

**POLS 6070 Research Design**  
208 OSH, 2:00 - 5:00 pm Mondays

**Schwartz-Shea**

Office Hrs: Mondays, 12:30-1:30 pm & by appointment  
Office: 256e OSH  
Phone mail: 581-6300  
Email: [psshea@poli-sci.utah.edu](mailto:psshea@poli-sci.utah.edu)

With methods, as with people, if you focus only on their limitations you will  
always be disappointed.  
— Shapiro (2002, 612)

— Calvin and Hobbes Cartoon

POLS 6070 is designed with three purposes in mind.

First, you will complete a research proposal. Consider this proposal a “dry run” for the actual proposal that you will complete under the supervision of your doctoral committee. Whether you change topics or further develop the chosen topic, the course readings and assignments will get you started thinking about the many choices involved. In your proposal you should strive for depth and detail.

Second, to produce some breadth, you will be exposed to three broad “approaches”: the quantitative-behavioral, comparative case study, and interpretive approaches. In contrast to the common metaphor of the “tool box” (which assumes neutrality among various “tools”), I use the term “approach” to emphasize the inevitable intertwining of theoretical, epistemological, ontological, and methodological choices (a topic explored in some detail on POLS 6040 Theories of Political Inquiry). Because the quantitative-behavioral approach is the most common in the discipline of political science and because it is the sole concern of POLS 6001 Quantitative Approaches in Political Science, it will receive less attention in 6070 than the other two approaches. An important caveat to remember is that the approaches and readings in this syllabus only scratch the surface of the enormous literature on research methodology. Depending on your dissertation topic, your committee may require or recommend additional readings and/or coursework.

Third, course assignments, readings, and discussion will require that you develop the research virtue of “reflexivity”—a heightened, analytic consciousness of the relation of “self” to the research context. The years spent as a graduate (“gradual”) student have an enormous impact on one’s personal and scholarly trajectory (see the Thought Experiment in Schwartz-Shea 2005, 24-33). You must learn disciplinary and subfield norms in order to survive and thrive but you must also develop your own ideas about what disciplines and subfields *should* be like in order to produce the social scientific knowledge relevant to our rapidly changing global world. Thus, we will ask questions such as: Do existing disciplinary and subfield divisions enable or hinder scholarly research (Smith 2003)? Is interdisciplinary research rewarded given contemporary disciplinary and subfield

structures? How will the “research context” of 2016 differ from that of 2006 (Bentz and Shapiro 1998)? How should research topics be chosen (Shapiro 2002)?

Finally, you should be cognizant of the distinction between “intellectuals” and “technicians.” A danger of the “tool” metaphor is its association with “technique”—with mechanical answers to tired questions that address the past rather than the future. In contrast, intellectuals embrace the “sociological imagination” refusing to be a slave to “method” and “technique” if these turn out to be more obstacle than midwife to their scholarly pursuits:

Adequate technicians can be trained in a few years. The sociological imagination can also be cultivated; certainly it seldom occurs without a great deal of often routine work. Yet there is an unexpected quality about it, perhaps because its essence is the combination of ideas that no one expected were combinable—say, a mess of ideas from German philosophy and British economics. There is a playfulness of mind back of such combining as well as *a truly fierce drive to make sense of the world*, which the technician as such usually lacks. Perhaps he is too well trained, too precisely trained. Since one can be trained only in what is already known, training sometimes incapacitates one from learning new ways; it makes one rebel against what is bound to be at first loose and even sloppy. But you must cling to such vague images and notions, *if they are yours*, and you must work them out. For it is in such form that original ideas, if any, almost always first appear” (Mills, 1959: 212, emphases added).

Thus, intellectuals should be ever aware of the problem of “trained incapacity,” a condition in which our theories and methodologies become straightjackets that blind, rather than inform, our understanding. Those suffering from trained incapacity may display the hubris that can afflict experts and professionals of all types when they believe *they* have the “best” approach to knowledge, refusing to acknowledge the partiality of their vision and the complexity of human experience. However, a more common experience for graduate students is lack of confidence—a feeling of being overwhelmed in a world in which “information in the world’s libraries and databases is doubling every 5 years” (Bentz and Shapiro 1998, 2). It is this insecurity that can make technique so attractive but, based on my experiences in the discipline, “method,” “technique,” or the embrace of a single “paradigm” are no substitute for “a truly fierce drive to make sense of” our chosen research questions. (See, also, Hirschman 1970).

#### From 6070 and 6700 to 6004

Last semester, the faculty approved replacing 6070 (Research design for American politics and public administration) and 6700 (International relations/comparative politics research design workshop) with a single course 6004 (Research Design):

POL 6004 Research Design Prerequisite: POLS 6001 and 6003.  
Focuses on methodological issues associated with the design of research projects. Covers a range of approaches to research purposes, question

selection, and generation and analysis of evidence. Students complete a research proposal.

POLS 6004 will be taught by faculty from all fields and the readings are meant to reflect all fields. I have attempted to move to the POLS 6004 vision in *this* course because a number of students majoring in international relations and comparative politics were advised to sign up this semester. The department's core requirements (6001, 6003, 6004, and 6040) reflect a commitment to the notion of a "discipline" of Political Science as opposed to a collection of subfields that have little in common and this change to 6004 is consistent with that commitment.

### **Required Texts**

Becker, Howard S. 1998, *Tricks of the Trade: How To Think About Your Research While You're Doing It*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. ON RESERVE  
 Neuman, Lawrence W., 2006, 6th edition, *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, Boston: Allyn & Bacon. EARLIER ADDITIONS ACCEPTABLE; ON RESERVE

### **Additional Text on Reserve**

Bentz, Valerie Malhotra, and Shapiro, Jeremy J. 1998. *Mindful Inquiry in Social Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

### **Course Requirements**

Seminar participation	20%
Competencies assignment	5%
Approaches assignment	15%
Research design	50%
Research design components	
Preliminary research question	10%
Draft question and focused literature review w/bibliography	10%
Final research design	80%

NOTE: The research design must be completed in order to receive credit for the course. Because of continuing resource scarcities, papers may not be emailed unless there are extenuating circumstances. Students must bear the costs of providing hard copy.

Seminar leadership. Each seminar meeting will begin with a brief student presentation on the week's assigned readings. Working in a group of two or three, students will take the first 20 minutes to identify and critique key elements of the readings. Seminar leaders should work together on their presentation and put some thought into the best ways to lay the groundwork for a productive seminar discussion. Following the presentation, we will take 30 minutes for students to add to, respond to, and build on the seminar leaders' comments. I will offer clarifications and help facilitate this discussion. But my goal for the first hour of class is to focus on the issues that *students* have reacted to most strongly. After this hour, I will assume more control over our agenda, pursuing some combination of lecture and guided discussion on topics we have not covered completely in the first

half of class. Each student will be responsible for seminar leadership at least once during the semester.

Students will give constructive feedback on others' proposals and this will count toward the participation grade. WebCT will facilitate this process. More detail to follow.

Competencies assignment. This brief assignment asks you to reflect on your personal strengths and how these might relate to the research you might do. It will provide me with the information that I need to assist you as individual researchers and to assign you to teams for the approaches assignment.

Approaches assignment. This assignment asks you to experiment with two things—the three “approaches” covered in the syllabus and scholarly collaboration. More detail to follow.

Research design. The primary written product this semester will be a research proposal that sets out a research question, defends its significance, and addresses how the research will be conducted. “Research design” is about proposing research projects that are significant and feasible and that will produce contributions to an ongoing scholarly conversation. Ideally, the proposal produced for this course will serve as a dissertation proposal (to be modified with your committee) and/or produce a paper for a scholarly conference.

Although there are three required deadlines to help guide you through this process, this assignment will require steady work throughout the semester. Despite the model of a linear, step-like process presented in many introductory research methods texts, actual scientific research is a complex, interactive, and often messy, serendipitous process. There is no “mechanical” procedure or method that can guarantee “good” and attention-grabbing research. This means that you must expect to revise and reformulate your research question and design as your understanding of your topic and the existing literature deepens. Students must be open to criticism but *simultaneously* persistent in their pursuit of research that matters to them, their doctoral committee, and the non-academic world.

Your full research design (15-20 pages) will be due on **Monday, May 1**. It should include a clear statement of your research question and its significance, a focused review of relevant literature, a detailed description of your research strategy, anticipated contributions of the research, a discussion of feasibility and ethics, and estimates of the project's timetable and funding needs.

Americans with Disabilities Act: Reasonable Accommodations for Qualified Students

The University of Utah seeks to provide equal access to its programs, services and activities for people with disabilities. If you will need accommodations in this class, reasonable prior notice needs to be given to the instructor and to the Center for Disability Services 162 Olpin Union Building, 581-5020 (V / TDD) to make arrangements for accommodations. All written information in this course can be made available in alternative format with prior notification.

A note on the readings

I have divided readings into three types: background, required, and suggested. The background readings (primarily chapters from the Neuman text) should be skimmed. Required readings should be read closely and will be assigned to individuals for discussion leadership. Suggested additional readings should be consulted for the development of the research proposal as a function of the "approach" chosen as well as the student's major field. *Note that not all of the suggested readings are available on e-reserve. If one is not and you believe you will read it, please let me know ASAP.*

**Course Overview: Estimated Reading, Topics, & Assignment Dates**

15	1.	Introduction	
55	2.	Quantitative, Behavioral Approach (Jan 17, 6-9 pm)	Competencies assignment due
100	3.	Comparative Case Study Approach	Research question due
135	4.	Interpretive Approach	Team assignments
150	5.	Purposes, Politics, and Philosophy	Annotated bibliography due
250	6.	Concepts, Theory, and Standards	
50	7.	Presidents Day—No class	
0	8.	Approaches Assignment –	In-class presentations and written assignments due
245	9.	Access/Sampling/Archives and Analysis I	
0	10.	Spring Break	
65	11.	Interviewing	Post draft to WebCT
200	12.	History and Analysis II (Discourse)	
0	13.	No class –	Post Feedback on Assigned Peers on WebCT
140+	14.	Ethics, IRB, Funding, and the Sociology of Knowledge	
50	15.	Multi-Method Research?	
	16.	No Readings - Guest Lecture -	Work on your design
	17.	Finals Week – Design due	May 1

**Week 1 January 9 – Introduction**Required reading

Bentz, Valerie Malhotra, and Shapiro, Jeremy J. 1998. "Research: The New Context and a New Approach." In *Mindful Inquiry in Social Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1-14. **14**

Suggested additional reading

Bentz, Valerie Malhotra, and Shapiro, Jeremy J. 1998. "Scholarly Practitioner: Facing the Loss of Identity through the Onslaught of the Information Age." In *Mindful Inquiry in Social Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 65-81. **16**

MacDonald, Susan Peck. 1989. "Data-Driven and Conceptually Driven Academic Discourse." *Written Communication*, 6, 4 (October): 411-435. **24**

**Week 2 January 16 – Quantitative, Behavioral Approach**

(with a focus on experimental and survey research)

Rescheduled to Tuesday January 17, 6-9 pm

Background readings

Neuman #9 (Experimental Research) & #10 (Survey Research)

Design reading

Neuman #6 (Qualitative Research Designs)

Required readings

Campbell, Donald T. and H. Laurence Ross. 1968. "The Connecticut Crackdown on Speeding: Time Series Data in Quasi-experimental Analysis." *Law and Society Review* 3:33-53. **20**

Gerber, Alan S. and Donald P. Green. 2000. "The Effects of Canvassing, Telephone Calls, and Direct Mail on Voter Turnout: A Field Experiment." *American Political Science Review* 94 (3):653-663. **10**

Brady, Henry E. 2000. "Contributions of Survey Research to Political Science." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 33:46-57. **11**

Lynn, Peter. 2003. "Developing Quality Standards for Cross-National Survey Research: Five approaches." *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 6:323-336. <http://ideas.repec.org/p/ese/iserwp/2001-21.html> **13 dd**

Suggested additional readings

Kuechler, Manfred. 1987. "The Utility of Surveys for Cross-National Research." *Social Science Research* 16:229-244. **15**

Kinder, Donald R. and Thomas R. Palfrey. 1993. "On Behalf of an Experimental Political Science." In Kinder, Donald R. and Thomas R. Palfrey, eds. *Experimental Foundations of Political Science*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1-39. **33**

Gelman, Andrew and Gary King. 1993. "Why Are American Presidential Election Campaign Polls So Variable When Votes Are So Predictable?" *British Journal of Political Science* 23:409-451. **42**

- Sapiro, Virginia. 1999. "Fifty years of the National Election Studies: A case study in the history of 'big social science'." American Political Science Association paper. <http://www.polisci.wisc.edu/users/sapiro/papers/bignes.pdf> **44 dd**
- Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine. 2002. "Theorizing Gender for Experimental, Game Theory: Experiments with 'Sex Status' and 'Merit Status' in an Asymmetric Game." *Sex Roles*, 47, (7/8), 301-319. **18**

Websites for some of the major surveys:

- The General Social Survey <http://www.norc.org/projects/gensoc.asp>
- The National Elections Studies <http://www.umich.edu/~nes/>
- Panel Study of Income Dynamics <http://psidonline.isr.umich.edu/>
- Comparative Study of Electoral Systems <http://www.umich.edu/~cses/>
- Time Sharing Experiments for the Social Sciences <http://experimentcentral.org/>

**Week 3            January 23 – Comparative Case Study Approach**  
(for more on History see Week 12)

Background readings

Neuman #14 (Historical-Comparative Research)

Design reading

Neuman #6 (Qualitative Research Designs)

Required readings

- Mill, John Stuart. 1970. "Two Methods of Comparison." In Amitai Etzioni and Fredric L. Dubow, eds. *Comparative Perspectives: Theories and Methods*. Boston: Little Brown, 205-213. **8**
- George, Alexander. 1979. "Case Studies and Theory Development." In Paul Gordon Lauren, ed. *Diplomacy: New Approaches in Theory, History, and Policy*. The Free Press, 43-68. **25**
- Ragin, Charles C. 1997. "Turning the Tables: How Case-Oriented Research Challenges Variable-Oriented Research." *Comparative Social Research*, Vol. 16, pp. 27-42. **15**
- Munck, Gerardo, L. 1998. "Canons of Research Design in Qualitative Analysis." *Studies in Comparative International Development* 33, no. 3, pp. 18-45. (useful summary of KKV.) **27**
- Gerring, John. 2004. "What Is a Case Study and What Is It Good for?" *American Political Science Review* 98(2):341-354. **13**
- Munck, Gerardo, L. 2005. "Tools for Qualitative Research." In Henry E. Brady and David Collier, eds., *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Lanham, Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 105-121. **16**

Suggested additional readings

Przeworski, Adam and Henry Teune, 1970. Ch. 2, "Research Designs," in their *The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry*. John Wiley.

- Lijphart, Arend. 1971. "Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method," *American Political Science Review* 65:3 (September): 682-693. **11**
- Eckstein, Harry. 1975. "Case Study and Theory in Political Science," in F. Greenstein and N. Polsby, eds. *The Handbook of Political Science*, vol. 7 (Addison-Wesley).
- Collier, David. 1993. "The Comparative Method," in Ada Finifter, ed., *Political Science: The State of the Discipline II* (American Political Science Association).
- Dion, Douglas. 1998. "Evidence and Inference in the Comparative Case Study," *Comparative Politics* 30:2 (January): 127-145. **18**
- McKeown, Timothy J., 1999. "Case Studies and the Statistical Worldview," *International Organization* 53:1 (Winter): 161-190. **29**

**Week 4            January 30 – Interpretive Approach**  
(with a focus on ethnography and constructivism)

Background reading

Neuman #13 (Field Research)

Design reading

Groenewald, Thomas. 2004. "A Phenomenological Research Design Illustrated." *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 3 (1), Article 4.  
[http://www.ualberta.ca/~iiqm/backissues/3\\_1/pdf/groenewald.pdf](http://www.ualberta.ca/~iiqm/backissues/3_1/pdf/groenewald.pdf) [accessed December 27, 2005]. **22**

Required readings

- Yanow, Dvora, and Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine. Forthcoming June 2006. "What's 'interpretive' about interpretive methods?" Introduction to their forthcoming edited volume, *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe. **30 dd**
- Shehata, Samer. Forthcoming June 2006. "Ethnography, identity, and the production of knowledge." In Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, eds., *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe. **34 dd**
- Lin, Ann Chih. 2000. "Appendix 1 Research Design Meets Prison Administration: Methodological Notes" and "Appendix 2 – On Being Who You Are: Credibility, Bias, and Good Research." In *Reform in the Making: The Implementation of Social Policy in Prison*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, pp. 175-194. **19**
- Pierce, Jennifer, 1995. "Articulating the Self in Field Research." In *Gender Trials: Emotional Lives in Contemporary Law Firms*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 189-214. **25**
- Onuf, Nicholas. 1998. "Constructivism: A User's Manual." In *International Relations in a Constructed World*, ed., Vendulka Kubalkova, Nicholas Onuf, and Paul Kowert, Anark NY: M.E. Sharpe, 58-78. **20**
- Dessler, David. 1999. "Constructivism within a Positivist Social Science," *Review of International Studies* 25: 123-137. **14**

Suggested additional readings

- Geertz, Clifford. 1958. "Deep Play: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight." 1-37.  
<http://webhome.idirect.com/~boweevil/essays.html> **37**
- Fenno, Richard, Jr. 1978. "Notes on Method: Participant Observation," *Home style: U.S. House Members and Their Districts*. Boston: Little, Brown, 249-295. **46**
- Fenno, Richard, Jr. 1986. "Observation, Context, and Sequence in the Study of Politics." *American Political Science Review* 80:1 (March): 3-15. **12**
- Eliasoph, Nina. 1998. "Appendix 2: Method." In *Avoiding Politics: How American Produce Apathy in Everyday Life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 269-279. **10**
- Eliasoph, Nina, and Paul Lichterman. 1999. "'We Begin with Our Favorite Theory...': Reconstructing the Extended Case Method." *Sociological Theory* 17 (2), 228-234. **6**
- Yanow, Dvora, 2000. *Conducting Interpretive Policy Analysis*. Sage University Papers Series on Qualitative Research Methods, Vol. 47. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Atkinson, Paul, Coffey, Amanda, and Delamont, Sara. 2003. "How Do You Know Your Informant is Telling the Truth?" In *Key Themes in Qualitative Research: Continuities and Change*. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press, 119-140. **21**
- Lichterman, Paul. 2005. "Appendix 1: Theory and Evidence in a Study of Religious Community Service Groups." In *Elusive Togetherness: Church Groups Trying to Bridge America's Divisions*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 264-273. **9**
- Adler, Emanuel, 1997. "Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics," *European Journal of International Relations* 3:3, 319-363. **44**
- Price, Richard and Reus-Smit, Christian. 1998. "Dangerous Liaisons? Critical International Theory and Constructivism," *European Journal of International Relations*, vol 4. (3): 259-294. **35**

**Week 5      February 6 – Purposes, Politics, and Philosophy of Science**

Background readings

Neuman #1 (Science and Research) & #4 (Meanings of Methodology)

Required readings

- Becker #1 – "Tricks" and "Coda" **13**
- Fay, Brian. 1996. "Must We Comprehend Others in Their Own terms?" In Fay, *Contemporary Philosophy of Social Science*. Oxford: Blackwell, 112-135. **22**
- Shapiro, Ian. 2002. "Problems, Methods, and Theories in the Study of Politics, Or: What's Wrong with Political Science and What to Do about It." *Political Theory* 30 (4): 588-611. **23**
- Smith, Rogers M. 2003. "Progress and Poverty in Political Science." *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 36 (3). **3**
- Brady, Henry E. 2004. "Symposium: Two Paths to a Science of Politics: Introduction." *Perspectives on Politics* 2 (2), 295-399. **5**

- Smith, Rogers M. 2004. "Symposium: Identities, Interests, and the Future of Political Science." *Perspectives on Politics* 2 (2), 300-312. **10**
- Granato, Jim and Scioli, Frank. 2004. "Symposium: Puzzles, Proverbs, and Omega Matrices: The Scientific and Social Significance of Empirical Implications of Theoretical Models (EITM)." *Perspectives on Politics* 2 (2), 313-323. **9**
- Thomas, George. 2005. "Review Essay: The Qualitative Foundations of Political Science Methodology." *Perspectives on Politics* 3 (4), 855-866. **9**
- Hawkesworth, Mary. Forthcoming June 2006. "Contending Conceptions of Science and Politics: Methodology and the constitution of the political." In Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, eds., *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe. **43 dd**

#### Suggested additional readings

- Mills, C. Wright. 1959. *The Sociological Imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Taylor, Charles. 1967. "Neutrality in Political Science." *Philosophy, Politics and Society*, 25-57.
- Hirschman, Albert. 1970. "The Search for Paradigms as a Hindrance to Understanding," *World Politics* 22 (April): 329-343. **14**
- Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce. 1985. "Toward a Scientific Understanding of International Conflict," *International Studies Quarterly* 29: 121-136. **15**
- Harding, Sandra. 1993. "Rethinking Standpoint Epistemology: What is 'Strong Objectivity'?" In Linda Alcoff, and Elizabeth Potter, eds., *Feminist Epistemologies*. New York: Routledge, 49-82.
- Anderson, Elizabeth. 1995. "Feminist Epistemology: An Interpretation and a Defense." *Hypatia*, 10 (3) 50-84.
- Schmidt, Mary R. 1993. "Grout: Alternative Kinds of Knowledge and Why They are Ignored," *Public Administration Review* 53, 6, (November/December): 525-530. **5**
- Lather, Patty. 1986. "Research as Praxis." *Harvard Educational Review*, 56, 257-277. **20**
- King, Gary, Robert Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. "The Science in Social Science," Ch. 1, in their *Designing Social Inquiry*. Princeton University Press, 3-33. **30 /247**
- Cheney, George, Morgan Wilhelmsson, and Ted Zorn 2002. "10 Strategies for Engaged Scholarship," in "Forum" section of *Management Communication Quarterly*, 16: 92-100. **8**
- Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine. 2003. "Is This the Curriculum We Want? Doctoral Requirements and Offerings in Methods and Methodology," *PS: Political Science and Politics*, Vol. 36 No. 3 (July): pp. 379-86. **7**
- Box, Richard C. 2005. "Critical Imagination in a Postmodern Environment." In *Critical Social Theory in Public Administration*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 14-31. **29**
- Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine. Forthcoming. "Conundrums in the Practice of Pluralism." In Sanford Schram, ed., *Making Political Science Matter: The Flyvbjerg Debate and Beyond*. NYU Press. **16**

## Week 6 February 13 – Concepts, Theory, and Standards

### Background readings

Neuman #3 (Theory and Research) and #7 (Qualitative and Quantitative Measurement)

### Required readings

Becker #4 “Concepts” **94 (1/2)**

Coppedge, Michael . 1999. “Thickening Thin Concepts and Theories,” *Comparative Politics* (July): 465-476. **11**

Adcock, Robert and David Collier, 2001. “Measurement Validity: A Shared Standard for Qualitative and Quantitative Research,” *American Political Science Review* 95:3 (September): 529-546. **17**

Becker #2 “Imagery” **94 (1/2)**

Gerring, John. 2000. "Causation." In *Social Science Methodology: A Critical Approach*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 128-151. **23**

Ragin, Charles. 2000. "Causal Complexity." In *Fuzzy Set Social Science*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 88-119. **31**

Charmaz, K 2003. “Grounded Theory: Objectivist and Constructivist Methods,” In Norman Denzin and Yvonne Lincoln, eds., *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 249-291. **42**

Wendt, Alexander 1999. “On Causation and Constitutions,” part of Ch. 2, in his *Social Theory of International Politics* Cambridge University Press, 77-89. **12**

Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine. Forthcoming June 2006. "Judging quality: Evaluative criteria and epistemic communities. In Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, eds., *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe. **37 dd**

### Suggested additional readings

Yee, Albert. 1996. “The Causal Effects of Ideas on Policies,” *International Organization* 50(1): 69-108. **39**

English, Robert. 2002. “Power, Ideas, and New Evidence on the Cold War’s End,” *International Security*, 26 (4): 70-92. **22**

Schonhardt-Bailey, Cheryl. 2005. “Measuring Ideas More Effectively: An Analysis of Bush’s and Kerry’s National Security Speeches.” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 38(4): 701-711. **about 8**

Goleman, D. 1986. “Introduction” and “An Ancient Malady and Its Cure.” In *Vital Lies, Simple Truths: The Psychology of Self-Deception* New York: Touchstone, pp. 15-25, 237-240.

Lasswell, H. D. 1970. “Self-Observation: Recording the Focus of Attention.” In *The Analysis of Political Behaviour: An Empirical Approach* Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, pp. 279-286.

Lasswell, H. D. 1941. “Know Thyself,” in *Democracy Through Public Opinion* Menasha, Wis.: George Banta Publishing Company, Ch. IV, pp. 45-60.

Spacal, S. 1990. "Free Association as a Method of Self-Observation in Relation to Other Methodological Principles of Psychoanalysis." *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 59:420-436.

Zaleznick, A. 1996. "Psychoanalysis." In A. and J. Kuper (eds.) *The Social Science Encyclopedia* 2nd ed. London: Routledge, pp. 684-687.

**Week 7        February 20 – President’s Day – No Class**

Required readings

Gioia, D. A. & Pitre, E. 1990. "Multiparadigm Perspectives on Theory Building." *Academy of Management Review*, 15(4), 584-602. **18**

Papa, M.J., Auwal, M.A., & Singhal, A. 1995. "Dialectic of Control and Emancipation in Organizing for Social Change: A Multi-Theoretical Study of the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh." *Communication Theory*, 5, 189-223. **34**

**Week 8        February 27 – Approaches Assignment Due**

**Week 9        March 6 – Access/Sampling/Archives and Analysis I**

Background readings

Neuman #12 (Analysis of Quantitative Data) & #15 (Analysis of Qualitative Data)

Required readings

Becker #3 – "Sampling" **109 (1/2)**

Collier, David and James Mahoney, 1996. "Insights and Pitfalls: Selection Bias in Qualitative Research," *World Politics* 49 (October): 56-91. **35**

Lustick, Ian S. 1996. "History, Historiography, and Political Science: Multiple Historical Records and the Problem of Selection Bias," *American Political Science Review* 90:3 (September): 605-618. **13**

Mahoney, James and Goertz, Gary. 2004. "The Possibility Principle: Choosing Negative Cases in Comparative Research" *American Political Science Review* 98(4):653-669. **15**

Feldman, Martha, Bell, Jeannine, and Michele Tracy Berger. 2003. "Gaining Access for Extended Observation," Ch 9 in *Gaining Access: A Practical and Theoretical Guide for Qualitative Researchers*, Walnut Creek: Altamira Press, 117-138. **21**

Weldes, Jutta. Forthcoming June 2006. "High politics and low data: Globalization discourses and popular culture." In Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, eds., *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe. **16 dd**

Kaufman, Chaim. 1994. "Out of the Lab and into the Archives," *International Studies Quarterly* 38:4 (December): 557-586. **29**

- Lynch, Cecelia, Forthcoming June 2006. "Critical interpretation and interwar peace movements: Challenging dominant narratives." In Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, eds., *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe. **15 dd**
- Becker #5 "Logic" **109 (1/2)**

Suggested additional readings

- Van Maanen, John. 1982. "Fieldwork on the Beat: This Being an Account of the Manners and Customs of an Ethnographer in an American Police Department." *Varieties of Qualitative Research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 103-51.
- Agar, Michael, 1986. *Speaking of Ethnography*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Kondo, Dorrinne K. 1990. "The Eye/I." *Crafting Selves: Power, Gender, and Discourses of Identity in a Japanese Workplace*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 3-48.
- Geddes, Barbara. 1993. "How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics." In *Paradigms and Sand Castles*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 89-129. **40**
- Emerson, Robert, Rachel Fretz and Linda Shaw. 1995. *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1-38, 108-41.
- Atkinson, Paul, Coffey, Amanda, and Delamont, Sara. 2003. "Strangeness and Familiarity." In *Key Themes in Qualitative Research: Continuities and Change*. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press, 25-47. **22**
- Feldman, Martha S. 1995. *Some Interpretive Techniques for Analyzing Qualitative Data*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Miles, Matthew B. and Huberman, A. Michael. 1994. *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

**Week 10      March 13 - Spring break**

**Week 11      March 20 – Interviewing**

Required readings

- Rubin, Herbert J. and Irene S. 1995. "Foundations of Qualitative Interviewing." In *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, ch. 2, pp. 17-41. **24**
- PS Symposium. 2002. "Interview Methods in Political Science" *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 35 (4 December), 663-682. **19**
- Aberbach, Joel D. and Bert A. Rockman. 2002. "Conducting and Coding Elite Interviews." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 35(4).
- Berry, Jeffrey M. 2002. "Validity and Reliability Issues in Elite Interviewing." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 35(4).
- Goldstein, Ken. 2002. "Getting in the Door: Sampling and Completing Elite Interviews." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 35(4).
- Leech, Beth. 2002. "Asking Questions: Techniques for Semistructured Interviews." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 35(4).

Rivera, Sharon Werning, Polina Kozyreva, and Eduard Sarovskii. 2002. "Interviewing Political Elites: Lessons From Russia." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 35(4).

Soss, Joe. Forthcoming June 2006. "Talking our way to meaningful explanations: A practice-centered view of interviewing for interpretive research." In Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, eds., *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe. **38 dd**

Suggested additional readings

Morgan, David L. 1988. *Focus Groups as Qualitative Research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Peabody, Robert L., et al. 1990. "Interviewing Political Elites." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 23(3):451-455. **5**

Devault, Marjorie, 1990. "Talking and Listening from Women's Standpoint: Feminist Strategies for Interviewing and Analysis," *Social Problems* 37(1), 96-116. **20**

Rubin, Herbert J. and Irene S. 1995. "Keeping on Target while Hanging Loose: Designing Qualitative Interviews." In *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, ch. 3, pp. 42-64. **22**

Feldman, Martha S. Jeanine Bell, and Michelle Tracy Berger. 2003. "Gaining Access for Interviewing." Ch 7 in *Gaining Access: A Practical and Theoretical Guide for Qualitative Researchers*, Walnut Creek: Altamira Press, 75-97. **22 /173=13%**

**Week 12      March 27 – History and Analysis II (Discourse)**

Background readings

Neuman #14 (Historical-Comparative Research) & Neuman #11 (Non-reactive Research and Secondary Analysis)

Required readings

Pierson, Paul. 2000. "Not Just What, but *When*: Timing and Sequences in Political Processes" *Studies in American Political Development*, Vol. 14, (Spring): pp. 72-92. **20**

Thies, Cameron G. 2002. "A Pragmatic Guide to Qualitative Historical Analysis in the Study of International Relations." *International Studies Perspectives* 3(4):351-372. **21**

Buthe, Tim. 2002. "Taking Temporality Seriously: Modeling History and the Use of Narratives as Evidence," *American Political Science Review* 96:3 (September): 481-493. **12**

Gerring John. 2003. "APD from a Methodological Point of View." *Studies in American Political Development* 17, 82-102. **20**

Skowronek, Stephen. 2003. "What's Wrong with APD?" *Studies in American Political Development* 17, 107-110. **4**

Smith, Rogers M. 2003. "Substance and Method in APD Research" *Studies in American Political Development* 17, 111-115. **5**

- Milliken, Jennifer. 1999. "The Study of Discourse in International Relations: A Critique of Research and Methods," *European Journal of International Relations*, 5: 2 (June): 225-254. **29**
- Woolley, John T. 2000. "Using Media-Based Data in Studies of Politics." *American Journal of Political Science* 44(1):156-173. **17**
- Schwarz-Shea, Peregrine, and Yanow, Dvora. 2002. "'Reading' 'Methods' 'Texts:': How Research Methods Texts Construct Political Science," *Political Research Quarterly* 55:457-486. **29**
- Sliverman, D. 2003. "Analyzing Talk and Text." In Norman Denzin and Yvonne Lincoln, eds., *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 340-362. **22**
- Box, Richard C. 2005. "Critical theory and the Paradox of Discourse." In *Critical Social Theory in Public Administration*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 69-89. **20**
- Jackson, Patrick J. Forthcoming June 2006. "Making Sense of Making Sense: Configurational Analysis and the Double Hermeneutic." In Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, eds., *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe. **28 dd**

#### Suggested additional readings

- Skocpol, Theda and Margaret Somers, 1980. "The Uses of Comparative History in Macrosocial Inquiry," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 22, 2: 174-197. **23**
- Njolstad, Olav 1990. "Learning from History? Case Studies and the Limits to Theory Building," in Nils Gleditsch and Olav Njolstad, eds. *Arms Races* (Sage, 1990), pp. 202-246. **44**
- Fearon, James. 1991. "Counterfactuals and Hypothesis Testing in Political Science," *World Politics* 43 (January): 169-95. **26**
- Jack Levy, Jack. 1997. "Too Important to Leave to the Other: History and Political Science in the Study of International Relations," *International Security* 22 (Summer): 22-33. **11**
- Box, Richard C. 2005. "The 'T' is Elsewhere: Critical History." In *Critical Social Theory in Public Administration*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 49-68. **20**
- Patterson, Molly and Kristen Renwick Monroe. 1998. "Narrative in Political Science," *Annual Review of Political Science*, 1, 315-331. **16**

**Week 13      April 3 – No class – Post Feedback on Assigned Peers**

**Week 14      April 10 – Multi-Method Research?**

#### Required readings

- Lin, Ann Chih. 1998. "Bridging Positivist and Interpretivist Approaches to Qualitative Methods" *Policy Studies Journal*, Vol. 26, No. 1: pp. 162-180. **18**
- Pearce, Lisa D. 2002. "Integrating Survey and Ethnographic Methods for Systematic Anomalous Case Analysis." In Ross M. Stolzenberg, ed., *Sociological Methodology*, American Sociological Association, pp. 103-132. **29**

Suggested additional readings

- Rossman, G. B., and Wilson, B. L. 1985. "Numbers and Words: Combining quantitative and qualitative methods in a single large-scale evaluation study." *Evaluation Review*, 9(5), 627-643. **16**
- Salomon, G., 1991. "Transcending the Qualitative-Quantitative Debate: The Analytic and Systematic Approaches to Educational Research." *Educational Researcher*, 20(6), 10-18. **8**
- Tashakkori, Abbas and Teddlie, Charles, eds., 2003. *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

**Week 15      April 17 – Ethics, IRB, Money, and Sociology of Knowledge**Background readings

Neuman #5 (Ethical Concerns) & #16 (Politics of Social Research) & Appendix A (ASA Code of Ethics)

Required readings

- Milgram, Stanley. 1974. *Obedience to Authority*. Appendix I. Plus: Baumrind, Diana. 1964. "Some Thoughts on Ethics of Research: After Reading Milgram's 'Behavioral Study of Obedience'." *American Psychologist* 19:421-423; and Milgram's response, "A Reply to Baumrind." *American Psychologist* 19:848-852. **8**
- Gullemin, M., and Gilliam L. 2004. "Ethics, Reflexivity, and 'Ethically Important Moments' in Research," *Qualitative Inquiry* 10(2): 261-280. **19**
- American Political Science Association. 1998. A Guide to Professional Ethics in Political Science, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. <http://www.apsanet.org/imgtest/ethicsguideweb.pdf>
- Human Subjects Protection Program Office, Institutional Review Board, University of Utah <http://www.research.utah.edu/irb/> **Peruse**
- Shea, Christopher. 2000. "Don't Talk to the Humans: The Crackdown on Social Science Research." *Lingua Franca* 10(6):26-34. **6**
- Sieber, J. E., S. Platner, et al. 2002. "How (Not) to Regulate Social and Behavioral Research." *Professional Ethics Report* 15(2): 1-4. **4**
- Nelson, Cary. 2004. "The Brave New World of Research Surveillance." *Qualitative Inquiry* 10: 207-18. **11**
- Bosk, Charles L., and De Vries, Raymond G. 2004. "Bureaucracies of Mass Deception: Institutional Review Boards and the Ethics of Ethnographic Research." *Annals, AAPSS* 595(September): 249-263. **14**
- King, Desmond. 1998. "The Politics of Social Research: Institutionalizing Public Funding Regimes in the United States and Britain." *British Journal of Political Science* 28(3):415-444. **29**
- Cheek, J. 2003. "An Untold Story? Doing Funded Qualitative Research," Norman Denzin and Yvonne Lincoln, eds., *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 80-111. **31**

Ragin, Charles, Nagel, Joane, and White, Patricia. 2004. *National Science Foundation Workshop on the Scientific Foundations of Qualitative Research*. Arlington, VA: National Science Foundation, 9-19. **10**

Monastersky, Richard. 2005. "The Number That's Devouring Science: The impact factor, once a simple way to rank scientific journals, has become an unyielding yardstick for hiring, tenure, and grants." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 52 (8), A12. October 14. <http://chronicle.com> **10**

Suggested additional readings

Tarrow, Sidney. 1991. "Aiming at a Moving Target: Social Science and the Recent Rebellions in Eastern Europe." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 24:12-20. **8**

Smith, Rogers M. 1997. "Still Blowing in the Wind: The American Quest for a Democratic, Scientific Political Science." *Daedalus* 126(1):253-287. **34**

Sorensen, James L., Carmen L. Masson, Wayne W. Clark, and Stephen F. Morin. 1998. "Public Testimony: A Guide for Psychologists." *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice* 29:588-593. **5**

Pelton, Leroy H. 2000. "Misinforming Public Policy: The Illiberal Uses of Social Science." *Society* 37:61-69. **8**

Solovey, Mark. 2001. "Project Camelot and the 1960s Epistemological Revolution: Rethinking the Politics-Patronage-Social Science Nexus." *Social Studies of Science* 31:171-206. **35**

Wilson, Gail. 2001. "Power and Translation in Social Policy Research." *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 4:319-326. **7**

Zawadzki, Paul. 2002. "Working with Abhorrent Objects: Some Moral and Epistemological Considerations." *International Social Science Journal* 54:519-528. **9**

Kazancigil, Ali. 2003. "Strengthening the role of the social sciences in society: The World Social Science Initiative." *International Social Science Journal* 55: 377-380. **4**

Atkinson, Paul, Coffey, Amanda, and Delamont, Sara. 2003. "Whose Side Are We On?" In *Key Themes in Qualitative Research: Continuities and Change*. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press, 71-96. **25**

Katz, Jack. 2004. "Subterranean Fieldworkers' Blues: Scratching Toward a Common Law of Social Research Ethics." February 17, Department of Sociology, UCLA. **53 dd**

Jeydel, Alana S., et al. 2005. "A Guide to Publishing Your First Book." *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 38 (4), 745-748 **3**

**Week 16      No readings – Guest Lecture**