

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

Fall 2015 (1041)

授課教師：劉正山 副教授	Instructor: Prof. Frank C.S. Liu
上課時間：星期三9:10-12:00	課程討論時間：星期四、五 10:00-12:00或另約
上課教室：社SS3007	電子郵件信箱： csliu@faculty.nsysu.edu.tw
教師研究室：社 1009-1	校內分機: 5555
劉老師的著作： http://goo.gl/DRZjXA	
**課程網誌： http://psmethodology.postach.io/	

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. As a doctoral level course aiming at providing an overview of the field, this course will focus on continuing debates across sub-fields of the discipline and help you look beyond the scope of your previous research. Students will be guided to think widely at the discipline level by overview eight major debates in the discipline. The following subjects will be introduced in class, each of which will take about two weeks of reading and discussion. Each time we meet we will spend two hours on discussion assigned readings and one hour on sharing each other's research progress, articles or news that worth investigation. The selected nine topics listed below have been identified as critical questions in this field. We will spend one to two weeks for each subject.

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
9. How to embed Taiwan studies into the global context? Some Examples.

Course Texts and Readings

The course requires active participation in reading assigned materials. Most articles are available on university's electronic journal archives. You are responsible to find them by yourself. Some papers may not be available from the university. So be sure to check out the class' blog for information about the provision of the electronic version of the papers. The book that everyone will read along with the weekly topics is: Haidt, J. (2013). *The Righteous Mind: Why Good People Are Divided by Politics and Religion* (Reprint edition). New York: Vintage. 好人總是自以為是 2015 大塊出版 姚怡平譯

Grading Policy

Requirement	% of Grade
Research paper	40
Reaction papers	30
Weekly Participation	30
Total	100

- Reaction papers (30%): One required reading report (10%) plus two reaction papers to assigned weekly papers (10% each).
 - The required reading report is your thoughts about an assigned book. The report of your thoughts should be less than 5 pages and turned in by the middle exam week.
 - The reaction papers reflect your effort to the doctoral level readings. 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. Reaction papers should demonstrate your (re)organization of the assigned readings and your thoughts (evaluation or critiques) about the papers. *Papers that (1) simply summarize the assigned readings, or (2) revealing that you are not reading them, 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 not on the length of the papers at all but on the organization of literature and the presentation of your thoughts. Students who choose the topics are subject to be assigned (randomly) as discussion leaders of the week. Be aware: works not meeting minimum quality requirement will be returned without grades.
- 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) with a list of

reference. The paper, not like any other papers of other course works, should pay a considerate amount of attention to methodology, i.e., why you design your research this way and how your research findings contribute to our knowledge about the topic you chose. Your paper must be well formatted before turn it in, so please make good use of modern reference manager software, such as Zotero, Endnote, Mendeley, etc. I personally recommend Zotero. Ask me why.

- Weekly participation (30%): Your attendance of the class determines this score. Missing one class, 2 points off. You must complete readings before entering the classroom.
- 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

**NOTE that the assigned readings are subject to update on the weekly basis. The list of new articles will be added to the course Evernote notebook as a note and to the blog as a post.

1. [9/15] Introduction of the Class

- Let's share our research interest and purposes. Most importantly, learn how to survive in this class.

2. [9/22] Think about Social Sciences and Your Career

- Required:
 - Lupia, A. (2014). What is the value of social science? Challenges for researchers and government funders. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 47(01), 1–7. doi:10.1017/S1049096513001534
 - King, G. (2014). Restructuring the social sciences: Reflections from harvard's institute for quantitative social science. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 47(01), 165–172. doi:10.1017/S1049096513001534
- Check out the posts on the course blog, and leave your comments below each article or news.

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

3. [9/29]

- Extra topic: How to initiate a research paper, organize literature, and formulate argument?
- Required:
 - Dryzek, J. S. (2006). Revolutions without enemies: Key transformations in political science. *American Political Science Review*, 100 (4), 487-492.

- 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.
- Grant, J. T. (2005). What divides us? The image and organization of political science. *Ps-Political Science & Politics*, 38 (3), 379-386.
- Supplemental:
 - 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.
 - Dickins, A. (2006). The evolution of international political economy. *International Affairs*, 82 (3), 479-.
 - 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.
 - Sigelman, L. (2006). The coevolution of American Political Science and the American Political Science Review. *American Political Science Review*, 100 (4), 463-478.
 - 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.

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

4. [10/6]

- 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.
 - Gerring, J. (2011). How good is good enough? A multidimensional, best-possible standard for research design. *Political Research Quarterly*, 64(3), 625–636.
 - Hanson, B. (2008). Wither Qualitative/Quantitative? Grounds for methodological convergence. *Quality & Quantity*, 42 (1) , 97-111.
- Supplemental:
 - Lezaun, J. (2007). A market of opinions: The political epistemology of focus groups. *Sociological Review*, 55 , 130-151.
 - 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.

- Whetsell, T. A. (2013). Theory-pluralism in public administration: Epistemology, legitimacy, and method. *American Review of Public Administration*, 43(5), 602–618. doi:10.1177/0275074012451311

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

5. [10/13]

6. [10/20]

- Required:

- Lawson, S. (2008). Political studies and the contextual turn: A methodological/normative critique. *Political Studies*, 56 (3), 584-603.
- 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.

- Supplemental:

- 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

7. [10/27]

8. [11/3]

- Required:

- Azzouni, J. (2004). Theory, observation and scientific realism. *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, 55(3), 371–392.
- Friedman, J. (2007). Ignorance as a starting point: From modest epistemology to realistic political theory. *Critical Review*, 19 (1) , 1-22.
- Lane, R. (1996). Positivism, scientific realism and political science: Recent developments in the philosophy of science. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 8 (3), 361-382.

- 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:

- Friedman, J. (2005). Popper, Weber, and Hayek: The epistemology and politics of ignorance. *Critical Review*, 17 (1-2) , I-LVIII.
- 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.
- Popper, K. (1968). *Logic of Scientific Discovery*. London: Hutchinson.
- 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

9. [11/10]

10. [11/17] mid-term exam (Dueday of the book reading report.)

- Required:

- Azzouni, J. (2004). Theory, observation and scientific realism. *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, 55(3), 371–392.
- 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.
- 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

11. [11/24]

12. [12/1]

- Required:

- Hamati-Ataya, I. (2012). Beyond (Post)Positivism: The Missed Promises of Systemic Pragmatism. *International Studies Quarterly*, 56(2), 291–305. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2478.2011.00710.x
 - Johnson, J. (2006). Consequences of positivism: A pragmatist assessment. *Comparative Political Studies*, 39 (2) , 224-252.
 - 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.
 - Nye, J. S. (2008). Bridging the gap between theory and policy. *Political Psychology*, 29 (4) , 593-603.
- 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]**
 - Shapiro, Ian. 2005. *The Flight from Reality in the Human Sciences*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 51-99.**
 - Whetsell, T. A., & Shields, P. M. (2011). Reconciling the varieties of pragmatism in public administration. *Administration & Society*, 43(4), 474–483. doi:10.1177/00953997111418915

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

13. [12/8]

14. [12/15]

- 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.**
 - Johnson, James. (2003). Conceptual Problems as Obstacles to Theoretical Progress in Political Science. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 15, 87-115.**
 - Tilly, Charles. (2001). Mechanisms in Political Processes. *Annual Review of Political Science* 4: 21-41.
 - Whetsell, T. A. (2013). Theory-pluralism in public administration: Epistemology, legitimacy, and method. *American Review of Public Administration*, 43(5), 602–618. doi:10.1177/0275074012451311
- Supplemental:
 - Clarke, K. A. (2007). The necessity of being comparative: Theory confirmation in quantitative political science. *Comparative Political Studies*, 40 (7) , 886-908.

- Glynn, A. N. (2012). The product and difference fallacies for indirect effects. *American Journal of Political Science*, 56(1), 257–269.
- Jervis, Robert. (1997). *System Effects: Complexity in Political and Social Life*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 73-91.**
- 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.**
- 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] **
- 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-.
- 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.**
- Schelling, T. C. (1978). *Micromotives and Macrobehavior*. New York: Norton. Chapter 1 & 3.**

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

15. [12/22]

16. [12/29]

- Student Presentation: Propose Your Method(s) and Methodology
- Required:
 - 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.
 - Yamamoto, T. (2012). Understanding the past: Statistical analysis of causal attribution. *American Journal of Political Science*, 56(1), 237–256.
- 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.
- 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.
- Gunnell, J. G. (2007). Are we losing our minds? Cognitive science and the study of politics. *Political Theory*, 35 (6) , 704-731.
- 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]
- Shadish, W. R.; Cook, T. D. & Campbell, D. T. (2007). *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.**
- Shapiro, Ian. 2005. *The Flight from Reality in the Human Sciences*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 178-203.**

TOPIC 9: How to Embed Taiwan Studies into the Global Context? Some Examples.

17. [1/5]

18. [1/12] Dueday of the term paper

- Required:

- Huang, C., & Wang, T. Y. (2014). Presidential coattails in Taiwan: An analysis of voter- and candidate-specific data. *Electoral Studies*, 33, 175–185. doi:10.1016/j.electstud.2014.05.001
- 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.
- Wei, C. (2013). China's economic offensive and Taiwan's defensive measures: Cross-strait fruit trade, 2005-2008. *China Quarterly*, (215), 641–662. doi:10.1017/S0305741013000000