

API-901: DOCTORAL RESEARCH SEMINAR

**JOHN F. KENNEDY SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT
HARVARD UNIVERSITY
FALL 2009**

Professor Pepper D. Culpepper

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course is required of all first-year Ph.D. candidates in Public Policy. The course provides an introduction to social science theory, philosophy, and research methods.

EXPECTATIONS AND GRADING

This is a graduate seminar and depends for the quality of discussion on your having done all the reading prior to class. To facilitate discussions, each student will comment on one or more themes or debates raised in the reading in a brief response paper, not to exceed 500 words, for each class with assigned reading (excluding the first class on Tuesday, September 15). These readings must be posted *to the online class pages* by 8am on the day of class. Each student can elect one "bye" session, in which they do not write comments on the day's reading. The bye sessions are intended to lighten your load on days for which you have other major assignments due in other classes, and you are still expected to do all the required reading on these days.

In this course we try to marry the high abstraction of theories about the philosophy of science with concrete examples of how social scientists work. Each student will provide an analysis of an example of good research completed by a Harvard professor of their choosing and will comment on the work of other students. Students will also develop and present at least an outline of a research proposal for their own topic of interest.

Course grading will be on a Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory basis.

COURSE MATERIALS

Required

- Reading packets (available at CMO)

Required Books to Purchase (available at the COOP)

- Henry E. Brady and David Collier (eds.). 2004. Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools and Shared Standards. Lanham, MD: Roman and Littlefield.
- Gary King, Robert Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Other Relevant Books (on reserve in KSG Library)

- Charles C. Ragin. 1987. The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Stephen Van Evera. 1997. Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

SCHEDULE
Tuesday , 3:10-6:00, L-332

Tuesday, September 15

What Does Scientific Research Require?

Our first meeting is to discuss the purposes and structure of the course and organize the schedule and responsibilities for student presentations. We will also discuss the basic themes of the course. **It is assumed you will have done the course reading for this session, even though it is our first.**

- a) Gary King, Robert Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research. Princeton: Princeton University Press, **Chapter 1**.
- b) Henry E. Brady, "Doing Good and Doing Better: How Far Does the Quantitative Template Get Us." **Chapter 3** in Brady and Collier, 2004, Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards, New York: Rowman and Littlefield,

Tuesday, September 22

Tarek Masoud presentation

- a) Selections from his book manuscript, *Why Islam Wins: Islamist Parties and their Electoral Ecologies*, will be distributed in class.

What is Social Science?

- b) Milton Friedman. 1953. "The Methodology of Positive Economics." Essays in Positive Economics. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, **pp. 3-43**.
- c) Clifford Geertz. 1973. The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays. Chapter 1, "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture." Cambridge: Basic Books, **pp. 3-30**.
- d) Max Weber. 1949. "The Methodology of the Social Sciences. 'Objectivity.'" In Edward A. Shils et al. (eds.), Social Science and Social Policy. New York: The Free Press, **pp. 72 – 82, 83 – 85, 89 – 91, 104 – 106, 110 – 111**
- e) The following chapters from Fred R. Dallmayr & Thomas A. McCarthy (eds.). 1977. Understanding and Social Inquiry. Notre Dame, University of Notre Dame Press:
Authors, "Introduction: Max Weber on Verstehen," **pp. 19-23**
Authors, "Introduction: The Positivist Reception," **pp. 77-80**
- f) Charles Taylor. 1971. "Interpretation and the Sciences of Man." Review of Metaphysics, **pp. 25-55, 65-71**.

Tuesday, September 29

Monica Toft Presentation

- a) “Civil War Termination in Historical and Theoretical Context,” Chapter 1 of *Securing the Peace: The Durable Settlement of Civil Wars*, forthcoming book [to be circulated electronically].

Positivism and Falsification

- b) Karl Popper. 1962. “Science: Conjectures and Refutation,” Conjectures and Refutations: The Growth of Scientific Knowledge, New York: Basic Books, **pp. 33-39**.
- c) Karl Popper. 1959. “The Problem of Induction,” The Logic of Scientific Discovery, New York: Basic Books, **pp. 27-34**.
- d) Thomas S. Kuhn. 1970. “Logic of Discovery or Psychology of Research?” In Imre Lakatos and Alan Musgrave, (eds.), Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, **pp. 1-23**.
- e) Imre Lakatos. 1970. “Falsification and the Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes.” In Imre Lakatos and Alan Musgrave, (eds.), Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge [reprinted with corrections 1972]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, **pp. 91-146**.

Tuesday, October 6

Ethnography and the Interpretive Turn

- a) Kathryn Edin and Maria Kefalas, *Promises I can keep: Why Poor Women put Motherhood before Marriage*, University of California Press, 2005, Introduction (pp. 1-26) and Appendices A and B (pp. 225-247).
- b) Paul Rabinow and William M. Sullivan. 1987. “The Interpretive Turn: A Second Look.” Paul Rabinow and William M. Sullivan (eds.), Interpretive Social Science: A Second Look, Berkeley: University of California Press, **pp. 1-30**.
- c) Paul Atkinson and Marytn Hammersley. 1994. “Ethnography and Participant Observation,” in Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln (eds.), Handbook of Qualitative Research. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, **pp. 248-261**.

The Socially Embedded Process of Research

- d) Daniel Little. 1991. Varieties of Social Explanation. Boulder: Westview Press, **pp. 222-238**.
- e) John R. Searle. 1995. The Construction of Social Reality. New York: The Free Press, **pp.7-29**.
- f) Arjo Klamer and Donald N. McCloskey. 1988. “Economics in the Human Conversation.” In Arjo Klamer et al. (eds.), The Consequences of Economic Rhetoric. Cambridge, England, Cambridge University Press, **pp. 3-19**.

- g) Robert M. Solow. 1988. "Comments from Inside Economics." In Arjo Klamer et al. (eds.), The Consequences of Economic Rhetoric. Cambridge, England, Cambridge University Press, pp. 31-37.

TUESDAY OCTOBER 13 – NO CLASS

PRESENTATION OF FACULTY WORK/ INTERVIEW ASSIGNMENT (starting Oct 20)

Each student will interview a faculty member close to his or her field and discuss an example of the faculty member's research. The student will present the identified work to the seminar. We are concerned more with methods, use of data, use of theory, reasoning from evidence to conclusions, etc., than with any specific research finding. Obtain an article-length version of the research product and write one or two pages summarizing the article's strengths. Two other students will comment in writing on the summary and the article.

Submit copies of the relevant article and summary one week in advance for distribution to the other members of the course. The commentators will provide copies of their critiques no later than the Friday before the class when the respective work will be discussed.

Tuesday, October 20

Student Presentation 1

Presenter _____

Commentator _____

Commentator _____

Student Presentation 2

Presenter _____

Commentator _____

Commentator _____

Student Presentation 3

Presenter _____

Commentator _____

Commentator _____

Student Presentation 4

Presenter _____

Commentator _____

Commentator _____

Tuesday, October 27

Research Design, Conceptual Stretching, and the Practice of Qualitative and Quantitative Research

- a) Gary King, Robert Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research. Princeton: Princeton University Press, **Chapters 2-3**.
- b) Gerardo Munck. 1998. "Tools for Qualitative Research." In Henry E. Brady and David Collier (eds.). 2004. Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools and Shared Standards. Lanham, MD: Roman and Littlefield, **pp. 105-121**.
- c) Robert Adcock and David Collier. 2001. "Measurement Validity: Toward a Shared Framework for Qualitative and Quantitative Research." American Political Science Review 95 **pp.529-546**.
- d) Giovanni Sartori 1970. "Concept Misinformation in Comparative Politics." American Political Science Review 64, **pp.1033-1053**.

Student Presentation 5

Presenter _____

Commentator _____

Commentator _____

Student Presentation 6

Presenter _____

Commentator _____

Commentator _____

Tuesday, November 3

Student Presentation 7

Presenter _____

Commentator _____

Commentator _____

Student Presentation 8

Presenter _____

Commentator _____

Commentator _____

Student Presentation 9

Presenter _____

Commentator _____

Commentator _____

Student Presentation 10

Presenter _____

Commentator _____

Commentator _____

Tuesday, November 10

Causal Mechanisms and Process Analysis

- a) Phillip E. Tetlock and Aaron Belkin. 1996. Counterfactual Thought Experiments in World Politics. Princeton: Princeton University Press, **pp. 3-38**.
- b) Timothy McKeown. 1999. "Case Studies and the Limits of the Quantitative Worldview." In Henry E. Brady and David Collier (eds.). 2004. Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools and Shared Standards. Lanham, MD: Roman and Littlefield, **pp. 139-167**
- c) Peter Hall. 2003. "Aligning Ontology and Methodology in Comparative Politics." In J. Mahoney and D. Rueschemeyer (eds.). Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences. New York, Cambridge University Press, **pp. 373-404**.
- d) Sidney Tarrow. 1995."Bridging the Quantitative-Qualitative Divide." In Henry E. Brady and David Collier (eds.). 2004. Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools and Shared Standards. Lanham, MD: Roman and Littlefield. **pp. 171-179**.

Student Presentation 11

Presenter _____

Commentator _____

Commentator _____

Student Presentation 12

Presenter _____

Commentator _____

Commentator _____

RESEARCH PROSPECTUS/DISSERTATION PROPOSAL

Each student will make a presentation, and each student will be a discussant of one or more other students' presentations. At a minimum, each presentation should include an overview of the literature and a careful outline of a research prospectus. A more elaborated dissertation prospectus is highly recommended, especially for advanced students. We urge you to take advantage of this opportunity to provide a thoughtful description of a research proposal, even if it is in the early stages of development, and to receive constructive critiques from your colleagues.

We expect each presentation to be done in the style of a job talk. You must use an overhead or slides. You must provide handouts or props, and your presentation should be well organized and smoothly presented. A copy of the overview, outline, or full prospectus must be distributed one week in advance of the presentation. In addition, two students will prepare brief comments on the text; these must be distributed on the Friday before the class.

Tuesday, November 17

STUDENT PRESENTATIONS: ROUND 2

Student Presentation 1

Presenter _____

Commentator _____

Commentator _____

Student Presentation 2

Presenter _____

Commentator _____

Commentator _____

Student Presentation 3

Presenter _____

Commentator _____

Commentator _____

Student Presentation 4

Presenter _____

Commentator _____

Commentator _____

Tuesday, November 24

Student Presentation 5

Presenter _____

Commentator _____

Commentator _____

Student Presentation 6

Presenter _____

Commentator _____

Commentator _____

Student Presentation 7

Presenter _____

Commentator _____

Commentator _____

Student Presentation 8

Presenter _____

Commentator _____

Commentator _____

Tuesday, December 1

Student Presentations

Student Presentation 9

Presenter _____

Commentator _____

Commentator _____

Student Presentation 10

Presenter _____

Commentator _____

Commentator _____

Student Presentation 11

Presenter _____

Commentator _____

Commentator _____

Student Presentation 12

Presenter _____

Commentator _____

Commentator _____