

POL 415: Political Science Junior Seminar
Syllabus updated 2016-01-29; Total Pages: 910
Prof. Alex Montgomery
ahm@reed.edu
(503) 517-7395

Class	Office
Tu 6:10-8:00 Vollum 120 https://moodle.reed.edu/course/view.php?id=835	We 1:30-3:30 or by appointment Vollum 241 http://alexmontgomery.com

Course Description and Goals

Half-credit course for one semester. This course is intended for second semester juniors in political science. The course prepares students to complete the initial steps required for a year-long project: asking a research question, reviewing prior literature on the subject, and proposing a research design. Conference.

The schedule of the course mirrors closely the political science junior qualifying examination. The materials covered in this course are independent of the qual, and none of your qual work will be used to satisfy the requirements for this course. However, the tools and techniques that you will learn in this course should help you complete the qual and prepare you for your senior thesis.

The course focuses on the tools and techniques of political science research. We will review many of the major research approaches in political science. Much of the work in the class will involve reading, analyzing, and critiquing existing political science research with an eye to identifying the questions asked, methodology chosen, and how answers were reached.

Finally, each week, the department will support students who volunteer to cook for the class. Please try to keep the expenditures to approximately \$50 per week.

Requirements

Class Participation

Students are required to actively participate in the class; they will have the opportunity to do so both during and outside of classroom hours. Many of the exercises will be conducted in groups inside and outside of class; some of these will involve peer review.

Readings

Readings for the course are E-Readings, which can be downloaded from the Moodle links using [Zotero](#), which is supported by the library. Students are expected to bring a copy of the readings to class every day for reference. Laptops may be used in class, but will be banned if abused. Readings marked "Further" on the syllabus are other relevant articles or books; they are not required for class. Students who have a particular interest in the topics in question are encouraged to read these pieces and to incorporate them into their assignments.

If you are unfamiliar with JSTOR or other political science article databases, please let me know the first day of class; similarly, if you are not already using Zotero, you should start now. There is a library session for qualifiers on Tuesday of Week 4 that you will all be required to attend that can assist you with these as well.

Two developments in recent years have created a rich set of resources for the budding researcher in political science. First, a number of publishers have created “handbooks” for political science (as well as other disciplines). We draw heavily on the Oxford University Press handbook series below. These have the additional advantage of being available as electronic resources at Reed.

Useful Oxford University Press Handbooks

- Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier, Henry E. Brady and David Collier, editors (2008) *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. 1st edition. Oxford University Press, ISBN 9780199286546
- John S. Dryzek, Bonnie Honig and Anne Phillips, editors (2008) *The Oxford Handbook of Political Theory*. 1st edition. Oxford University Press, ISBN 9780199548439
- Robert E. Goodin, editor (2009) *The Oxford Handbook of Political Science*. Oxford University Press, ISBN 9780191619793

Second, as an outgrowth of methodological debates in the discipline, some excellent guides to qualitative research have appeared. These are particularly valuable to Reed students since some variant of case study research is used in most theses.

Qualitative Research Guides

- Gary King, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba (1994) *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton University Press, ISBN 0691034710
- Stephen Van Evera (1997) *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press <<http://www.worldcat.org/oclc/37043858>>, ISBN 080148457X
- Barbara Geddes (2003) *Paradigms and Sandcastles: Theory Building and Research Design in Comparative Politics*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press <<http://www.worldcat.org/oclc/51607439>>, ISBN 0472068350
- Henry E. Brady and David Collier, editors (2004) *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, ISBN 0742511251
- Alexander L. George and Andrew Bennett (2005) *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, ISBN 0262572222
- Gary Goertz (2006) *Social Science Concepts: A User's Guide*. Princeton: Princeton University Press <<http://www.worldcat.org/oclc/58831523>>, ISBN 0691124108
- Paul Kellstedt and Guy Whitten (2013) *The Fundamentals of Political Science Research*. Cambridge University Press, ISBN 9781107621664

Every student will be given a copy of the Political Science Department Junior Qual Handbook <http://academic.reed.edu/poli_sci/resources/juniorqualhandbook.htm>. Pay particular attention to the more extended list of research resources that are made available in those documents.

Institutional Resources

The Interuniversity Consortium on Political and Social Research (ICPSR) <<http://icpsr.umich.edu>> is the worlds largest archive of social science data. There are datasets and resources applicable to almost every area of research. Even if you are not quantitatively inclined, there may be something there that could provide a numerical lens on your research question. The ICPSR runs a Summer Quantitative Research Institute in Ann Arbor, MI that may be of interest to select students.

The Consortium on Qualitative Research Methods (CQR) <<http://www.maxwell.syr.edu/moynihan/programs/cqrm/>> at Syracuse University is something of a counterweight to the ICPSR. There are a very rich set of resources at their website. The also run a summer research institute at Syracuse.

Course Website

Frequent use of the course website will be necessary for success in the class. Supplemental and core readings will be made available there; and assignments will be turned in electronically using the site.

Assignments

Assignments will be due weekly on Mondays at noon. Weeks in which a substantial part of the qual is due (i.e., weeks 3, 7, 10, 12) will not have additional assignments, but your submissions may be used as part of an exercise those days. Most of the assignments will be short, as they are designed to test mastery of concepts and tools rather than your ability to generate mass quantities of text.

Citation and Plagiarism

A major goal of this course is to encourage good reading, research, and citation habits. Good research requires good documentation of sources and the ability to put one's own analysis and thoughts into a paper rather than relying on others. When in doubt as to whether you should cite something, always do it. Citations are required for ideas as well as facts, and are imperative even if you are not directly quoting authors. Make sure that you provide as specific a citation as possible; if an author discusses an idea in one section or one page, cite the specific section or page instead of the full article or book. I usually recommend that students use in-text author-date citation with full Chicago Manual of Style citations; see their Citation Quick Guide: <http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/tools_citationguide.html>.

However, style is less important than the cites being present. If you use an idea or a fact without attribution, you are plagiarizing someone else's work. Plagiarism and cheating are violations of academic integrity and thus violations of Reed's Honor Principle. As specified by Reed's academic conduct policy, such violations will result in disciplinary actions, including suspension or permanent dismissal from the College. Plagiarism is submitting a piece of work which in part or in whole is not entirely the student's own work without attributing those same portions to their correct source. For examples of plagiarism and how to avoid it, see <<http://www.csub.edu/ssric-trd/howto/plagiarism.htm>>. If nothing else, you should avoid "sinister buttocks" syndrome. For more information on Reed's policies see: <http://www.reed.edu/academic/gbook/comm_pol/acad_conduct.html>.

Plagiarism often comes as the result of a student being up against a deadline without being able to meet it. If you are having trouble meeting a deadline for whatever reason, please contact me. It is always better to ask for more time than to plagiarize. When you ask for an extension, you should a) explain what events are causing you to miss the deadline and b) request an amount of time proportional to the interfering events. You may ask for an extension up to, but not exceeding, the amount of time remaining for the assignment, except for cases of emergencies. However, since this course runs on a strict timetable and your fellow students are counting on you, in many cases extensions cannot be granted.

Accommodations

If you'd like to request academic accommodations due to a disability, please contact Disability Support Services. If you have a letter from Student Services, please let me know so we can discuss those accommodations.

26-Jan: 01.1. How to Qual (36 Pages)

- Department of Political Science (2011) *Senior Thesis Handbook*. September 29 . Sections 3, 4, and 6
- Department of Political Science (2015) *Junior Qualifying Examination Handbook*. January 25 . Sections 1-4

Week 2 - The Interview: Talk to a Reed Political Science professor about their work

Interview a Reed political science professor about a current research project. Ask them the following questions, and write up a 1-2 page report based on these questions, including appropriate citations in your write up of the interview materials.

1. What is the thesis of your current research?
2. How did you come to be interested in this topic? How is it related to your previous research or teaching?
3. What is your main argument?
4. Is this an empirical project? If so:
 - (a) How will you be conducting your empirical analysis?
 - (b) What will be your major data source or sources?
 - (c) How will you establish causality?
5. If this is not an empirical project:
 - (a) What are the primary literatures, authors, or texts that you will read for this project?
 - (b) Would you describe this primarily as a project in conceptual analysis or textual analysis?
 - (c) How will you go about establishing results?
6. What will you (or did you) conclude?

2-Feb: 02.1. How to Ask Your Question (55 Pages)

- Gary King, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba (1994) The Science in Social Science. In King, Keohane and Verba *Designing Social Inquiry*. chapter 1, 3–33
- Darius M. Rejali (1995) Define Your Terms! Dictionaries, Medievals, and Thinking about Concepts. *PS: Political Science & Politics*. 28(3)September, 515–520 <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/420322>>
- Alexander Wendt (1998) On constitution and causation in International Relations. *Review of International Studies*. 24(5)December, 101–118 <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0260210598001028>>
- Robert Fannion (2012) *How to Formulate a Research Question: A Guide for the Casual Researcher*. POL 415

Further

- Steven Bernstein et al. (2000) God Gave Physics the Easy Problems: Adapting Social Science to an Unpredictable World. *European Journal of International Relations*. 6(1)March, 43–76 <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1354066100006001003>>, ISSN 1354–0661, 1460–3713
- Gary Goertz (2006) Introduction. In Goertz *Social Science Concepts: A User's Guide*. chapter 1, 1–24
- Gary Goertz and James Mahoney (2006) Concepts in Theories: Two-Level Theories. In Goertz *Social Science Concepts: A User's Guide*. chapter 9, 237–268
- Gary Goertz (2008) Concepts, Theories, and Numbers: A Checklist for Constructing, Evaluating, and Using Concepts or Quantitative Measures. In Box-Steffensmeier, Brady and Collier *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. chapter 5, 20

Week 3 - Qual Draft Proposal

The way you define your question in the long run affects the number and range of sources and the quality of the arguments you can pull together for a literature review. The choice of question can therefore be strategic. This is the first place in the assignment where your creative judgment and skill come into play.

Some questions are simply enormous (What is the literature on revolution, terrorism or Congress or John Rawls?) and there are many well-traveled paths. In these areas, the goal is to narrow the topic in a way that there is a puzzle, question, proposition or hypothesis to explore. For example, "Is a presidential system more liable to gridlock than a parliamentary system?" may yield a variety of different positions in comparative politics. Or "Has Hobbes really solved the "Problem of the Fool" in the Leviathan?" Each of these questions directs your attention towards a range of different answers to this question.

A question may also be a non-starter because there is very little information on it or all the information you can find on it is of one sort (say journalistic coverage or by just one author). Here you may need to think about ways to revise your question so you can grasp a variety of research sources. Here your instructor may be able to give you good advice.

You must state in your proposal the significance of the question in Political Science. What is the existing literature you have found so far on this question? While understanding "what views of Osama bin Laden might exist in the United States?" might be a question of interest to you, you need to explain why a Political Scientist might be interested in this question.

The scope of the literature review may depend upon how much literature already exists on the particular topic. To put it another way, given a research question such as "Why have sanctions lasted so long against Cuba?" the appropriate literature review may study general theories of sanctions duration; in the case of a subject that has been extensively studied, a review may study the particular topic of Cuban sanctions if the theoretical positions are well staked out in order to identify remaining puzzles unexplained by the existing approaches.

Mini Oral Presentations at noon on Feb 9 and 10 in Winch

9-Feb: 03.1. How to Answer Your Question (104 Pages)

- Stephen Van Evera (1997) Hypotheses, Laws, and Theories: A users guide. In Van Evera *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*. chapter 1, 7–48
- Barbara Geddes (2003) Big Questions, Little Answers. How the Questions You Choose Affects the Answers You Get. In Geddes *Paradigms and Sandcastles: Theory Building and Research Design in Comparative Politics*. chapter 2, 27–88

Further

- James A. Davis (1985) *The Logic of Causal Order*. SAGE, ISBN 9780803925533
- Gary King, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba (1994) Descriptive Inference. In King, Keohane and Verba *Designing Social Inquiry*. chapter 2, 34–74
- John Gerring (2005) What Standards are (or Might) be Shared? In Michèle Lamont and Patricia White, editors *Workshop on Interdisciplinary Standards for Systematic Qualitative Research*. National Science Foundation Supported Workshop, 107–123
- James Mahoney and Gary Goertz (2006) A Tale of Two Cultures: Contrasting Quantitative and Qualitative Research. *Political Analysis*. 14(3)June, 227–249 <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/pan/mpj017>>, ISSN 1047–1987, 1476–4989
- Henry E. Brady, David Collier, and Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier (2009) Overview of Political Methodology: Post-Behavioral Movements and Trends. In Goodin *The Oxford Handbook of Political Science*. chapter 48
- James Mahoney (2010) After KKV: The New Methodology of Qualitative Research. *World Politics*. 62(1)January, 120–147 <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0043887109990220>>, ISSN 1086–3338
- Paul Kellstedt and Guy Whitten (2013) Chap. 2-3 In Kellstedt and Whitten *The Fundamentals of Political Science Research*

Week 4 - In Theory: Review a Political Theory piece

Choose one of the readings from the list of cases below (MacPherson, Brown, or Tronto). Using the language of and making specific reference to Tully and Rawls, provide a one page review of the article, including the core question or puzzle; the mode or approach of the theorist; and the conclusion of the author(s).

Library Session at 4:30 PM on Feb 16 in L17

16-Feb: 04.1. Political Theory (78 Pages)

- John Rawls (2001) Four Roles of Political Philosophy. In *Justice as Fairness: A Restatement*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press <<http://www.worldcat.org/oclc/45388455>>, ISBN 0674005104, 1–5
- James Tully (2002) Political Philosophy as a Critical Activity. *Political Theory*. 30(4)August, 533–555 <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0090591702304005>>, ISSN 0090–5917

Cases

- C. B. MacPherson (1968) Elegant Tombstones: A Note on Friedman’s Freedom. *Canadian Journal of Political Science / Revue canadienne de science politique*. 1(1)March, 95–106 <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3231697>>
- Wendy Brown (2006) American Nightmare: Neoliberalism, Neoconservatism, and De-Democratization. *Political Theory*. 34(6)December, 690–714 <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0090591706293016>>
- Joan C. Tronto (2013) Introduction: When Care is No Longer ”at Home”. In *Caring Democracy Markets, Equality, and Justice*. New York: New York University Press <<http://www.worldcat.org/oclc/837947709>>, ISBN 0814770452. chapter 1, 1–13

Further

- James Farr (2008) The History of Political Thought as Disciplinary Genre. In Dryzek, Honig and Phillips *The Oxford Handbook of Political Theory*. chapter 12, 10
- Arlene W. Saxonhouse (2008) Exile and Reentry: Political Theory Yesterday and Tomorrow. In Dryzek, Honig and Phillips *The Oxford Handbook of Political Theory*. chapter 46

Week 5 - Clarifying Concepts: Review three Democracy pieces

Write a one-page literature review of the O’Donnell, Collier and Levitsky, and Coppedge articles. This review should be *organized by ideas* and not by articles. Make sure you clearly define the concept or concepts as you understand them and discuss the competing definitions.

23-Feb: 05.1. Conceptualization (87 Pages)

- David Collier and Robert Adcock (1999) Democracy and Dichotomies: A Pragmatic Approach to Choices about Concepts. *Annual Review of Political Science*. 2, 537–565

Cases

- Guillermo A. O’Donnell (1994) Delegative Democracy. *Journal of Democracy*. 5(1), 55–69 <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/jod.1994.0010>>, ISSN 1086–3214
- David Collier and Steven Levitsky (1997) Democracy with Adjectives: Conceptual Innovations in Comparative Research. *World Politics*. 49(3)April, 430–451 <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/wp.1997.0009>>
- Michael Coppedge et al. (2011) Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy: A New Approach. *Perspectives on Politics*. 9(2)June, 247–267 <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1537592711000880>>, ISSN 1541–0986

Further

- Barbara Geddes (1999) What Do We Know about Democratization after Twenty Years? *Annual Review of Political Science*. 2(1), 115–144 <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.2.1.115>>
- Peter H. Smith and Melissa R. Ziegler (2008) Liberal and Illiberal Democracy in Latin America. *Latin American Politics and Society*. 50(1), 31–57 <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-2456.2008.00003.x>>, ISSN 1548–2456

Week 6 - Review the Reviews: Proliferating Proliferation Puzzles

Compare and contrast the approaches taken by Sagan, Ogilvie-White, and Hymans to the nuclear proliferation literature. What are the different ways in which they choose to slice the literatures (major units, level of analysis, mode of analysis, causal mechanisms, etc.)? What are the advantages and disadvantages of each method of organization?

1-Mar: 06.1. Literature Reviews (69 Pages)

- Hilton Obenzinger (2005) *What Can a Literature Review Do for Me? How to Research, Write, and Survive a Literature Review*. Stanford University

Cases

- Scott D. Sagan (1996/97) Why Do States Build Nuclear Weapons? Three Models in Search of a Bomb. *International Security*. 21(3)Winter, 54–86 <<http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2539273>>
- Tanya Ogilvie-White (1996) Is There a Theory of Nuclear Proliferation? An Analysis of the Contemporary Debate. *Nonproliferation Review*. 4(1)Fall, 43–60
- Jacques E. C. Hymans (2006) Theories of Nuclear Proliferation: The State of the Field. *Nonproliferation Review*. 13(3)November, 455–465 <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10736700601071397>>

Week 7 - Qual Draft Annotated Bibliography

All literature reviews must include an annotated bibliography. We cannot tell if you have mastered the necessary research skills merely by a list of books and articles in your bibliography. The purpose of the annotation is to assure us that you thought creatively about the resources you used, that you did not simply depend on one or two basic resources and you know how to use a full range of library resources as well as scholarly techniques.

The one constant across all bibliographies should be that you indicate how you found the sources you did. This is what we mean by an annotated bibliography. We do not mean that you have to have read everything you have and summarized it in a note on each one. The goal of the qual is to enhance your research skills, so we want to know what skills you used to compile the bibliography. We want to know you used a variety of skills to find the materials. If you want to add notes about the texts, that's fine with us, but tell us how you found the books and articles.

So, as you do your research, make sure you keep a record of how you have been gathering the information. This is what you will need for your bibliography. This includes things as simple as following footnote trails and browsing as well as using various databases and hard copy texts (the annotated bibliography of Machiavelli, the encyclopedia of the social sciences) in the reference section. With databases, we would like to know what search terms you used in conducting your searches. Source material in languages other than English should have the titles translated, and in this case it might be appropriate to add a sentence on what it is, if it is not sufficiently clear, as well as how you found it.

Label and annotate all your bibliographic entries. Specify not only where you found it but how you found it. The following sample entries on nationalism are meant to illustrate what the final bibliography ought to look like. You may find programs such as Endnote or Zotero useful for keeping track of where and how you found each item (we used Zotero to generate the sample below, using the Extra field). While we do not require that you include a summary of each piece in the notes, we highly recommend that you do, as this is a good scholarly habit to get into (in Zotero, you should add Notes for this purpose).

8-Mar: 07.1. 7–8:30 PM, Vollum Lecture Hall: Jenna Jordan, “Does Leadership Targeting Work?”

Week 8 - Mind your Elders: Summarize and Critique prior qual research designs

Read all of the sample qual research designs. In teams of 2-3, pick one of the sample research designs and make a 3-5 minute presentation in powerpoint explaining and critiquing the design. Upload a copy of the slides here and come to class prepared to present and discuss it.

15-Mar: 08.1. Summarizing and Critiquing Prior Quals

22-Mar: 09.1. Spring Break

Week 10 - Qual Draft Outline

Now you need to write this down in a format that allows the reader to take in the entire state of research on this question at a glance. Outline broadly and imaginatively regarding the (re)sources at your disposal. What are the important contrasting positions? What are the overall strengths of research in this field? What are the weaknesses? What questions have gone ignored or unanswered? All this takes skill, and if it is well done, it amounts to an argument about the nature of the field or about a particular thesis worth investigating.

The outlines should be in standard Roman numeral format and be about a page and generally not more than two pages. They should demonstrate analytical thought as well as familiarity with the texts you are using. To be specific, now that you have compiled started compiling a bibliography and are reasonably familiar with the contents of them, we look to see you organizing this material in some fashion, either chronologically or by topic or by author, as is appropriate for your literature review. Some of you have already done this with your draft bibliographies, but we would like to see further refinement. Further, we hope that you'll keep an eye out for interesting trends in the texts, or notable absences in the material - what you expected to find and didn't or alternatively, great imbalances (a lot on something and little on something else).

In constructing your outlines, keep these elements in mind. Well executed, an outline of the available literature should suggest an argument about the way the literature has developed, the gaps in the literature, and what the literature is especially rich in.

29-Mar: 10.1. Public Policy Approaches (110 Pages)

- John W. Kingdon (1984) How Does an Idea's Time Come? In Kingdon *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. chapter 1, 1–22
- John W. Kingdon (1984) Processes: Origins, Rationality, Incrementalism, and Garbage Cans. In Kingdon *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. chapter 4, 75–94
- Deborah A. Stone (1989) Causal Stories and the Formation of Policy Agendas. *Political Science Quarterly*. 104(2), 281–300 <<http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2151585>>, ISSN 00323195
- Paul A. Sabatier (2007) The Need for Better Theories. In Sabatier *Theories of the Policy Process*. chapter 1, 3–17
- Paul A. Sabatier (2007) Theories of the Policy Process. In Sabatier *Theories of the Policy Process*. chapter 6, 155–187

Further

- Rogan Kersh (2000) The Rhetorical Genesis of American Political Union. *Polity*. 33(2), 229–257 <<http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3235489>>, ISSN 00323497
- Todd Bridgman and David Barry (2002) Regulation is Evil: An Application of Narrative Policy Analysis to Regulatory Debate in New Zealand. *Policy Sciences*. 35(2)June, 141–161 <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1016139804995>>, ISSN 0032–2687, 1573–0891
- Suzanne Mettler (2005) The Creation of the G.I. Bill of Rights of 1944: Melding Social and Participatory Citizenship Ideals. *Journal of Policy History*. 17(4)October, 345–374 <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/jph.2005.0022>>, ISSN 1528–4190

Week 11 - Reverse-engineering Research: Getting Here from There

Find a paper published in a peer-reviewed political science journal that relies on a case study design. Write up what you believe would be an appropriate *proposal for the research design* that preceded this written work; i.e. pretend you were the author or authors presenting the research design to the political science department at Reed.

Pay close attention to the guidelines for appropriate comparative case study design in Van Evera. Be specific about separating the theory, hypotheses, case selection method, method of data collection, and style of inference.

5-Apr: 11.1. Case Study Research (96 Pages)

- Stephen Van Evera (1997) What Are Case Studies? How Should They be Performed? In Van Evera *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*. chapter 2, 49–88
- Barbara Geddes (2003) How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias and Related Issues. In Geddes *Paradigms and Sandcastles: Theory Building and Research Design in Comparative Politics*. chapter 3, 89–129

- Jason Seawright and John Gerring (2008) Case Selection Techniques in Case Study Research: A Menu of Qualitative and Quantitative Options. *Political Research Quarterly*. 61(2)June, 294–308
<<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1065912907313077>>

Further

- Stanley Lieberman (1992) Small N's and Big Conclusions. In Ragin and Becker *What is a Case? Exploring the Foundations of Social Inquiry*
- Ragin and Becker
- Gary King, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba (1994) Increasing the Number of Observations. In King, Keohane and Verba *Designing Social Inquiry*. chapter 6, 208–230
- Kurt Weyland (1998) Swallowing the Bitter Pill Sources of Popular Support for Neoliberal Reform in Latin America. *Comparative Political Studies*. 31(5)October, 539–568 <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0010414098031005001>>, ISSN 0010–4140, 1552–3829
- John Gerring (2004) What Is a Case Study and What Is It Good for? *American Political Science Review*. 98(2)May, 341–354 <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0003055404001182>>
- James Mahoney and Gary Goertz (2004) The Possibility Principle: Choosing Negative Cases in Comparative Research. *American Political Science Review*. null(4)November, 653–669
<<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0003055404041401>>, ISSN 1537–5943
- Gerardo L. Munck (2004) Tools for Qualitative Research. In Brady and Collier *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*
- Alexander L. George and Andrew Bennett (2005) Chap. 2-5 In George and Bennett *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*, 37–108

Week 12 - Qual Draft Research Design

Your next task is consequently to design a draft research proposal based on your literature review. We expect the initial research designs submitted to be drafts, just as the schedule says. That is, we expect substantial improvement on them when they are resubmitted at the end of the semester, incorporating faculty comments as well as other improvements along the way. Even so, if the draft is incomplete or inadequate, we may, in some cases, ask for resubmissions.

Even though the designs are drafts at this stage, the department expects to see the following elements incorporated into the designs.

1. You should offer a clear thesis or puzzle based on the review and state its significance to political science (not just to politics). Why is this research question important (the inevitable "who cares?" question)? This question should be plausible in light of the literature review you have just conducted. Think about the literature you have read and place your design within the framework of the literature.

2. Propose a way and methodology to test, prove, or disprove your thesis, outline the stages through which the research would proceed, and tell us what you expect to find based on the literature you have reviewed thus far. What would it take to convince you that you are wrong (identifying the truth conditions for your claim)? Whether the material is empirical or theoretical, each student must answer this question in plausible and feasible ways. Keep in mind that if you cannot answer this question, then there is no difference between what you are doing and mythology or rhetoric.

This document should be no longer than 5 pages and must have an acceptable system of citation. Your literature review should be of great assistance to you, but remember that a literature review opens the way for many research papers, not just one. If you are uncertain on how to proceed with the literature you have read, you should speak as soon as possible with your class instructor.

Though there is no expectation that the student will have the time to answer it, the strategy you propose must be feasible. This means that a student could pursue and complete the strategy you propose over the course of a year given the resources normally available to one.

This is of course not (yet at any rate) a research paper. If you did write a research paper based on the literature review, you would need to go over your review again and delete a lot of material as many of the sources you cover may not be directly related to your research design.

Mini Oral Presentations at noon on Apr 12 and 13 in GCC-C/D

12-Apr: 12.1. Measurement (59 Pages)

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

Cases

- Alexander H. Montgomery (2013) Stop Helping Me: When Nuclear Assistance Impedes Nuclear Programs. In Adam N. Stulberg and Matthew Fuhrmann, editors *The Nuclear Renaissance and International Security*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, ISBN 0804785309. chapter 7, 177–202
- Christopher Way and Jessica Weeks (2014) Making it Personal: Regime Type and Nuclear Proliferation. *American Journal of Political Science*. 58(3)July, 705–719 <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12080>>

Week 13 - Say it in English: Sentence Construction

Take an example of a particularly awful paragraph from this class, from another class, or from your own writing and transform it into a shining example of clarity, cohesion, and emphasis using Williams' techniques. Bonus points if the paragraph was written by a Reed professor.

19-Apr: 13.1. Writing I: Sentences (86 Pages)

- George Orwell (1946) *Politics and the English Language*. <<http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/orwell46.htm>>
- Joseph M. Williams (1990) Chap. 1-4 In *Williams Style*, 1–79

Week 14 - Outlines to Organization: Draft introduction to your literature review

By now, you have turned in your draft annotated bibliography, draft outline, and draft research design. You should also have short reviews of most of the items in your bibliography. Consequently, you should have an overall grasp of how you should organize your review. For today, turn in the introduction to your literature review, demonstrating your grasp of coherence, concision, length, elegance, and usage.

By Wednesday, turn in the EDITED introduction to your PARTNER'S literature review, demonstrating your grasp of coherence, concision, length, elegance, and usage.

26-Apr: 14.1. Writing II: Structure (130 Pages)

- Joseph M. Williams (1990) Chap. 5-10 In *Williams Style*, 80–198
- John Gerring, Joshua Yesnowitz, and Stephen Bird (2013) *General Advice on Social Science Writing*. June Blog post <<http://blogs.bu.edu/jgerring/files/2013/06/Adviceonessaywriting.pdf>>

Week 16 - Qual Final due at noon on May 9