix, Simon. 2004. "A Global Ranking of Political Science Departments." *Political Studies Review* 2: 293-313.
- Hix, Simon. 2004. "European Universities in a Global Ranking of Political Science Departments." *European Political Science* 3 (2): 5–23. URL: <http://www.essex.ac.uk/ECPR/publications/eps/onlineissues/spring2004/profession/hix.htm>
- Masuoka, Natalie, Bernard Grofman, and Scott L. Feld. 2007. "Ranking Departments: A Comparison of Alternative Approaches." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 40 (3): 531-537.
- Giles, Micheal W., and James C. Garand. 2007. "Ranking Political Science Journals: Reputational and Citational Approaches." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 40 (4): 741-751.
- Moed, Henk F. 2005. *Citation Analysis in Research Evaluation*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- David, Miriam E. 2008. "Research Quality Assessment and the Metrication of the Social Sciences." *European Political Science* 7 (1): 52-63.

Assignment: For the seminar of this week, do a little research to find out the answers to the following questions. What are the six scholarly journals that are most likely to publish articles in the field of your interest? Do not just focus on specialist outlets but also consider general political science journals. Which others do you have to follow regularly to keep up with the literature? What is the impact factor of these journals relative to the most cited political science journals (for a list of these, see, e.g., the first article by Hix among the readings)? Which one do you think you may be able to get published in? Look through all research articles in the last two full volumes of this journal and prepare the following statistics: what percentage of the articles uses one method and another, and what is the percentage distribution of the various substantive topics that appear in these publications? Prepare these tables (one for topics and one for methods) with the help of your own coding scheme that allows you to classify every article into one or more categories and less than ten percent of all articles are allocated in the residual ‘other methods/topics’ category. Last but not least, explain why you would not want to target a more highly ranked journal. Email me your results by noon on the Wednesday of the second week.

PART II: CHOOSING YOUR THEORY, DATA, AND METHODS

Motto: “Truth is like a truffle: ‘First you have to figure out where to dig; then you have to dig around a lot, and then you have to get rid of all the clinging dirt that obscures what you really want.’” (A. Wuffle on the Wuffeauldian perspective on science)

Week 3: Nomothetic versus ideographic research. The template for clinical research in medical science compared to policy studies and hypothesis testing in the social sciences. Experiments and quasi-experiments provided by cross-sectional, panel or longitudinal data. Interpretive research in the ethnographic tradition; participant observation

Guest speaker: Xymena Kurowska (Department of International Relations and European Studies)

Readings (the first two are among the shortest possible illustrations of 'positivist' methods, with the first mocking them rather than really meaning what it says. The next three discuss or illustrate interpretivist research by field observation/ethnographic methods):

Gray, Mark M., and A. Wuffle. 2005. "Vindicating Anthony Downs." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 38 (3): 737-740.

Ulbig, Stacy. 2009. "Engaging the Unengaged: Using Visual Images to Enhance Students' "Poli Sci 101" Experience." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 42 (2): 385-391.

Shehata, Samer. 2006. "Ethnography, Identity, and the Production of Knowledge." In *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*, eds. Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea. New York: M.E. Sharpe, pp. 244-65.

Cohn, Carol. 1987. "Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 12 (4): 687-718.

Neumann, Iver B. 2005. "To Be a Diplomat." *International Studies Perspectives* 6 (1): 72-93.

For (a) a fascinating ethnographic analysis of what laboratory experimenters actually do and how arbitrary some conventions are, and (b) what experimental researchers in their turn think about what ethnographic research does and what is wrong with that, see:

121 CET Knorr Cetina, Karin. 1999. *Epistemic Cultures: How the Sciences Make Knowledge*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

320./072 Gerber, Alan S., Donald P. Green, and Edward H. Kaplan. 2004. "The Illusion of Learning from Observational Research." In *Problems and Methods in the Study of Politics*, edited by Ian Shapiro, Rogers M. Smith and Tarek E. Masoud. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp. 251-73.

Further on the use of experiments in political science:

Morton, Rebecca and Kenneth Williams, *From Nature to the Lab: Experimental Political Science and the Study of Causality*, manuscript available at:
<http://politics.as.nyu.edu/docs/IO/2797/experiment.pdf>

Lau, Richard R., and David P. Redlawsk. 2001. "Advantages and Disadvantages of Cognitive Heuristics in Political Decision Making." *American Journal of Political Science* 45: 951-971.

170 ZIMB Zimbardo, Philip. 2007. *The Lucifer Effect: Understanding How Good People Turn Evil*. New York: Random House.

McDermott, Rose. 2002. "Experimental Methodology in Political Science." *Political Analysis* 10: 325-342.

Druckman, James, Donald Green, James Kuklinski, and Arthur Lupia. 2006. "The Growth and Development of Experimental Research in Political Science." *American Political Science Review* 100 (4): 627-35.

For some introductory methods texts on research by observation (with two examples at the end of the listing), see:

- 320./072 BUR Burnham, Peter, Karin Gilland, Wyn Grant, and Zig Layton-Henry. 2004. *Research Methods in Politics*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 221-49.
- 300./72 JOR Jorgensen, Danny L. *Participant Observation: A Methodology for Human Studies*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- 306.1/072 HUM Hume, Lynne, and Jane Mulcock, eds. 2004. *Anthropologists in the Field: Cases in Participant Observation*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- 306.1/01 ATK Atkinson, Paul. ed. 2007. *Handbook of Ethnography*. London: Sage.
- Bennett, Andrew, and Colin Elman. 2007. "Qualitative Methods: The View from the Subfields." *Comparative Political Studies* 40 (2): 111-121.
- Bevir, Mark, and R A W Rhodes. 2006. "Defending Interpretation." *European Political Science* 5 (1): 69-83.
- 300.1 KIN King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, pp. 3-33.
- Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine. ed. 2009. "Symposium: Teaching Interpretive Methods." *Qualitative and Multi-Method Research: Newsletter of the APSA Organized Section for Qualitative and Multi-Method Research* 7 (1): 2-28.
- Fenno, Richard F., Jr. 1990. *Watching Politicians: Essays on Participant Observation*. Berkeley, CA: IGS Press.
- Kurowska, Xymena, and Benjamin Tallis. 2009. "EU Border Assistance Mission: Beyond Border Monitoring?" *European Foreign Affairs Review* 14: 47-64.

For some thoughts on whether and how interpretivist and positivist research practices need to be combined, see:

- 300./72 ALF Alford, Robert R. 1998. *The Craft of Inquiry: Theories, Methods, Evidence*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lin, Ann Chih. "Bridging Positivist and Interpretivist Approaches to Qualitative Methods." *Policy Studies Journal* 26 (1): 162-80.
- Taagepera, Rein, Stephen Coleman, Josep M. Colomer, and Bernard Grofman. 2007. "Symposium: Why Political Science is not Scientific Enough." *European Political Science* 6 (2): 111-155.
- 320./072 Shapiro, Ian. 2004. "Problems, Methods, and Theories in the Study of Politics, or: What's Wrong with Political Science and What to Do About it." In *Problems and Methods in the Study of Politics*, edited by Ian Shapiro, Rogers M. Smith and Tarek E. Masoud. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp. 19-41.

Assignment: I would like you to practice a bit how you can make a research proposal appealing to reviewers, and to do so before you would even start writing your dissertation proposal (and have forgotten, while struggling to develop the detailed design of your own study, what we learnt about the keys to a successful proposal). So let's play a bit and pretend that the research reported in the assigned readings for this week have not yet been done, we have no idea what results they would produce, and you are about to propose exactly one of those projects for a grant agency. Write a very concise, max. three-page research proposal for undertaking this study. Feel free to improve on the study design employed in the reading. Omit references and any literature review

this time, but otherwise please follow closely the Schmitter and Przeworski-Salomon guidelines (see both among the previous week's readings) for the ideal proposal.⁴

Week 4: The role and development of generalizations, theories, concepts, and hypotheses. Formal models, simulations, and agent-based modeling. Causal laws, social mechanisms, probabilistic relationships, multiple conjunctural causation, analytical narratives, causal chains, feedback processes, self-fulfilling and self-negating prophecies

Readings:

- # Lijphart, Arend. 1996. "The Puzzle of Indian Democracy: A Consociational Interpretation." *American Political Science Review* 90 (2): 258-268.
- # Grofman, Bernard. 2004. "Downs and Two-Party Convergence." *Annual Review of Political Science* 7 (1): 25-46.
- # Schelling, Thomas C. 2006. "Dynamic Models of Segregation." in *Strategies of Commitment and Other Essays*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 249-310. (Note that for our current purposes, it is enough if you read the section titled "Prologue, 2006" on pp. 249-53; however, it is worth to at least browse the whole article to get a feel for what it does.)
- # Rothstein, Bo. 2005. *Social Traps and the Problem of Trust*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 28-42.
- # Schmitter, Philippe C. 2009. "The Confessions of a Repeat Offending and Unrepentant Conceptualist." Paper presented at the Mattei Dogan Prize Ceremony at the 21st IPSA World Congress of Political Science, Santiago de Chile, 12-16 July 2009.

For some more thoughts on how theories come about:

- Morgenthau, Hans J. 1978. "Six Principles of Political Realism." in *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, 5th revised ed. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, pp. 4-15.
- Morgenthau, Hans J. 1948. "A Realist Theory of International Politics" in *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, chapters. 1, 3.
- 300.1 King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, pp. 12-22, 75-114.
- 300./72 Silverman, David. 2000. *Doing Qualitative Research: A Practical Handbook*. London: Sage, pp. 75-87.
- 300./72 BRE Brewer, John, and Albert Hunter. 2006. *Foundations of Multimethod Research: Synthesizing Styles*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 125-68.

⁴ Basically the task is to exercise yourself in writing a proposal - but not in inventing the substantive content of some research but rather in writing up the idea in a good, well-argued research proposal. Hence you get the substantive ideas of the research project ready-made in the readings and you can pick one from any of the four research articles for the week. They are indeed amusing pieces in one way or another but all have a discernible research question and research design. You can improve on their research design in your fictitious research proposal (i.e. the assignment) if you do not like some aspects of what they do, but the key task is not to show that you are good in designing research but rather that you are good in writing up the proposal (for any kind of research).

- Gerring, John. 2001. *Social Science Methodology: A Criterial Framework*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, chapter 1.
- Hedström, Peter, and Richard Swedberg, eds. 1998. *Social Mechanisms: An Analytical Approach to Social Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, introductory chapter.
- Glynnos, Jason, and David Howarth. 2007. *Logics of Critical Explanation in Social and Political Theory*. London: Taylor and Francis Ltd.
- 300./72 Glaser, Barney G., and Anselm L. Strauss. (1967) 1999. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.

For a discussion of how the notion of causality may apply in the social sciences and specifically in politics:

- Gerring, John. 2005. "Causation: A Unified Framework for the Social Sciences." *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 17 (2): 163–98.
- Mahoney, James. 2008. "Toward a Unified Theory of Causality." *Comparative Political Studies* 41 (4–5): 412–36.
- Brady, Henry E. 2008. "Causation and Explanation in Social Science." in *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*, ed. Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier, Henry E. Brady, and David Collier. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Elster, Jon, 1998. "A Plea for Mechanisms." In *Social Mechanisms: An Analytical Approach to Social Theory*, ed. Peter Hedström and Richard Swedberg. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 45–73.
- Wuffle, A. 1999. "Credo of a "Reasonable Choice" Modeler." *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 11 (2): 203-6.
- 320.6 Schelling, Thomas C. 2006. "Social Mechanisms and Social Dynamics." in *Strategies of Commitment and Other Essays*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 235-48.
- Fearon, John. 1991. "Counterfactuals and Hypothesis Testing in Political Science." *World Politics* 43 (2): 169–95.
- Pierson, Paul. 2000. "Increasing Returns, Path Dependence and the Study of Politics." *American Political Science Review* 94 (2): 251–67.
- Bates, Robert H., Avner Greif, Margaret Levi, Jean-Laurent Rosenthal, and Barry R. Weingast. 2000. "The Analytic Narrative Project." *American Political Science Review* 94 (3): 696-702.
- Bates, Robert H., Avner Greif, Margaret Levi, Jean-Laurent Rosenthal, and Barry Weingast. 2000. "Analytic Narratives Revisited." *Social Science History* 24 (4): 685-96.
- 320./072 Levi, Margaret. 2004. "An Analytic Narrative Approach to Puzzles and Problems." In *Problems and Methods in the Study of Politics*, edited by Ian Shapiro, Rogers M. Smith and Tarek E. Masoud. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp. 201-26.

For the key texts on concept formation in political science and their interpretivist critique, see:

- Sartori, Giovanni 1970. "Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics." *American Political Science Review* 64 (4): 1033-53.
- Collier, David, and Robert Adcock 1999. "Democracy and Dichotomies: A Pragmatic Approach to Choices about Concepts." *Annual Review of Political Science* 2: 537-65.

- Collier, David, and James Mahoney. 1993. "Conceptual 'Stretching' Revisited: Adapting Categories in Comparative Politics." *American Political Science Review* 87: 845-55.
- 300./72 Goertz, Gary. ed. 2006. *Social Science Concepts: A User's Guide*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bevir, Mark, and Asaf Kedar. 2008. "Concept Formation in Political Science: An Anti-Naturalist Critique of Qualitative Methodology." *Perspectives on Politics* 6 (3): 503-517.

Assignment: This week's readings illustrate some ways of forming theories and concepts that we will discuss in class. Your writing task is to develop an empirically testable theory about "why European political science is so unproductive" (cf. Schneider, Gerald, Bernard Steunenberg, Katharina Holzinger, and Nils Petter Gleditsch. 2007. "Symposium: Why European Political Science is So Unproductive and What Should Be Done About It." *European Political Science* 6 (2): 156-91). Write up the whole thing in maximum 700 words but make sure that you clarify the concepts in your theory, suggest hypotheses that follow from it, and outline feasible empirical tests of your propositions. Obviously, you may or may not accept at face value the proposition that "European political science is so unproductive", e.g. if you so wish then you can propose theories about who and why has this perception and/or makes this claim.

Week 5: The ambiguous relationship between data and theory. Data archives, publicly available databases, replications datasets, data available on request, expert surveys, secondary data analysis, fraud in science. Replicability, validity and reliability: how can you tell what data sets and variables are credible enough for you to rely on them? An example of how these questions emerge in case study designs

Readings:

- # Collier, Paul, Anke Hoeffler, and Nicholas Sambanis. 2005. "The Collier-Hoeffler Model of Civil War Onset and the Case Study Project Research Design." In *Understanding Civil War: Evidence and Analysis*, edited by Paul Collier and Nicholas Sambanis. Washington, DC: World Bank, pp. 1-34.
- # Kalynas, Stathis N., and Nicholas Sambanis. 2005. "Bosnia's Civil War: Origins and Violence Dynamics." In *Understanding Civil War: Evidence and Analysis*, edited by Paul Collier and Nicholas Sambanis. Washington, DC: World Bank, pp. 191-230.

For more on the subject matter of our examples, see:

- 303.6/6 COL Collier, Paul, and Nicholas Sambanis, eds. 2005. *Understanding Civil War: Evidence and Analysis, Vols. 1-2*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- 303.6/6 LEV Levy, Jack, and Gary Goertz. 2007. *Explaining War and Peace: Case Studies and Necessary Condition Counterfactuals*. London: Routledge.

On measurement standards and case study methodology, see:

- 300.1 KIN King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, pp. 34-74, 151-67.

- 300./72 BRE Brewer, John, and Albert Hunter. 2006. *Foundations of Multimethod Research: Synthesizing Styles*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 105-124.
- Thies, Cameron G. 2002. "A Pragmatic Guide to Qualitative Historical Analysis in the Study of International Relations." *International Studies Perspectives* 3: 351-72.
- 327./072 TRA Trachtenberg, Marc. 2006. *The Craft of International History: A Guide to Method*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Adcock, Robert, and David Collier. 2001. "Measurement Validity: A Shared Standard for Qualitative and Quantitative Research." *American Political Science Review* 95 (3): 529-546.
- 300./72 ZEL Zeller, Richard A., and Edward G. Carmines. 1980. *Measurement in the Social Sciences: The Link between Theory and Data*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gerring, John. 2004. "What Is a Case Study and What Is It Good for?" *American Political Science Review* 98 (2): 341-354.
- Gerring, John. 2007. "Is There a (Viable) Crucial-Case Method?" *Comparative Political Studies* 40 (3): 231-253.
- Coppedge, Michael. 1999. "Thickening Thin Concepts and Theories: Combining Large N and Small in Comparative Politics." *Comparative Politics* 31: 465-476.
- Gerring, John, and Rose McDermott. 2007. "An Experimental Template for Case Study Research." *American Journal of Political Science* 51 (3): 688-701.
- 300./72 SIL Silverman, David. 2000. *Doing Qualitative Research: A Practical Handbook*. London: Sage, pp. 102-12.
- Mahoney, James. 2007. "Qualitative Methodology and Comparative Politics." *Comparative Political Studies* 40 (2): 122-44.
- 300./72 Gerring, John. 2007. *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 300./722 George, Alexander L., and Andrew Bennett. 2005. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- 300./72 RAG Ragin, Charles, and Howard Becker, eds. 1992. *What is a Case: Exploring the Foundations of Social Inquiry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 300./722 Yin, Robert K. 1993. *Applications of Case Study Research*. London: Sage
- 300./722 Stake, Robert E. 1995. *The Art of Case Study Research*. London: Sage.
- 300./72 Gillham, Bill. 2000. *Case Study Research Methods*. London: Continuum.

Assignment: Search for publicly available data sets in your field of interest. Choose one and describe a theoretical problem that you could analyze using these data. Explain how exactly this data will allow the required analysis. Evaluate the data set in terms of substantive content; coverage (geographic and temporal dimensions); validity; reliability; replicability; and accessibility. There may be some more criteria to think about when you are assessing whether you can actually use a given data to address a particular question (sometimes specific to the kind of data that you are looking at), so do not necessarily take these six points as an exhaustive list. In some cases some of these six items will really look so trivial that you do not want to bother writing down your answer to them in the assignment. But do try to think through these kinds of questions about the data set that you will discuss in the assignment and write down your assessment. Do all this in no more than 600 words. See the forum on this assignment on the

course's e-learning site for some more idea about what you may consider "data" and where you can look for useful materials, as well as what you may want to look at while assessing a dataset in terms of the above criteria.

PART III: Problems of case selection, data collection and analysis, external and internal validity, and inference under different methods

Motto: "I've missed over 9,000 shots in my career. Twenty-six times I've been trusted to take the game winning shot and missed. I've failed over and over again in life. And that is why I succeed." (Michael Jordan)

Week 6: Research cultures from arts via crafts to industrial production. Frequency distribution of various methods in political science and across its different fields. Cross-sectional and longitudinal quantitative data in the analysis of causal relationships

NOTE: CEU hosts some high-profile lectures this week and because of that each of our time slots for the 6th week were moved one hour later, i.e. to 6.10-7.50 pm on Wednesday, 28 October; to 4.10-5.50 pm on Thursday, 29 October; and 4.10-5.50 pm on Friday, 30 October.

Readings:

Putnam, Robert D., with Roberto Leonardi, and Raffaella Y. Nanetti. 1993. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, pp. 1-120.

For some commentary on Putnam's book, see:

Morlino, Leonardo. 1995. "Italy's Civic Divide." *Journal of Democracy* 6 (1): 173-177.

Tarrow, Sidney. 1996. "Making Social Science Work Across Space and Time: A Critical Reflection on Robert Putnam's Making Democracy Work." *American Political Science Review* 90 (2): 389-97.

Jackman, Robert W., and Ross A. Miller. 1996. "A Renaissance of Political Culture?" *American Journal of Political Science* 40: 632-59.

Jackman, Robert W., and Ross A. Miller. 1998. "Social Capital and Politics." *Annual Review of Political Science* 1: 47-73.

Rothstein, Bo. 2005. *Social Traps and the Problem of Trust*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 43-70.

Solt, Frederick. 2004. "Civics or Structure? Revisiting the Origins of Democratic Quality in the Italian Regions." *British Journal of Political Science* 34 (1): 123-135.

O'Connell, Michael. 2003. "Anti 'Social Capital'. Civic Values versus Economic Equality in the EU." *European Sociological Review* 19 (3): 241-248.

Ballarino, Gabriele, and Hans Schadee. 2005. "Civicness and Economic Performance. A Longitudinal Analysis of Italian Provinces, 1980-2000." *European Sociological Review* 21 (3): 243-257.

For an example of a CEU PhD student applying quantitative macro-data analysis for her dissertation and getting published a co-authored journal article on the way, see:

Lapuente, Victor, and Marina Nistotskaya. 2009. "To the Short-Sighted Victor Belong the Spoils: Politics and Merit Adoption in Comparative Perspective." *Governance* 22 (3): 431-458.

For some recent evidence on the frequency distribution of various methods and approaches in the discipline, see:

Turner, Charles C., and Cameron G. Thies. 2009. "What We Mean by Scope and Methods: A Survey of Undergraduate Scope and Methods Courses." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 42 (2): 367-373.

Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine. 2003. "Is This the Curriculum We Want? Doctoral Requirements and Offerings in Methods and Methodology." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 36 (3): 379-386.

Bennett, Andre, Aharo Barth, and Kennet R. Rutherford. 2003. "Do We Preach What We Practice? A Survey of Methods in Political Science Journals and Curricula." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 36 (3): 373-8. Also available from <http://www.apsanet.org/imgtest/PreachWhatWePractice-Bennett.pdf>

King, Ronald F., and Cosmin Gabriel Maria. 2008. "Defining Political Science: A Cross-National Survey." *European Political Science* 7 (2): 207-219.

300./3 SIL Smelser, Neil J., and Paul B. Baltes, eds. 2001. *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

320./072 BOX Box-Steffensmeier, Janet M., Henry E. Brady, and David Collier, eds. 2008. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Week 7: Interpretive research with discourse analysis

Guest speaker: Xymena Kurowska (Department of International Relations and European Studies)

Readings:

Soss, Joe. 2006. "Talking Our Way to Meaningful Explanations: A Practice-Oriented View of Interviewing for Interpretive Research." In *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*, eds. Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea. New York: M.E. Sharpe, pp. 127-49.

Hansen, Lene. 2006. *Security as Practice: Discourse Analysis and the Bosnian War*. London: Routledge. Chapters 2-3 and 6-9.

For more on discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis, see, e.g.:

300./72 Brewer, John, and Albert Hunter. 2006. *Foundations of Multimethod Research: Synthesizing Styles*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 59-78.

Dessler, David, and John Owen. 2005. "Constructivism and the Problem of Explanation." *Perspectives on Politics* 3 (3): 597-610.

- 300./72 Fairclough, Norman. 2003. *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Routledge.
- Glynos, Jason, and David Howarth. 2008. "Structure, Agency and Power in Political Analysis: Beyond Contextualized Self-Interpretations." *Political Studies Review* 6: 155-169.
- Herrera, Yoshiko M., and Bear F. Braumoller, eds. 2004. "Symposium: Discourse and Content Analysis." *Qualitative Methods: Newsletter of the APSA Organized Section on Qualitative Methods* (Spring): 15-39.
- 327./1/01 Klotz, Audie, and Cecelia M. Lynch. 2007. *Strategies for Research in Constructivist International Relations*. New York: M.E. Sharpe
- Milliken, Jennifer. 1999. "The Study of Discourse in International Relations: A Critique of Research and Methods." *European Journal of International Relations* 5 (2): 225-254.
- Potter, Jonathan, and Margaret Wetherell. 1994. "Analyzing Discourse." In *Analyzing Qualitative Data*, edited by Alan Bryman and Robert G. Burgess. London: Routledge, pp. 47-66.
- 300./72 Silverman, David. 2000. *Doing Qualitative Research: A Practical Handbook*. London: Sage, pp. 88-101.
- 320./011 Stavrakakis, Yannis. 1999. *Lacan & The Political*. London: Routledge.
- 401.4/1 Wetherell, Margaret, Stephanie Taylor, and Simeon J. Yates. 2001. *Discourse as Data: A Guide for Analysis*. London: Sage.
- 401.4/1 Wodak, Ruth, and Michael Meyer, eds. 2001. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage.

For some more applications, see:

- Chiang, Shiao-Yun. 2009. "Personal Power and Positional Power in a Power-Full 'I': A Discourse Analysis of Doctoral Dissertation Supervision." *Discourse & Communication* 3 (3): 255-71.
- 324./2/41 Fairclough, Norman. 2000. *New Labour, New Language?* London: Routledge.
- 302.2/3 Fairclough, Norman. 1995. *Media Discourse*. London: Edward Arnold.
- 320./014 Howarth, David, and Jacob Torfing, eds. 2005. *Discourse Theory in European Politics: Identity, Policy and Governance*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- 335./009 Laclau, Ernesto, and Chantal Mouffe. 1985. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy*. London: Verso.
- 321./094 Laclau, Ernesto. 1990. *New Reflections on the Revolution of Our Time*. London: Verso.
- 321.8 Laclau, Ernesto. 2005. *On Populist Reason*. London: Verso.
- Milliken, Jennifer. 2002. *The Social Construction of the Korean War: Conflict Possibilities*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Politi, Panagiota. 2009. "One-sided Laughter in Academic Presentations: A Small-scale Investigation." *Discourse Studies* 11 (5): 561-584.
- 302.2/3 Richardson, John E. 2007. *Analysing Newspapers: An Approach from Critical Discourse Analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan.
- Verdoolaege, Annelies. 2009. "The Audience as Actor: The Participation Status of the Audience at the Victim Hearings of the South African TRC." *Discourse Studies* 11 (4): 441-463
- 306.4/4 Wodak, Ruth, Rudolf de Cillia, Martin Reisigl, and Karin Liebhart. 1999. *The Discursive Construction of National Identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

140 Zizek, Slavoj. 1989. *The Sublime Object of Ideology*. London: Verso.

Note that most journals dedicated to discourse analysis – e.g., *Discourse & Communication*, *Discourse & Society* and *Critical Discourse Studies* – are, like the Wodak, Chiang and Fairclough readings above, mostly devoted to critical discourse analysis, i.e. a “critical realist” and (socio-)linguistics-oriented branch of discourse analysis.

Week 8: Hypothesis testing in comparative (case) studies. Case selection in small-, medium-, large-N and multilevel research

Readings:

Grzymala-Busse, Anna. 2007. *Rebuilding Leviathan: Party Competition and State Exploitation in Post-Communist Democracies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-28, 81-132.

For journal articles emanating from the same research project (a nice illustration of how you can get more than just a book out of a book project), see:

Grzymala-Busse, Anna. 2003. "Political Competition and the Politicization of the State in East Central Europe." *Comparative Political Studies* 36 (10): 1123-1147.

Grzymala-Busse, Anna. 2006. "The Discreet Charm of Formal Institutions: Postcommunist Party Competition and State Oversight." *Comparative Political Studies* 39 (3): 271-300.

Grzymala-Busse, Anna. 2006. "Authoritarian Determinants of Democratic Party Competition: The Communist Successor Parties in East Central Europe." *Party Politics* 12 (3): 415-437.

Grzymala-Busse, Anna. 2007. "Encouraging Effective Democratic Competition." *East European Politics and Societies* 21 (1): 91-110.

On the comparative methods, see:

320.3 LAN Landman, Todd. 2008. *Issues and Methods in Comparative Politics: An Introduction*. 3rd ed. London: Routledge.

300.1 KIN King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, pp. 115-49, 208-30.

320./072 BUR Burnham, Peter, Karin Gilland, Wyn Grant, and Zig Layton-Henry. 2004. *Research Methods in Politics*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 58-79, 165-88, 205-20.

300./72 BRE Brewer, John, and Albert Hunter. 2006. *Foundations of Multimethod Research: Synthesizing Styles*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 79-104.

320./072 FIN Collier, David 1993. "The Comparative Method." in *Political Science: The State of the Discipline II*, ed. by Ada W. Finifter. Washington, DC: American Political Science Association, pp. 105-19.

Clarke, Kevin A. 2007. "The Necessity of Being Comparative: Theory Confirmation in Quantitative Political Science." *Comparative Political Studies* 40 (7): 886-908.

- Lieberman, Evan S. 2005. "Nested Analysis as a Mixed-method Strategy for Comparative Research." *American Political Science Review* 99 (3): 435–52.
- Rohlfing, Ingo. 2008. "What You See and What You Get: Pitfalls and Principles of Nested Analysis in Comparative Research." *Comparative Political Studies* 41 (11): 1492–514.

For troubling questions and good advice about case selection in comparative research, see:

- Sartori, Giovanni 1996. "Comparing and Miscomparing." In *Comparative Politics. Notes and Readings*. 8th ed., ed. Belmont, Steven L. Brown and Roy C. Macridis. CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company. pp. 20–30.
- Lijphart, Arend 1975. "The Comparable-cases Strategy in Comparative Research." *Comparative Political Studies* 8: 158–77.
- Hicks, Alexander M. 1994. "Qualitative Comparative Analysis and Analytical Induction: The Case of the Emergence of the Social Security State." *Sociological Methods and Research* 23 (1): 86-113 .
- Geddes, Barbara. 1990. "How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics." *Political Analysis* 2: 131-150.
- Collier, David 1995. "Translating Quantitative Methods for Qualitative Researchers: The Case of Selection Bias." *American Political Science Review* 89: 461-74.
- Collier, David G., and James Mahoney 1996. "Insights and Pitfalls: Selection Bias in Qualitative Research." *World Politics* 49: 56-91.

For a fitting example of the complexity of arguments about case selection in a particular study:

- Ashworth, Scott, Joshua D. Clinton, Adam Meirowitz, and Kristopher W. Ramsay. 2008. "Design, Inference, and the Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism." *American Political Science Review* 102 (2): 269-273.
- Pape, Robert A. 2008. "Methods and Findings in the Study of Suicide Terrorism." *American Political Science Review* 102 (2): 275-277.

Week 9: Research at the ideographic end of the continuum. The use of interviews, (participatory) action research, content analysis, and focus groups. Accounting for possible data errors and the treatment of missing observations in the analysis

Guest speaker: Andrea Krizsán (Center for Policy Studies)

Readings (*Descriptively-oriented research tends to require longer reports than nomothetic studies, so be prepared to skim Ferree et al. 2002 in its entirety. As you will see, the book is organized around 'two stories'. We will discuss the first (analyzing alternative frames of an issue) at the Wednesday seminar, so if you attend that seminar then make sure that you read more carefully the following bits: pp. 3-24, 43-57, 59, 82-153, 286-304. The second 'story' (evaluating discourse quality) will be discussed at the Thursday seminar, so if you attend that then make sure that you read more carefully the following bits: pp. 3-24, 43-57, 59, 126-30, 201-255, 280-5, 286-304. On Friday we shall move on to have a look at some further methods topics that, once*

again, were somewhat arbitrarily allocated to this week, and you find a few readings for those below.

Ferree, Myra Marx, William Anthony Gamson, Jürgen Gerhards, and Dieter Rucht. 2002. *Shaping Abortion Discourse. Democracy and Public Sphere in Germany and the US*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

On descriptive designs:

300.1 KIN King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, pp. 34-74.

On interviewing:

Drzewiecka, Anna. 2007. "The Joys and Perils of Conducting Field Research in Eastern Europe." *European Political Science* 6 (3): 295-301.

300./72 WEN Wengraf, Tom. 2001. *Qualitative Research Interviewing: Biographical Narrative and Semi-structured Methods*. London: Sage.

300./72 SIL Silverman, David. 2000. *Doing Qualitative Research: A Practical Handbook*. London: Sage, pp. 119-190.

For a concise introduction to issues in the treatment of missing data, see:

Allison, Paul D. 2002. *Missing Data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

On content analysis (textbooks and examples of use):

401.4/1 POP Popping, Roel. 2000. *Computer-assisted Text Analysis*. London: Sage.

300./72 SEA Kelle, Udo. 2004. "Computer-Assisted Qualitative Data Analysis." in *Qualitative Research Practice*, edited by Clive Seale, Giampietro Gobo, Jaber F. Gubrium, and David Silverman. London: Sage, pp. 473-489.

Jerit, Jennifer, and Jason Barabas. 2006. "Bankrupt Rhetoric: How Misleading Information Affects Knowledge about Social Security." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 70 (3): 278-303.

320./014 STE Steiner, Jürg, André Bächtiger, Markus Spörndli, and Marco R. Steenbergen. 2004. *Deliberative Politics in Action: Analysing Parliamentary Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hofferbert, Richard I., and Hans-Dieter Klingemann. 1990. "The Policy Impact of Party Programmes and Government Declarations in the Federal Republic of Germany." *European Journal of Political Research* 18: 277-304.

Barker, David C., and Adam B. Lawrence. 2006. "Media Favoritism and Presidential Nominations: Reviving the Direct Effects Model." *Political Communication* 23 (1): 41-59.

On the design and conduct of focus groups and their possible substantive yield, see:

300./723 MOR Morgan, David L. 1998. *Planning Focus Groups*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

300./723 KRU Krueger, Richard A. 1998. *Moderating Focus Groups*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Bartle, John. 2003. "Measuring Party Identification: An Exploratory Study with Focus Groups." *Electoral Studies* 22 (2): 217-37.

CEUL 941./085/092 Billig, Michael. 1998. *Talking of the Royal Family*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.

300./72 HEN Hennink, Monique M. 2007. *International Focus Group Research: A Handbook for the Health and Social Sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

PART IV: PRESENTATIONS OF DRAFT PROPOSALS AND SOME PRACTICAL QUESTIONS

Week 10: Presentation of draft dissertation proposals starts. Taking stock about research design - what have we learnt, what do we miss, and what can we do about that?

Note: The original idea was that the “taking stock” class would take place in week 12 and involve a round-table “discussion about job markets, jobbanks, interview guides and mock-interviews; combining dissertation writing with teaching, other research, and parenthood” with CEU faculty, alumni, and ABD (all-but-dissertation) PhD students. However, now that the doctoral school plans to organize a whole seminar series on academic practice, it seems that we can better spend this class with taking stock of where we got and you are still missing for writing up your draft dissertation proposals. I did however leave the recommended readings unchanged, i.e. they are related to the originally intended topic of the week 12 roundtable.

Readings (none is mandatory this week and the caveat again applies that, unless you are interested in Anglosaxon job markets, the readings below may give more ideas about the questions that you can ask than about the answers that you are interested in):

378.1/2 DEN DeNeef, A. Leigh, and Craufurd D. Goodwin, eds. 1995. *The Academic's Handbook*. 2nd ed. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. (The 3rd edition came out in 2007 but is not yet available in the library.)

Fuerstman, Daniel, and Stephan Lavertu. 2005. "The Academic Hiring Process: A Survey of Department Chairs." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 38 (4): 731-6.

Rothgeb, John M., and Betsy Burger. 2009. "Tenure Standards in Political Science Departments: Results from a Survey of Department Chairs." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 42 (3): 513-9.

Klingemann, Hans-Dieter. 2008. "Capacities: Political Science in Europe." *West European Politics* 31 (1): 370-96.

378 DEL Delamont, Sara, and Paul Atkinson. 2004. *Successful Research Careers: A Practical Guide*. Maidenhead: Open University Press

Klingemann, Hans-Dieter, and *et al.* 2009. "Political Science in Central and Eastern Europe: National Development and International Integration." Berlin, Mannheim: Gesis - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften. Available from <http://www.cee-socialscience.net/archive/politicalscience/article1.html>. Accessed on 7 August 2009.

The PS: Political Science & Politics magazine of the APSA and European Political Science published by the ECPR are useful source of informal but evidence-based commentary on this kind of matters, and are written specifically for political scientist. Less discipline-specific, far more subjective, but also more plentiful advice can be found in the magazine Inside Higher

Education, which has a 'Career Advice' section featuring a handy search facility and lots of great tips. See, e.g.:

Sabine Hikel. 2009. "When Should You Quit?" *Inside Higher Education*, July 20, 2009.

Available at http://www.insidehighered.com/advice/leaving_academia/hikel2

Mary Jane Hurst. 2009. "Mentor Yourself." *Inside Higher Education*, July 29, 2009. Available at <http://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2009/29/hurst>

Piss Poor Prof. 2009. "Can You Afford to Be an Adjunct?" *Inside Higher Education*, August 3, 2009. Available at <http://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2009/06/15/adjunct>

Piss Poor Prof. 2009. "Adjunct Survival." *Inside Higher Education*, August 3, 2009. Available at <http://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2009/08/03/adjunct>

Mycock, Andrew. 2007. "'Where's the Real Lecturer?' The Experiences of Doctoral Educators in the UK." *European Political Science* 6 (2): 208-18.

Rhodes, Martin. 2006. "Young People in the European Political Science Profession." *European Political Science* 5 (3): 232-4.

Hassner, Ron E. 2008. "Trial by Fire: Surviving the Job Talk Q&A." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 41 (4): 803-8.

Wuffle, A. 2006. "Uncle Wuffle's Advice on Job Talks." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 39 (4): 883-6. Available from <http://www.socsci.uci.edu/~bgrofman/Wuffle-Advice%20on%20job%20talks.pdf>

Mathews-Gardner, Lanethea, Michelle D. Deardorff, Grant Reeher, William Hudson, MaryAnne Borrelli, and Glen Halva-Neubauer. 2008. "Getting a Job at a Teaching Institution and Then Succeeding: A Q&A with Experienced Teacher-Scholars." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 41 (3): 575-8.

Wuffle, A. 1993. "Uncle Wuffle's Advice to the Assistant Professor." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 26 (1): 89-90. Available from:

<http://web.archive.org/web/20040212123359/www.apsanet.org/PS/march93/wuffle.cfm>

There are plenty of websites with commentary and rumours on academic job markets, but chances are that you can get better tips about these from peers than senior faculty.

Week 11: Discussion of draft dissertation proposals continues. Discussion on literature reviews, library search techniques, and the formal evaluation of past evidence. The differential role and composition of literature reviews in articles, books, proposals and dissertations. Literature search techniques for books, journal articles, conference papers, work in progress, electronic publications, open access and grey literature. Speed reading. Meta-analysis and the incorporation of past evidence in the analysis of new data via Bayesian models

Guest speaker: Tunde Lepp (CEU Library)

Readings:

Althaus, Scott L. 1996. "Who Speaks for the People? Political Knowledge, Representation, and the Use of Opinion Surveys in Democratic Politics." PhD thesis. UMI Number 9714540. Chicago, IL: Department of Political Science, Northwestern University, chapter 5.

- # Althaus, Scott L. 1998. "Information Effects in Collective Preferences." *American Political Science Review* 92 (3): 545-558.
- # Althaus, Scott L. 2003. *Collective Preferences in Democratic Politics: Opinion Surveys and the Will of the People*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, chapter 4.

Open access:

- "The Berlin Declaration on Open Access to Knowledge in the Sciences and Humanities."
Available from <http://oa.mpg.de/openaccess-berlin/berlindeclaration.html>
- "E-journals.org home page." Available from <http://www.e-journals.org/>
- "Social Sciences Open Access Repository." Available at www.ssoar.info
- Shadbolt, Nigel, Tim Brody, Les Carr, and Stevan Harnad. 2006. "The Open Research Web: A Preview of the Optimal and the Inevitable." Available from <http://cogprints.org/4841/>. Accessed on 15 August 2009.
- May, Christopher. 2005. "The Academy's New Electronic Order? Open Source Journals and Publishing Political Science." *European Political Science* 4 (1): 14-24.
- Willinsky, John. 2009. *The Access Principle: The Case for Open Access to Research and Scholarship*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- 303.4/833 SUN Sunstein, Cass R. 2008. *Infotopia: How Many Minds Produce Knowledge*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Techniques for literature review, meta-analysis, Bayesian priors:

- 300./72 HAR Hart, Chris. 1998. *Doing a Literature Review: Releasing the Social Science Research Imagination*. London: Sage.
- 300./72 HAR 300.72 Hart, Chris. 2001. *Doing a Literature Search: A Comprehensive Guide for the Social Sciences*. London: Sage.
- 300./72 COO Cooper, Harris. 1998. *Synthesizing Research: A Guide for Literature Reviews*. 3rd ed. London: Sage. (A 4th edition came out in 2009 under the title Synthesizing Research: A Guide for Literature Reviews, and contains up-to-date tips on search etc.).
- 808./0665 Harmon, Joseph E., and Alan G. Gross, eds. 2007. *The Scientific Literature: A Guided Tour*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- 300./72 OLE O'Leary, Zina. 2004. *The Essential Guide to Doing Research*. London: Sage, chapter 6.
- 300./72 LIP Lipsey, Mark W. and David B. Wilson. 2001. *Practical Meta-analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Jackman, Simon. 2004. "Bayesian Analysis for Political Research." *Annual Review of Political Science* 7 (1): 483-505. (NB: Focus on his first example: the second example is beyond the orbit of this week's conversation.)

For an excellent example of meta-analysis as a tool of reviewing the literature:

- Lau, Richard R. , Lee Sigelman, and Ivy Brown Rovner. 2007. "The Effects of Negative Political Campaigns: A Meta-Analytic Reassessment." *Journal of Politics* 69 (4): 1176–1209.

This is an example of how you do the same when the literature is less extensive and much of it looks methodologically problematic:

Boulianne, Shelley. 2009. "Does Internet Use Affect Engagement? A Meta-Analysis of Research." *Political Communication* 26 (2): 193-211.

Assignment: All participants will have two tasks this week. First, send in at least one relevant question about how you can search for relevant literature for your research that you would like to ask from a library information service specialist. Second, analyze how an article, a monograph, and a PhD dissertation by the same person on the same topic cover the previous literature. The article-monograph-dissertation set that we take as our example comes from Scott Althaus, because he was so successful in turning his dissertation into influential, prize-winning, much cited publications. Think about possible explanations for the differences that you find between the way the three works do the literature review, and summarize in max two pages these differences and what your explanations would be for them.⁵

Week 12: Discussion of draft dissertation proposals. The facts and values debate, especially with respect to explanations, predictions, policy recommendations and evaluation research. Research ethics and legal issues in studying human subjects

Guest speaker: Diane Stone (Department of Public Policy)

Readings:

- # Mosse, David. 2006. "Anti-Social Anthropology? Objectivity, Objection, and the Ethnography of Public Policy and Professional Communities." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute (N.S.)* 12: 935-56.
- # 362.8/3 BAC Bacchi, Carol Lee. 1999. "What is the Problem? An Approach to Policy." In *Women, Policy and Politics: The Construction of Policy Problems*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 15-64.
- # Berrebi, Claude. 2009. "The Economics of Terrorism and Counterterrorism: What Matters and Is Rational-Choice Theory Helpful?" In *Social Science for Counterterrorism: Putting the Pieces Together*, edited by Paul K. Davis and Kim Cragin. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, pp. 151-208.

Some more food for thought about how scientific analysis impacts political practice:

Eriksson, Johan, and Bengt Sundelius. 2005. "Molding Minds That Form Policy: How to Make Research Useful." *International Studies Perspectives* 6 (1): 51-71.

⁵ The book version was awarded both the 2004 David Easton Prize by the Foundations of Political Theory Section of the American Political Science Association (this prize is given for a book published in the previous five years that "broadens the horizons of contemporary political science by engaging issues of philosophical significance in political life through any of a variety of approaches in the social sciences and humanities") and the 2004 Goldsmith Book Prize by the Joan Shorenstein Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy at Harvard University (the Goldsmith Prize is given to "the best academic and best trade books that seek to improve the quality of government or politics through an examination of press and politics in the formation of public policy.") The 1998 APSR article on the same topic, in turn, became a mainstay in graduate reading packs in voting behavior and public opinion research (cf. e.g. the most widely used Niemi and Weisberg textbook).

- Woon, Jonathan. 2009. "Change We Can Believe In? Using Political Science to Predict Policy Change in the Obama Presidency." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 42 (2): 329-333.
- 320./072 Norton, Anne. 2004. "Political Science as a Vocation." In *Problems and Methods in the Study of Politics*, edited by Ian Shapiro, Rogers M. Smith and Tarek E. Masoud. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp. 67-82.
- 320./019 TET Tetlock, Philip E. 2005. *Expert Political Judgment: How Good is it? How Can we Know?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- 320./072 Piven, Frances Fox. 2004. "The Politics of Policy Science." In *Problems and Methods in the Study of Politics*, edited by Ian Shapiro, Rogers M. Smith and Tarek E. Masoud. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp. 83-105.

For some discussions of ethics issues in political science, see:

- American Political Science Association Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms. 2008. "APSA Guide to Professional Ethics in Political Science." 2nd revised ed. Available from http://www.apsanet.org/section_513.cfm
- 320./072 BUR Burnham, Peter, Karin Gilland, Wyn Grant, and Zig Layton-Henry. 2004. *Research Methods in Politics*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 250-69.
- 300./72 OLE O'Leary, Zina. 2004. *The Essential Guide to Doing Research*. London: Sage, chapter 4.
- 300./72 KIM Kimmel, Allan J. 1988. *Ethics and Values in Applied Social Research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- 305.8/09/1717 DES Zanca, Russel. 2000. "Intruder in Uzbekistan: Walking the Line between Community Needs and Anthropological Desiderata." In *Fieldwork Dilemmas: Anthropologists in Postsocialist States*, edited by Hermine G. De Soto and Nora Dudwick. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, pp. 153-171
- 320.6 HOD Cowburn, Malcolm. 2007. "Ethics, Research and Policy." In *Policy Reconsidered: Meaning, Politics and Practices*, edited by Susan M. Hodgson and Zoë Irving. Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Hauck, Robert J. P., and et al. 2008. "Symposium—Protecting Human Research Participants, IRBs, and Political Science Redux." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 41 (3): 475-511.
- Hertwig, Ralph, and Andreas Ortmann. 2008. "Deception in Experiments: Revisiting the Arguments in its Defense." *Ethics & Behavior* 18 (1): 59-92.
- 300./72 PAL Pallone, Nathaniel J., and James J. Hennessy, eds. 1995. *Fraud and Fallible Judgment: Varieties of Deception in the Social and Behavioral Sciences*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Assignment: The readings for this week should give you some ideas about how your research (i.e., the one that you present some initial ideas about in our seminar series) might raise ethical concerns. Send in at least one relevant question so that we can discuss it in class.