

**University of Pennsylvania**  
**Political Science 295:**  
**Introduction to Political Research**  
Spring 2003  
(Friday 2-5 p.m.; 305 Towne Building)

Professor David L. Rousseau  
E-mail Address: rousseau@sas.upenn.edu  
Office Phone: 898-6187

Office: 235 Stiteler Hall  
Office Hours: Fridays 10-12  
or by appointment

**Mission of the Course**

In most undergraduate political science courses in the United States, students are consumers of research conducted by others. Students read historical cases of military crises, examine regression results probing the relationship between democracy and war, peruse interviews with government officials, and scrutinize surveys of public opinion. What is often unclear is the research process lurking behind these final results. The mission of this course is to shed light on the research process in political science.

The course has three goals. First, students will develop the skills of a social scientist. Over the course of the semester students will be developing hypotheses, constructing research designs, testing hypotheses, and communicating findings. Second, students will become intelligent users and consumers of a wide variety of investigatory techniques including, experiments, surveys, large-N statistical studies, formal models, computer simulation, content analysis, historical case studies, and interviews. We will explore the strengths and weaknesses of these methods in order to identify when and where each is most appropriate. Third, students will develop the statistical skills necessary to analyze the quantitative data. Students will become familiar with several basic descriptive statistics and statistical techniques such as means, standard deviations, correlation analysis, contingency tables, regression analysis, and hypothesis testing. This course fulfills the University's *Quantitative Skills Requirement*.

**Requirements of the Course**

Students' final grades will be based on the following examinations and assignments:

1) Midterm Exam (on Friday, March 7th)	30 percent
2) Final Exam (date and time to be announced)	50 percent
3) Participation, Quizzes, and Other Assignments	20 percent

The midterm and final exams are mandatory and will consist of multiple choice, essay, and problem solving questions. Make-up exams are only available to students providing documentation of an *emergency* medical situation (i.e., colds and dental appointments don't count). The exams will be cumulative. Throughout the semester, there will be a number of in-class and out-of-class assignments. While these assignments will not be graded, students hoping to acquire the skills necessary to do research in the social sciences should plan on completing these assignments. Quizzes, both scheduled and unscheduled, will be used to ensure the students are keeping up with the required

readings. There will be no makeup quizzes or assignments. Attendance is mandatory and will be taken randomly throughout the term. Students with learning disabilities *must* inform me during the first two weeks of class.

### **The Computer Lab**

The class meets for one three hour session per week. This is a long block of time that is difficult to use effectively because of student (and instructor!) fatigue. In order to minimize this problem, most weeks will be divided into three parts. During the first hour of class we will meet in the regular classroom for formal presentations (e.g., lectures, guest speakers, and student presentations). During the second hour, we will move to the School of Arts and Sciences Computer Classroom located in 319 Towne. In this room, we will conduct experiments, take surveys, perform content analysis, analyze data, and use simulations. Finally, during the third hour we will move back into the classroom for a discussion period.

### **Statistical Skills**

There are no prerequisites for this course. This means I make no assumptions about your prior exposure to research methods, quantitative analysis, or computer software. However, over the course of the semester you will learn to analyze data using a few simple quantitative techniques. While the simplest descriptive statistics (e.g., means) can be calculated using a calculator, more complex analyses (e.g., contingency tables with large data sets) require the use of a statistical software package. While you may use any statistical package you wish for your homework assignments, I will use a package called "STATA" to demonstrate quantitative techniques in class. You will also be required to use STATA or another package which currently resides on the lab computers to complete in-class exercises. Finally, you *must* bring a formatted diskette labeled "PSCI295" and an inexpensive calculator with you to class every week (and to the midterm and final examinations).

### **Required Text**

There is one required book and one required course pack for this class. The textbook is available from the University of Pennsylvania Book Store (36<sup>th</sup> and Walnut Street) and the course pack is available from Wharton Reprographics (400 Steinberg Hall-Dietrich Hall).

Frankfort-Nachmias, Chava and David Nachmias. 2000. *Research Methods in the Social Sciences. 6<sup>th</sup> Edition*. New York: Worth Publishers.  
(H61.N25 2000, on reserve at Rosengarten Reserve in Van Pelt Library).

The required readings marked [R] can be found in the Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias text; the required readings marked with an asterisk [R\*] can be found in the course pack. While I strongly recommend purchasing the course pack and text, the text are available on reserve in the Rosengarten Reserve Room in the Van Pelt-Dietrich Library and the course pack readings are available on electronic reserve via the Blackboard web site. Immediately after the required readings, I have listed several suggested readings for each topic which are marked [S]. The suggested readings can be accessed via Franklin, databases, or e-journals.

In certain weeks (e.g., Week 4 and 5), I have assigned two versions of the required reading. The first is a more difficult reading designed for advanced undergraduate students and beginning graduate students. The second is an easier version designed for undergraduates. I strongly encourage the adventurous to read the more advanced reading. If you find that you cannot comprehend the more advanced material on the first reading, I would read the simpler chapter before tackling the more difficult reading. While students choosing only to read the simpler readings over the course of the semester will be able to pass the course, they are unlikely to receive outstanding grades on the midterm and final.

### **Course Web Page**

The course web page will be a central element of the class. The web page will contain the class syllabus, lecture overheads, required readings, optional assignments, surveys, computer exercises, midterm and final review sheets, student contact information, and links to sites relating to research in political science. The course web page is accessible through the Blackboard web site used by many University of Pennsylvania classes. The web address of Blackboard is:

<https://courseweb.library.upenn.edu/>

### **Outline of Lectures**

#### **Week 1 (1/17): *Introduction to Research in Political Science***

This class will be devoted to an overview of the class and course mechanics. By the end of this short informational class, you should be able to determine if it suits your needs and interests.

#### **Week 2 (1/24): *Theories and Hypothesis Testing***

In this class we will explore the concept of "science" and its applicability to the analysis of human behavior. I will introduce the concepts of hypothesis construction and hypothesis testing. Finally, I will briefly survey the many possible methodologies available to empirically test hypotheses including controlled experiments, survey research, content analysis, correlational analysis, qualitative case studies, and simulations.

#### ***Readings:***

[R] Frankfort-Nachmias, Chava and David Nachmias. 2000. *Research Methods in the Social Sciences. 6<sup>th</sup> Edition*. New York: Worth Publishers. Chapters 1, 2, 3, 7 and 8. Pages 1-66, 137-186.

#### **Week 3 (1/31): *Research Ethics***

Research involving human beings raises a number of ethical concerns. Some of these concerns will be raised in future readings (e.g., the discussion of experiments in the *Handbook of Social Psychology*). Early research in both the social and physical sciences often failed to adequately protect the subjects from physical and emotional harm. In response, *Human Subject Review Boards* have been created at universities in order to

ensure subjects provide informed consent, research is not harmful, and the subjects leave the process fully understanding research puzzle.

- [R\*] American Psychological Association's *Ethical Principles of Psychologist and Code of Conduct* (Effective Date 1 December 1992). Available at [www.apa.org/ethics/code.html](http://www.apa.org/ethics/code.html). Pages 1-31.
- [R] Frankfort-Nachmias, Chava and David Nachmias. 2000. *Research Methods in the Social Sciences. 6<sup>th</sup> Edition*. New York: Worth Publishers. "Chapter 4: Ethics in Social Science Research." Pages 67-86.
- [R\*] Greenberg, Jerald and Robert Folger. 1988. "Chapter 2: Informed Consent" *Controversial Issues in Social Research*. New York: Springer-Verlag. Pages 21-37.
- [R\*] Greenberg, Jerald and Robert Folger. 1988. "Chapter 8: Debriefing: Informed Consent" *Controversial Issues in Social Research*. New York: Springer-Verlag. Pages 139-160.
- [R\*] Zimbardo, Philip G., Christina Maslach, and Craig Haney. 2000. "Reflections on the Stanford Prison Experiments." In Thomas Blass's (ed.) *Obedience to Authority: Current Perspectives on the Milgram Paradigm*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Pages 1-35.

#### **Week 4 (2/7): Experiments**

Although experiments are a cornerstone of the natural sciences and widely used in the social sciences, they have been slow to catch on in political science. The strength of experiments lies in the researcher's ability to control the environment and manipulate particular variables with great precision. We will examine a number of different experiments from political science and social psychology in order to illustrate the wide variety of experimental methods that have been used in the social sciences.

##### **a. Experimental Method:**

- [R\*] Aronson, Elliot, Timothy D. Wilson, and Marilynn B. Brewer. 1998. "Chapter 3: Experiments in Social Psychology." In Daniel T. Gilbert, Susan T. Fiske, and Gardner Lindzey (eds.) *The Handbook of Social Psychology. 4<sup>th</sup> Edition*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill. (A more difficult reading designed for advanced undergraduate students and beginning graduate students.) Pages 99-142.
- [R] Frankfort-Nachmias, Chava and David Nachmias. 2000. *Research Methods in the Social Sciences. 6<sup>th</sup> Edition*. New York: Worth Publishers. "Chapter 5: Research Designs: Experiments." (An easier reading designed for undergraduate students.) Pages 87-112.
- [S] McDermot, Rose. 2002. "Experimental Methods in Political Science." *Annual Review of Political Science. 5*:31-61.
- [S] Kinder, Donald R. and Thomas R. Palfrey. 1993. "On Behalf of an Experimental Political Science." In Donald R. Kinder and Thomas R. Palfrey (eds.) *Experimental Foundations of Political Science*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press. Pages 1-39.

[S] Roth, Alvin E. 1988. "Laboratory Experimentation in Economics: A Methodological Overview." *The Economic Journal* 98 (December) 974-1031.

**b. Example of an Experiment in Political Science:**

[R\*] Iyengar, Shanto, Mark D. Peters, and Donald R. Kinder. 1993. "Experimental Demonstrations of the "Not-So-Minimal" Consequences of Television New Programs." In Donald R. Kinder and Thomas R. Palfrey (eds.) *Experimental Foundations of Political Science*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press. Pages 313-331.

**c. Critiques of Experiments :**

[R\*] Carlsmith, J. Merrill, Phoebe C. Ellsworth, and Elliot Aronson. 1976. "Some Problems with Experimentation in Social Psychology." In *Methods of Research in Social Psychology*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company. Pages 53-92.

[S] Sears, David O. 1986. "College Sophomores in the Laboratory: Influences of a Narrow Data Base on Social Psychology's View of Human Nature." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51:515-530.

**d. Further Readings about Experiments :**

- 1) David L. Rousseau, Dan Miodownik, and Deborah Lux. 2001. "Shared Identity and Threat Perception in International Relations." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, San Francisco, CA September 2001.
- 2) Greenwood, John D. 1982. "On the Relation Between Laboratory Experiments and Social Behavior: Causal Explanations and Generalization." *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior*, 12/3 (October), 225-250.
- 3) Mintz, Alex and Nehemia Geva. 1993. "Why Don't Democracies Fight Each Other? An Experimental Study." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*. 37/3 (September), 484-504.
- 4) Lau, Richard R. and David P. Redlawsk. 2001. "Advantages and Disadvantages of Cognitive Heuristics in Political Decision Making." *American Journal of Political Science* 45/4 (October) 951-971.
- 5) Brewer, Marilynn B. and Rupert J. Brown. 1998. "Intergroup Relations." In Daniel T. Gilbert, Susan T. Fiske, and Gardner Lindzey (eds.) *The Handbook of Social Psychology*. 4<sup>th</sup> Edition. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill. pp.554-594.
- 6) Bornstein, Gary and Meyrav Ben-Yossef. 1994. "Cooperation in Intergroup and Single-Group Social Dilemmas." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 30, 52-67.
- 7) Brewer, Marilynn B. 1986. "Choice Behavior in Social Dilemmas: Effects of Social Identity, Group Size, and Decision Framing." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 50/3, 543-49.

## **Week 5 (2/14): Surveys**

Survey research involves asking people questions in person, over the phone, via the mail, or on the internet. Much of survey research involves probing the opinion of the public at home and abroad. While the simplest surveys are descriptive tools, experimental surveys can probe causal mechanisms with great accuracy. This week we will discuss a variety of questions including: How does one conduct a survey? Why are some survey questions good and others bad? How do you select a sample? What is the difference between an open-ended and close-ended question?

### **a. The Survey Research Method:**

[R\*] Schwarz, Norbert, Robert M. Groves, and Howard Schuman. 1998. "Chapter 4: Survey Methods." In Daniel T. Gilbert, Susan T. Fiske, and Gardner Lindzey (eds.) *The Handbook of Social Psychology*. 4<sup>th</sup> Edition. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill. (A more difficult reading designed for advanced undergraduate students and beginning graduate students.) Pages 143-179.

[R] Frankfort-Nachmias, Chava and David Nachmias. 2000. *Research Methods in the Social Sciences*. 6<sup>th</sup> Edition. New York: Worth Publishers. Chapter 10: Survey Research." (An easier reading designed for undergraduate students.) Pages 205-228.

[S] Babbie, Earl. 1998. *Survey Research Methods*. Second Edition. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth. A basic text for advanced undergraduates that explores every step in the process from sampling to question writing to survey implementation.

### **b. Example of a Survey:**

[R\*] Schuman, Howard and Cheryl Rieger. 1992. "Historical Analogies, Generation Effects, and Attitudes Toward War." *American Sociological Review* 57(June), 315-326.

### **c. Critiques of Surveys:**

[R\*] LaPiere, Richard T. 1998. "Attitudes vs. Actions and the Pitfalls of Quantitative "Survey" Research." In Gregg Lee Carter (ed.) *Empirical Approaches to Sociology: A Collection of Classic and Contemporary Readings*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon. The classic article, originally published in 1934, is as relevant today as when it was written. Pages 49-56.

[R\*] Schwarz, Norbert. 1999. "Self-Reports: How the Questions Shape the Answers." *American Psychologist* 54/2 (February), 93-105.

[R\*] Reinharz, Shulamit. 1992. "Feminist Survey Research and Other Statistical Research Formats." In *Feminist Methods in Social Research*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. Focus on the critique section. Pages 76-94.

[R\*] Groves, Robert M. 1987. "Research on Survey Data Quality." *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 51/4 Part 2 (Winter), S156-S172. Brief article on sources of error and research exploring these issues.

### **d. Further Readings about Surveys:**

1) Jamieson, Kathleen Hal, Michael G. Hagen, Dan Orr, Lesley Sillaman, Suzanne Morse, and Kim Kirn 2000. "What Did the Leading

- Candidates Say, and Did It Matter? (What Could Voters Learn from the 2000 Primaries?),” *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, vol. 572 (November).
- 2) Schwarz, Norbert and Seymour Sudman, (eds.) 1996. *Answering Questions: Methodology For Determining Cognitive And Communicative Processes In Survey Research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers. A book about methods.
  - 3) Converse, Jean and Stanley Presser. 1986. *Survey Questions: Handcrafting the Standardized Questionnaire*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications. Another book about methods.
  - 4) Sudman, Seymour, Norman M. Bradburn, Norbert Schwarz. 1996. *Thinking About Answers : The Application Of Cognitive Processes To Survey Methodology*. San Francisco : Jossey-Bass Publishers. Another book about methods.
  - 5) Zaller, John. 1992. *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. A classic application from American Politics.
  - 6) Holsti, Ole R. and James N. Rosenau. 1990. "The Structure Of Foreign Policy Attitudes Among American Leaders." *The Journal of Politics* 52/1 (February) 94-126. An application from international relations.
  - 7) Wittkopf, Eugene R. 1994. "Faces of Internationalism in a Transitional Environment" *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 38(September):376-401. An application from international relations.
  - 8) Rousseau, David L. 2002. "Motivations for Choice: The Salience of Relative Gains in International Relations." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 46/3 (June), 394-426.

**Week 6 (2/21): Surveys and Experiments Revisited: Race and Politics**

One way to understand the strengths and weaknesses of various methods of investigation is to focus on a particular research puzzle. In this week, we will discuss the issue of race and politics from a methodological perspective. How might you use surveys to measure racial attitudes? Are racial attitudes more difficult to measure than other attitudes? How might one use experiments to probe the impact of racial beliefs on opinion and behavior? Can experiments get around self-censorship?

**a. Racism Experiments and Surveys:**

- [R\*] Iyengar, Shanto, Mark D. Peters, and Donald R. Kinder. 1993. "Survey-Based Experiments on White Racial Attitudes toward Residential Integration." In Donald R. Kinder and Thomas R. Palfrey (eds.) *Experimental Foundations of Political Science*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press. Pages 53-78.
- [R\*] Biernat, Monica and Christian S. Crandall. "Racial Attitudes." In John P. Robinson, Phillip R. Shaver, and Lawrence S. Wrightsman (eds.) *Measuring Political Attitudes*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press. Pages 297-411. The bulk of this reading is survey questions. You should come prepared to discuss the strengths and weakness of different survey

instruments (e.g., the Modern Racism Scale (MRS) versus older measures of racism).

[R\*] Greenwald, Anthony G., Debbie E. McGhee, and Jordan L. K. Schwartz. 1998. "Measuring Individual Differences in Implicit Cognition: The Implicit Association Test." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 74/6 (June). 1464-1480.

**b. Measurement, Sampling, and Questionnaire Development:**

[R] Frankfort-Nachmias, Chava and David Nachmias. 2000. *Research Methods in the Social Sciences. 6<sup>th</sup> Edition*. New York: Worth Publishers. Chapter 11: Questionnaire Construction. pp. 229-254.

**c. Further Readings about Racism:**

- 1) Sidanius, Jim, Seymour Feshback, Shana Levin, and Felicia Pratto. 1997. "The Interface Between Ethnic and National Attachment: Ethnic Pluralism or Ethnic Dominance?" *Public Opinion Quarterly* 61, 102-133.
- 2) Greenwald, Anthony G., Mahzarin R. Banaji, Laurie A. Rudman, Shelley D. Farnham, Brian A. Nosek, and Deborah S. Mellott. 2002. "A Unified Theory of Implicit Attitudes, Stereotypes, Self-Esteem, and Self-Concept." *Psychological Review*. 109/1 (January), 3-25.
- 3) Greenwald, Anthony G. and Brian A. Nosek. 2001. Health of the Implicit Association Test at Age 3." Special issue of the *Zeitschrift fur Experimentelle Psychologie*.
- 4) McConahay, John B., Betty B. Hardee, and Valerie Batts. 1981. "Has Racism Declined in America? It Depends on Who is Asking and What is Asked." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*. 25/4 (December), 563-579.
- 5) Brief, Arthur P., Joerg Dietz, Robin Reizenstein Cohen, S. Douglas Pugh, and Joel B. Vaslow. 2000. "Just Doing Business: Modern Racism and Obedience to Authority as Explanations for Employment Discrimination." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process* 81/1 (January), 72-97.
- 6) Rousseau, David L. 2003. "Racism and Realism in International Relations." Unpublished manuscript.

**Week 7 (2/28): Large-N Statistical Studies**

Large-N statistical studies (often called "quasi-experimental designs or correlational analysis) are studies of the historical behavior of individuals or groups. Are democracies less likely to use force against other democracies? Are Republican controlled legislatures more likely to cut taxes than Democratic controlled legislatures? Are states with agricultural economies more likely to experience a communist or fascist revolution than states with commercial economies? In order to analyze these questions, we look to the past and employ statistical methods such as regressions in order to discover "average" or "typical" patterns of behavior.

**a. Large-N Statistical Method:**

[R] Frankfort-Nachmias, Chava and David Nachmias. 2000. *Research Methods in the Social Sciences. 6<sup>th</sup> Edition*. New York: Worth Publishers. Chapter 6: Research Designs: Cross-Sectional and Quasi-

Experimental Designs.” (Note: both this and the following reading are required for all students this week.) Pages.113-136

[R\*] Braumoeller, Bear F. and Anne E. Sartori. 2002. “Empirical-Quantitative Approaches to the Study of International Relations.” Prepared as Chapter 6 of Detlef Sprinz and Yael Wolinsky (eds.) *The Analysis of International Relations* (under review). Pages.1-21.

**b. Example of Large-N Statistical Study :**

[R\*] Rousseau, David L., Christopher Gelpi, Dan Reiter, and Paul Huth. 1996. “Assessing the Dyadic Nature of the Democratic Peace.” *American Political Science Review* 90/3 (September), 512-533.

**c. Critique of Large-N Statistical Studies:**

[R\*] “The Qualitative-Quantitative Disputation: Gary King, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba’s *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research.*” 1995. *American Political Science Review* 89/2 (June) 454-481.

**d. Further Readings on Large-N Statistical Studies:**

- 1) Oneal, John R., and Bruce M. Russett. 1999c. "The Kantian Peace: The Pacific Benefits of Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations, 1885-1992." *World Politics* 52:1-37.
- 2) Mansfield, Edward D. 1994. *Power, Trade, and War*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. (HF1379.M36 1994)
- 3) Hufbauer, Gary Clyde, Jeffrey J. Schott, and Kimberly Ann Elliott. 1990. *Economic Sanctions Reconsidered*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Revised Edition, 2 Volumes. Washington, DC: Institute for International Economics.
- 4) Kugler, Jacek and Douglas Lemke (eds.) *Parity and War: Evaluations and Extensions of the War Ledger*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- 5) Huth, Paul K. 1996. *Standing Your Ground: Territorial Disputes and International Conflict*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

**Week 8 (3/7): Midterm Exam**

No assigned readings for this week.

**SPRING BREAK:** no class on Friday March 14<sup>th</sup>.

**Week 9 (3/21): Formal Models**

Beginning in the 1970s and proliferating in the 1980s, formal models have become a central component of research in political science. A formal model is mathematical representation of a problem or process. By carefully articulating assumptions and decision rules, formal model generate predictions about expected behavior in particular settings. Although formal models are a hypothesis generating tools, the predictions of the models can be verified using other methods of investigation.

**a. Formal Method:**

[R\*] Morrow, James D. 1994. *Game Theory for Political Scientists*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. “Chapter 1: Overview” Pages 1-15.

[R\*] Zagare, Frank. 1984. *Game Theory: Concepts and Applications*. Beverley Hills, CA: Sage Publications. Pages 11-63.

**b. Example of a Formal Model:**

[R\*] Schultz, Kenneth A. 1999. "Do democratic institutions constrain or inform? Contrasting two institutional perspectives on democracy and war," *International Organization* 53/2 (Spring), 233-266.

**c. Critique of Formal Modeling :**

[R\*] Walt, Stephen M. 1999. "Rigor or Rigor Mortis?: Rational Choice and Security Studies." *International Security* 23/4 (Spring), 5-48. (You may want to look at responses by formal modelers in the same issue.)

[S] Green, Donald P. and Ian Shapiro. 1994. *Pathologies of Rational Choice Theory: A Critique of Applications in Political Science*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

**d. Further Readings on Formal Models:**

- 1) Gowa, Joanne. 1994. *Allies, Adversaries, and International Trade*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- 2) Snidal, Duncan. 1991. "Relative Gains and the Pattern of International Cooperation." *American Political Science Review* 85/3 (September), 701-26. Reprinted in David A. Baldwin (ed.) *Neorealism and Neoliberalism: The Contemporary Debate*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.
- 3) Martin, Lisa L. 1994. *Coercive Cooperation: Explaining Multilateral Sanctions*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. (HF1413.5 M37 1992)
- 4) Krasner, Stephen D. (ed). 1983. *International Regimes*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- 5) Oye, Kenneth (ed). 1986. *Cooperation Under Anarchy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- 6) Friedman, Jeffrey. 1996. *The Rational Choice Controversy: Economic Models of Politics Reconsidered*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- 7) Ordeshook, Peter C. 1986. *Game Theory and Political Theory*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- 8) Bates, Robert, Avner Greif, Margaret Levi, Jean-Laurent Rosenthal, and Barry R. Weingast. 1998. *Analytic Narratives*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

**Week 10 (3/28): Computer Simulations:**

Computer simulations have only recently emerged as a major method of research in political science. Computer simulations are similar to formal models in that the researcher must carefully specify all assumptions and decision rules. However, the two methods diverge greatly in how the problem is solved. While a formal modeler would solve the problem analytically, the simulation researcher will "simulate" the model in order to inductively discover the solution. In general, simulations are useful for complex and/or non-linear problems that cannot be solved analytically. In this class (as in political science more generally), we will focus on a particular type of simulation called "agent-based model." In an agent-based model, the researcher specifies the properties of the agent and rules for agent-to-agent interaction. Once the simulation begins, both the

agents and the environment evolve -- sometimes moving toward an equilibrium and sometimes not.

**a. The Computer Simulation Method:**

[R\*] Macy, Michael W. and Robert Willer. 2002. "From Factors to Actors: Computational Sociology and Agent-Based Modeling." *Annual Review of Sociology* 28, 143-66.

**b. Example of a Computer Simulation:**

[R\*] Cederman, Lars-Erik. 2001. "Modeling the Democratic Peace as a Kantian Selection Process." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 45/4 (August), 470-502.

**c. Critiques of Computer Simulation:**

[R\*] Johnson, Paul E. 1999. "Simulation Modeling in Political Science." *American Behavioral Scientists* 42/10 (August), 1509-1530.

[S] Di Paolo, Ezequiel A. 1999. "Chapter 4: Methodological Issues in the Use of Formal Models and Computer Simulations." In *On the Evolution and Behavioral Dynamics of Social Coordination: Models and Theoretical Aspects*. D.Phil Thesis. University of Sussex.

**d. Data Analysis Readings:**

[R] Frankfort-Nachmias, Chava and David Nachmias. 2000. *Research Methods in the Social Sciences, 6<sup>th</sup> Edition*. New York: Worth Publishers. Chapter 14: Data Preparation and Analysis and Chapter 15: The Univariate Distribution. Pages 303-350.

**e. Further Readings on Computer Simulations :**

- 1) Schelling, Thomas C. 1978. *Micromotives and Macrobehavior*. New York: Norton.
- 2) Cederman, Lars-Erik. 1994. "Emergent Polarity: Analyzing State-Formation and Power Politics." *International Studies Quarterly*, 38,4(December), 501-33.
- 3) Lustick, I. S. 2000. "Agent-based modeling of collective identity: Testing constructivist theory," *Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulations*, 3(1). Available at <http://jasss.soc.surrey.ac.uk/3/1/1.html>.
- 4) Axelrod, Robert. 1984. *The Evolution of Cooperation*. New York: Basic Books.
- 5) Epstein, Joshua and Robert Axtell. 1996. *Growing Artificial Societies: Social Science From the Bottom Up*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- 6) Parunak, H. Van Dyke, Robert Savit, and Rick L. Riolo. 1998. *Proceedings of Multi-Agent Systems and Agent-Based Simulation*.
- 7) Macy, Michael and John Skvoretz. 1998. "The Evolution of Trust and Cooperation between Strangers: A Computational Model." *American Sociological Review* 63/5 (October), 638-661.

**Week 11 (4/4): Content Analysis**

Content analysis involves quantitatively coding the "content" of written documents, audio transcripts, radio programs, television programs, public speeches, or internet pages. Content analysis allows us to explore the beliefs, attitudes, and

preferences of actors (even after they are dead). The method is often used in conjunction with other methods in order to establish a firmer causal link. For example, a researcher might explore whether a rise in anti-communist statements in national newspapers (using content analysis) precedes the rise of anti-communist attitudes in public opinion polls (using a survey).

**a. The Method of Content Analysis:**

[R\*] Smith, Charles P. 2000. "Content Analysis and Narrative Analysis." In Harry T. Reis and Charles M. Judd (eds.) *Handbook of Research Methods in Social and Personality Psychology*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. Pages.313-335.

**b. Examples of Content Analysis:**

[R\*] Axelrod, Robert. 1977. "Argumentation in Foreign Policy Settings: Britain in 1918, Munich in 1938, and Japan in 1970." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 21/4 (December) 727-45.

[R\*] van der Veen, Maurits. 2002. "Chapter 3: Debates About Aid: Contents and Patterns." In Maurits van der Veen's *Framing Aid: Ideas and Interests in Foreign Policy*. Book manuscript under review. Other chapters of the book manuscript (and related papers) are available at: <http://www.sas.upenn.edu/~maurits/research.html#FramingFP> pp. 1-28.

**c. Critique of Content Analysis :**

[R\*] Larson, Deborah Welch. 1988. "Problems of Content Analysis in Foreign Policy Research: Notes from the Study of the Origins of the Cold War." *International Studies Quarterly* 32, 241-255.

**d. Data Analysis Readings:**

[R] Frankfort-Nachmias, Chava and David Nachmias. 2000. *Research Methods in the Social Sciences. 6<sup>th</sup> Edition*. New York: Worth Publishers. Chapter 16: Bivariate Analysis. Pages 351-384.

**e. Further Readings on Content Analysis :**

- 1) Johnston, Alastair Iain. 1995. *Cultural Realism: Strategic Culture and Grand Strategy in Chinese History*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. An outstanding example using ancient Chinese texts to assess beliefs and predicted behavior.
- 2) Krippendorff, Klaus. 1980. *Content Analysis: An Introduction To Its Methodology*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications. Another "method" reading by Sage Publications (the little green books).
- 3) Weber, Robert Philip. 1985. *Basic Content Analysis*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications. Yet another "method" reading by Sage Publications (the little green books).
- 4) Larson, Deborah W. 1985. *The Origins of Containment: A Psychological Explanation*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- 5) Kaufmann, Chaim D. 1994. "Out of the Lab into the Archives: A Method For Testing Psychological Explanations of Political Decision Making." *International Studies Quarterly* 38/4 (December), 557-587.
- 6) North, Robert C. et al. 1963. *Content Analysis: A Handbook with Applications for the Study of International Crisis*. Evanston, IL:

Northwestern University Press. A classic analysis of content in the field of international relations.

- 7) Abdelal, Rawi, Yoshiko M. Herrera, Alastair Iain Johnston, and Terry Martin. 2001. "Treating Identity as a Variable: Measuring the Content, Intensity, and Contestation of Identity." Paper prepared for presentation at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, August 30-September 2, 2001, San Francisco. Extending and automating the analysis of texts cross nationally.
- 8) Neuman, W. Russell, Marion R. Just, and Ann N. Crigler. 1992. *Common Knowledge: News and the Construction of Political Meaning*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. Nice use of multiple methods, including content analysis, in order to zero in on an issue.

### **Week 12 (4/11): *Historical Case Studies and Archival Research***

Case studies are perhaps the best known method of investigation. Case studies of particular events (e.g., the Cuban Missile Crisis) and a small number of events (e.g., social revolutions) are common in all sub-fields of political science. The strength of the method lay in the author's ability to trace the process of a causal argument. This week's class will address a variety of questions including: How do you select cases? How do you eliminate competing explanation? What is the relationship between case studies and large-N studies? Why do case studies often reach different conclusions than quantitative studies?

#### **a. The Case Study Method Method:**

[R\*] Van Evera, Stephen. 1997. "What are Case Studies and How Should They be Performed?" In Stephen Van Evera's *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. pp. 49-88.

#### **b. Example of a Case Study :**

[R\*] Kier, Elizabeth. 1997. "Chapter 5: Explaining British Doctrine." and "Chapter 6: Culture and British Doctrine." In Elizabeth Kier's *Imagining War: French And British Military Doctrine Between The Wars*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Pages.89-139.

#### **c. Critiques of Case Studies:**

[R\*] "The Qualitative-Quantitative Disputation: Gary King, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba's *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*." 1995. *American Political Science Review* 89/2 (June) 454-481. NOTE: THIS READING WAS ASSIGNED FOR WEEK 7 AS WELL.

[S] King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

#### **d. Data Analysis Readings:**

[R] Frankfort-Nachmias, Chava and David Nachmias. 2000. *Research Methods in the Social Sciences. 6<sup>th</sup> Edition*. New York: Worth

Publishers. Chapter 17: Control, Elaboration, and Multivariate Analysis. Pages 385-412.

**e. Further Readings on Case Studies:**

- 1) Skocpol, Theda. 1994. *Social Revolutions In The Modern World*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- 2) Sil, Rudy. 2002. *Managing "Modernity": Work, Community and Authority in Lat-Industrializing Japan and Russia*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- 3) Callaghy, Thomas. forthcoming 2002. "The Paris Club and International Economic Governance: Doubles Crises and Debt" in Vinod Aggarwal and Brigitte Granville (eds.) *Sovereign Debt: Origins, Management, and Restructuring*. London: Royal Institute of International Studies.
- 4) Layne, Christopher. 1994. "Kant or Cant: The Myth of the Democratic Peace." *International Security* 19,2 (Fall), 5-49.
- 5) George, Alexander L. and Richard Smoke. 1974. *Deterrence in American Foreign Policy: Theory and Practice*. New York: Columbia University Press. A classic work on systematic analysis of multiple case studies.
- 6) Snyder, Jack. 1984. *Ideology of the Offensive: Military Decision Making and the Disasters of 1914*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- 7) Milner, Helen V. 1988. *Resisting Protectionism: Global Industries and the Politics of International Trade*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- 8) Khong, Yuen Foong. 1992. *Analogies at War: Korea, Munich, Dien Bien Phu, and the Vietnam Decisions of 1965*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

**Week 13 (4/18): Interviews**

Interviewing is an extremely common method of inquiry, particularly in foreign policy research and comparative politics. While interviews are often completed as part of a case study, the interview method can be used in a wide variety of situations. At one end of the spectrum, the interview is simply one observation in a survey (i.e., a large number of interviewees and a highly structured interview instrument that allows the quantitative analysis of the data). At the other end of the spectrum, the interview is a completely unstructured question and answer period between two people. Depending on how they plan to use the results of the interview, researchers select a point somewhere between these two points.

**a. Method:**

[R\*] Bartholomew, Kim, Antonia J. Z Henderson, and James E. Marcia. 2000. "Coded Semistructured Interviews in Social Psychology." In Harry T. Reis and Charles M. Judd (eds.) *Handbook of Research Methods in Social and Personality Psychology*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. Pages 286-312.

**b. Example:**

[R\*] Summerfield, Penny. 1998. "Chapter 3: "Heroes" and "Stoics": War Work and Feminine Identity." In Penny Summerfield's *Reconstructing Woman's Wartime Lives*. Manchester, UK: University of Manchester Press. Pages 78-113.

**c. Critique:**

[R\*] Johnson, Marcia. 1998. "Individual and Cultural Reality Monitoring." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. v560, 179-94.

**d. Data Analysis Readings:**

[R] Frankfort-Nachmias, Chava and David Nachmias. 2000. *Research Methods in the Social Sciences. 6<sup>th</sup> Edition*. New York: Worth Publishers. Chapter 18: Index Construction and Scaling Methods and Chapter 19: Inferences. Pages 413-456.

**e. Further Readings:**

- 1) Lane, Robert Edwards. 1962. *Political Ideology, Why The American Common Man Believes What He Does*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe. A political science classic that was once at the center of the qualitative-quantitative debate.
- 2) Gamson, William A. 1992. *Talking Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 3) Brenner, Michael, Jennifer Brown, and David Canter. (eds.) 1985. *The Research Interview: Uses and Approaches*. London: Academic Press.
- 4) Thompson, Paul. 2000. *The Voice of the Past: Oral History*. Third Edition. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. Available on-line for University of Pennsylvania students via the Franklin Library Catalog.
- 5) Schwarz, Norbert and Seymour Sudman (eds.) 1994. *Autobiographical Memory and the Validity of Retrospective Reports*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

**Week 14 (4/25): Conclusions**

No assigned reading for this week.