

國立中山大學政治學研究所  
政治學方法論  
Political Methodology (IPS701)

Spring 2013 (1012)

---

授課教師：劉正山 副教授

Instructor: Prof. Frank Cheng-shan Liu

上課時間：星期三下午1:10-4:00

課程討論時間：星期一、五 下午1:00-3:00 或另約

上課教室：社 3007

電子郵件信箱：[csliu@faculty.nsysu.edu.tw](mailto:csliu@faculty.nsysu.edu.tw)

教師研究室：社 1009-2

校內分機：5555

課程公告網站：<http://www2.nsysu.edu.tw/politics/liu>

---

## Course Description

Methodology is about what how we gain knowledge, a tool by which we evaluate questions we ask, the methods we use, and knowledge we acquire. We will focus on reasons of doing research and help you look beyond current scope of research. Students will be guided to think widely at the discipline level by overview the major debates or controversies in the discipline. We will also evaluate some examples that may or may not advance our knowledge regarding our political life. While its reading load is heavier than other master-level courses, this course will focus more on intellectual discussion about current research in the field than on readings itself. To be more systematically formulate the flow of our discussion, the following subjects will be introduced in class, each of which will take about two weeks of reading and discussion. Note that these topics and relevant readings are introduced only for discussion purpose. We may introduce new topics and readings or modify the reading list as the semester goes.

1. How divided are we? The outlook of the discipline
2. How useful is it to label ourselves as “qualitative” or “quantitative” researchers?
3. How could we release the tension between science and philosophy? Or, how necessary is it?
4. “Science ignorance”? The reexamination the epistemology of political science
5. Scientific realism and beyond
6. How empirical is empirical enough? Method- versus problem-driven Research
7. How could theorization be achieved? The challenges of theory-driven Research
8. What else can be done? The prospect of the discipline, experiment and causality

## Course Texts and Readings

The course requires active participation in reading assigned materials. Most articles are available on university's electronic journal archives. A copy of required book chapters and some journal articles that are not available in the library or databases (marked with \*\* in the end of the entry) will be put in a basket with a proper label in the institute office one week before the class. You can also make a good use of the interlibrary loan system.

## Grading Policy

Requirement	% of Grade
Participation	30
Two reaction papers	30
Research paper	40
Total	100

- Participation and Discussion Leadership (30%): Involvement in class discussion include your attendance, questions provided for discussion, and responses to questions. You are asked to read through the given materials before the class and bring thoughts to the class. You will be assigned a week to play as a discussion leader.
- Reaction papers (30%): Pick up two topics of this semester in the beginning of the semester and write papers of evaluating the readings of the chosen topic. Each reaction paper should cover the readings of the week, no longer than 6 pages, and doubled spaced. Reaction papers should demonstrate your (re)organization of the assigned readings and your thoughts (evaluation or critiques) about the papers. *Papers that simply summarize the assigned readings will be returned for rewriting.* Bonus points will be given to papers with extended (self-selected) readings that help develop arguments or clarify points. Papers will be graded based on the originality of thoughts, the organization of literature, the presentation of your thoughts, and overall format (use APA or APSA style).
- Research paper (40%): This is a semester-long work that addresses research topic of your interest. The paper should have a clear research purpose, a set of research questions, a compacted literature review (10 to 15 articles or books). The paper, not like any other papers of other course works, should pay a considerable amount of attention to methodology, i.e., why you design your research this way.
- All papers are due in class. Make sure you manage your time well and turn in the hot copies of the papers before the deadlines.

## Weekly Schedule

### 1. Introduction of the Class [Feb. 20]

### 2. Think about your career [Feb. 27]

- Some Thoughts for Discussion:

- “The Disposable Academic: Why Doing a PhD is Often a Waste of Time,” The Economist December 16, 2010, available at [http://www.economist.com/node/17723223?story\\_id](http://www.economist.com/node/17723223?story_id)

## **TOPIC 1: How Divided Are We? An Outlook of the Discipline**

### **3. [March 6]**

### **4. [March 13] -TBA**

- Required:
  - Grant, J. T. (2005). What divides us? The image and organization of political science. *Ps-Political Science & Politics*, 38 (3), 379-386.
  - Garand, J. C. (2005). Integration and fragmentation in political science: Exploring patterns of scholarly communication in a divided discipline. *Journal of Politics*, 67 (4), 979-1005.
  - Dickins, A. (2006). The evolution of international political economy. *International Affairs*, 82 (3), 479-.
  - Dryzek, J. S. (2006). Revolutions without enemies: Key transformations in political science. *American Political Science Review*, 100 (4), 487-492.
  - Box-Steffensmeier, J. M. & Sokhey, A. E. (2007). A dynamic labor market: How political science is opening up to methodologists, and how methodologists are opening up political science. *Ps-Political Science & Politics*, 40 (1), 125-127.
- Supplemental:
  - Schwartz-Shea, P. (2003). Is this the curriculum we want? Doctoral requirements and offerings in methods and methodology. *Ps-Political Science & Politics*, 36 (3) , 379-386.
  - Thies, C. G. & Hogan, R. E. (2005). The state of undergraduate research methods training in political science. *Ps-Political Science & Politics*, 38 (2), 293-297.
  - Sigelman, L. (2006). The coevolution of American Political Science and the American Political Science Review. *American Political Science Review*, 100 (4), 463-478.

## **TOPIC 2: How Useful is It to Label Ourselves as “Qualitative” or “Quantitative” Researchers?**

### **5. [March 20]**

### **6. [March 27]**

- Required:
  - Bond, J. R. (2007). The scientification of the study of politics: Some observations on the behavioral evolution in political science. *Journal of Politics*, 69 (4) , 897-907.

- Hanson, B. (2008). Wither Qualitative/Quantitative? Grounds for methodological convergence. *Quality & Quantity*, 42 (1) , 97-111.
  - Gerring, J. (2011). How good is good enough? A multidimensional, best-possible standard for research design. *Political Research Quarterly*, 64(3), 625–636.
  - Johnson, J. (2006). Consequences of positivism: A pragmatist assessment. *Comparative Political Studies*, 39 (2) , 224-252.
- Supplemental:
    - Lees, C. (2006). We are all comparativists now - Why and how single-country scholarship must adapt and incorporate the comparative politics approach. *Comparative Political Studies*, 39 (9) , 1084-1108.\*\*
    - Clarke, K. A. (2007). The necessity of being comparative - Theory confirmation in quantitative political science. *Comparative Political Studies*, 40 (7) , 886-908.
    - Lezaun, J. (2007). A market of opinions: The political epistemology of focus groups. *Sociological Review*, 55 , 130-151.
    - Schwartz-Shea, P. & Yanow, D. (2002). “Reading” “methods” “texts”: How research methods texts construct political science. *Political Research Quarterly*, 55 (2), 457-486.

### **TOPIC 3: How Could We Release the Tension between Science and Philosophy? Or, How Necessary is It?**

**7. [April 3] (spring break - one day off)**

**8. [April 10]**

**9. [April 17]**

- Required:
  - McCormick, J. P. (2000). Political science and political philosophy: Return to the classics - No, not those! *Ps-Political Science & Politics*, 33 (2), 195-197.
  - Mayhew, D. R. (2000). Political science and political philosophy: Ontological not normative. *Ps-Political Science & Politics*, 33 (2), 192-193.
  - Smith, S. B. (2000). Political science and political philosophy: An uneasy relation. *Ps-Political Science & Politics*, 33 (2) , 189-191.
  - White, S. K. (2000). Taking ontology seriously in political science and political theory: A reply to Mayhew. *Ps-Political Science & Politics*, 33 (4), 743-744.
  - Lawson, S. (2008). Political studies and the contextual turn: A methodological/normative critique. *Political Studies*, 56 (3), 584-603.
- Supplemental:
  - Little, D. (1991). Methodological individualism. *Varieties of Social Explanation: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Social Science*. 183-201. Boulder: Westview Press.\*\*

- Little, D. (1991). Toward methodological pluralism. *Varieties of Social Explanation: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Social Science*, 222-238. Boulder: Westview Press.\*\*
- Little, D. (1998). *Microfoundations, Method and Causation: On the Philosophy of the Social Sciences*. New Brunswick, NJ : Transaction Publishers. [Read Part III or Chapters 9-12]\*\*
- O’Neill, J. (2003). Unified science as political philosophy: Positivism, pluralism and liberalism. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science*, 34A (3), 575-596.\*\*
- Stauffer, D. (2007). Reopening the quarrel between the ancients and the moderns: Leo Strauss’s critique of Hobbes’s “New political science”. *American Political Science Review*, 101 (2) , 223-233.

## **TOPIC 4: “Science Ignorance” and the Discipline’s Evolutionary Epistemology**

### **10. [April 24] (week of mid-term exam)**

### **11. [May 1]**

- Required:
  - Lane, R. (1996). Positivism, scientific realism and political science: Recent developments in the philosophy of science. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 8 (3), 361-382.\*\*
  - Friedman, J. (2007). Ignorance as a starting point: From modest epistemology to realistic political theory. *Critical Review*, 19 (1) , 1-22.
  - Schatz, E., & Maltseva, E. (2012). Assumed to be universal: The leap from data to knowledge in the american political science review. *Polity*, 44(3), 446–472.
  - Wendt, A. & Duvall, R. (2008). Sovereignty and the UFO. *Political Theory*, 36 (4), 607-633.\*\*
- Supplemental (these are classics; no copies will be provided; read on your own):
  - Friedman, J. (2005). Popper, Weber, and Hayek: The epistemology and politics of ignorance. *Critical Review*, 17 (1-2) , I-LVIII.
  - Popper, K. (1968). *Logic of Scientific Discovery*. London: Hutchinson.
  - Kuhn, T. S. (1970). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago : University of Chicago Press.
  - Lakatos, I. (1970). *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*. Lakatos, I. & Musgrave, A.(Eds.) Cambridge [Eng.] : University Press.
  - Lakatos, I. (1978). *The Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes*. Worrall, J. & Currie, G.(Eds.) New York : Cambridge University Press.
  - Weems, L. (2006). Unsettling politics, locating ethics: Representations of reciprocity in post-positivist inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12 (5), 994-1011.\*\*

## **TOPIC 5: Scientific Realism and Beyond**

**12. [May 8]**

**13. [May 15] -TBA**

- Required:
  - Chernoff, F. 2009. The Ontological Fallacy: A rejoinder on the status of scientific realism in international relations. *Review of International Studies*, 35(2): 371-395.
  - Cruickshank, J. 2004. A tale of two ontologies: an immanent critique of critical realism. *Sociological Review*, 52 (4): 567-585.
  - Kivinen, O. & Piironen, T. 2007. Sociologizing metaphysics and mind: A pragmatist point of view on the methodology of the social sciences. *Human Studies*, 30 (2): 97-114.
  - Michel, T. 2009. Pigs can't fly, or can they? Ontology, scientific realism and the metaphysics of presence in international relations. *Review of International Studies*, 35(2): 397-419.

## **TOPIC 6: How Empirical is Empirical Enough? Method- versus Problem-Driven Research**

**14. [May 22]**

- Required:
  - Shapiro, Ian. 2005. *The Flight from Reality in the Human Sciences*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 51-99.\*\*
- Supplemental:
  - Morton, R. B. (1999). *Methods and Models: A Guide to The Empirical Analysis of Formal Models in Political Science*. New York : Cambridge University Press.[Read Chs. 2, 3, & 4]\*\*

## **TOPIC 7: How Could Theorization be Achieved? The Challenges of Theory-Driven Research**

**15. [May 29]**

**16. [June 5]**

- Required:
  - Elster, J. (1998). A plea for causal mechanisms. Hedstrom, P. & Swedberg, R.(Eds.) *Social Mechanisms: An Analytical Approach to Social Theory*. pp. 45-73. New York : Cambridge University Press.\*\*

- Glynn, A. N. (2012). The product and difference fallacies for indirect effects. *American Journal of Political Science*, 56(1), 257–269.
  - Tilly, Charles. (2001). Mechanisms in Political Processes. *Annual Review of Political Science* 4: 21-41.
  - Rueschemeyer, D. (2003). Can One or a Few Cases Yield Theoretical Gains? Mahoney, J. & Rueschemeyer, D.(Eds.) *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 305-336.\*\*
  - Johnson, James. (2003). Conceptual Problems as Obstacles to Theoretical Progress in Political Science. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 15, 87-115.\*\*
  - Yamamoto, T. (2012). Understanding the past: Statistical analysis of causal attribution. *American Journal of Political Science*, 56(1), 237–256.
- Supplemental:
    - Schelling, T. C. (1978). *Micromotives and Macrobehavior*. New York: Norton. Chapter 1 & 3.\*\*
    - King, Gary, Robert Keohane, and Sidney Verba. (1994). *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 3-33, 75-149.\*\*
    - Jervis, Robert. (1997). *System Effects: Complexity in Political and Social Life*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 73-91.\*\*
    - Mutz, D. C. (2008). Is deliberative democracy a falsifiable theory? *Annual Review of Political Science*, 11 , 521-538.\*\*
    - Pearl, J. (2000). *Causality : Models, Reasoning, and Inference*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.[Read Ch5]\*\*
    - Rosenberg, S. W. (2003). Theorizing political psychology: Doing integrative social science under the condition of postmodernity. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 33 (4) , 427-.
    - Morgan, S. L. & Winship, C. (2007). *Counterfactuals and Causal Inference: Methods and Principles for Social Research*. New York: Cambridge University Press.[Read Chs. 1, 8 & 10] \*\*

## **TOPIC 8: How Much Truth Can We Find Out? Experiment and Causality**

### **17. [June 12]**

### **18. [June 19] student oral presentation of semester research and due of the term paper**

- Student Presentation: Propose Your Method(s) and Methodology
- Required:
  - Gerring, J. (2010). How good is good enough? A multidimensional, best-possible standard for research design. *Political Research Quarterly*, 64(3), 625–636.

- Gonzalez-Ocantos, E., de Jonge, C. K., Meléndez, C., Osorio, J., & Nickerson, D. W. (2012). Vote buying and social desirability bias: Experimental evidence from Nicaragua. *American Journal of Political Science*, 56(1), 202–217.
  - Imai, K., Keele, L., Tingley, D., & Yamamoto, T. (2011). Unpacking the black box of causality: Learning about causal mechanisms from experimental and observational studies. *American Political Science Review*, 105(04), 765-789.
- Supplemental:
    - Carmen, I. H. (2007). Genetic configurations of political phenomena: New theories, new methods. *Annals of The American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 614 , 34-55.\*\*
    - Nye, J. S. (2008). Bridging the gap between theory and policy. *Political Psychology*, 29 (4) , 593-603.
    - Gunnell, J. G. (2007). Are we losing our minds? Cognitive science and the study of politics. *Political Theory*, 35 (6) , 704-731.\*\*
    - Ma, S.-Y. 2007. Political science at the edge of chaos? The paradigmatic implications of historical institutionalism. *International Political Science Review*, 28(1): 57-78. \*\*
    - Shapiro, Ian. 2005. *The Flight from Reality in the Human Sciences*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 178-203.\*\*
    - Druckman, J. N.; Green, D. P.; Kuklinski, J. H. & Lupia, A. (2006). The growth and development of experimental research in political science. *American Political Science Review*, 100 (4) , 627-635.
    - Shadish, W. R.; Cook, T. D. & Campbell, D. T. (2007). *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.