PA 8004: Integrative Doctoral Seminar in Public Affairs II
Social Science, Society, and Methodology
Joe Soss
Spring 2022

Professor: Joe Soss
Office Hours: T 2:15-4:15 and by appt.
Office/Zoom: Humphrey 261 / https://umn.zoom.us/my/joesoss
Contact: jbsoss@umn.edu, 612-626-9865
Please sign up for Prof. Soss office-hour meetings at:
https://www.signupgenius.com/go/5080545a5ac22a4fb6-prof1

Class Meetings: T 11:30-2:00, In-Person: HHH 173, Zoom: https://umn.zoom.us/j/93901662150
Class Email List: pa8004_001s22@umn.edu

Course Overview
This seminar is designed to introduce public affairs doctoral students to a range of issues surrounding social-scientific inquiry. In Section I, we ask how social-scientific ideas and practices reflect the broader societies in which they are embedded and, in turn, how social science can have an impact on the world, for good or ill. We conclude by putting such questions in dialogue with some leading philosophies of science. In section II, we compare and contrast methodological stances associated with positivist, interpretive, and critical traditions of social science. Our goal is to clarify and expand our understandings of the varied ways scholars pursue understanding, explanation, and engagement in the social sciences. In Section III, we explore some of key elements that position and define a piece of social science research—for example, ethics and morals, theories and models, concepts and categories, and questions and cases. Finally, in Section IV, we compare and contrast three modes of analysis and explanation commonly deployed across the social sciences: (a) control, conjunction, and comparison; (b) analyses of processes, mechanisms, or paths of development; and (c) various modes of structural, relational, or constitutive analysis.

This course is not a survey of *methods*. We will give little attention to questions of technique, such as how to design an experiment, organize ethnographic fieldwork, conduct network analysis, or obtain efficient maximum likelihood estimates. Yet PA 8004 also is not a course on abstract philosophies of science. We will not go far into the weeds when it comes to philosophical debates over epistemology, ontology, and the like. Our goal will be to till the ground between abstract philosophy and concrete technique, working to develop better understandings of how different approaches to social science actually *work* – in a methodological sense and as integral elements of the world of public affairs. By the end of the semester, students should have a greater ability to identify, understand, and critique the underlying logics of inquiry and explanation at work in a piece of scholarship. Students should develop a more sophisticated perspective on the interplay of science and society and a more critical understanding of the varied ways one might pursue "publicly engaged scholarship." Students should be able to locate their own work on a broader methodological landscape, seeing more clearly the particularity of their own assumptions, procedures, standards of evaluation, ethical commitments, and orientations toward public action.

Student Responsibilities and Expectations
As I write this syllabus, the COVID-19 pandemic continues its latest surge and the coming months, once again, seem unpredictable. In general, people's lives have become more unpredictable and difficult. Here at the Humphrey School, we have no special immunity to the virus or its consequences. Many of us are experiencing life disruptions as well as ongoing social, economic, psychological, and physical hardships.

A lot of us feel exhausted, in a deep and cumulative way. Here, as in the broader society, these sorts of burdens are widespread and distributed in highly unequal ways.

In revising this course for the coming semester, I've tried to honor both sides of a complex dilemma. On one side, I want the course to accommodate the conditions of people's lives and avoid compounding the stresses, inequalities, and injustices we are experiencing. This side of the matter suggests that, as the instructor, I should assign and expect less. But there's another side as well. You've signed up for (and paid for) a serious, PhD-level course of study. To the greatest extent possible, I think you deserve to get what you were promised when you signed up for the program. This side of the matter suggests it would be wrong to water down the course, give you less than what you were led to expect, and send you out into the world less prepared for what you hope to accomplish. I assume that some of you are in a position to carry a full workload this semester and are eager to engage with all that your courses have to offer.

In response, I have designed the course to offer students access to all the readings and discussions that would normally be available while, at the same time, reducing the amount of required writing and giving students more control over the timing of their work. I have tried to make expectations and responsibilities more accommodating within a course design that remains ambitious and challenging. We'll see how it goes. I hope you will let me know if the design is not working as well as I hoped, and I will do my best to stay flexible if some changes seem advisable along the way.

Class Preparation and Seminar Meetings
The course is structured as a seminar. In class, I will pose discussion questions and present brief lectures to clarify methodological issues. *In the main, though, our meetings will emphasize student participation and dialogue.* For this format to work, you will need to read with a critical eye and think about how the readings relate to work in your own field. As you prepare for class each week, you should work to (1) put the assigned readings into dialogue with one another, (2) connect them to issues we've discussed in earlier weeks, and (3) develop your own questions and perspectives for class discussion. *You should arrive at class ready to articulate your perspectives on what the readings say, which issues most deserve our attention, why some arguments should be seen as stronger than others, how we should think about the strengths and weaknesses of arguments, and so on*.

In my experience, one of the most effective ways to prepare for class is simply to talk about the readings with one or more students at some point during the day or so before class. No formal agenda is needed. The point is to give yourself a first crack at saying some things out loud about the good, the bad, and the ugly in the week's assigned readings – and equally important, *listening* to some alternative views – before you arrive at class. You'll be amazed at how much difference an hour of informal talk can make for the quality of our seminars. It's a low-pressure way to clear up confusions; it gives you a chance to complain a little about the readings and the class; it tends to make reticent students feel more at ease speaking up in seminar; and it's a great way to make sure you arrive at class with a *perspective* on what you've read. These sorts of conversations with a peer or two are not required, but I highly recommend them.

The email forum for our course can also serve as a venue for these sorts of conversations as well as for distributing essays and other materials to classmates and the instructor. I invite you to take advantage of this space for pre- and post-seminar discussions if you would like. I will also use the email forum to send out course updates, announcements, and guiding questions for your readings. To send an email to the forum, use the address: pa8004_001s22@umn.edu.

At the risk of stating the obvious, we differ considerably in our scholarly interests, methodological commitments, and previous training – not to mention our positions in social, economic, and political life. In all our discussions, please show respect for these differences and strive to be constructive in engaging them. Remember that actively listening to others is at least as important as talking – and not the same

thing as merely hearing the words a person says. Remember as well that if you want to actively listen to your classmates, you will need to be proactive in creating space for them to speak and developing a conversational stance that welcomes them to do so.

In a graduate seminar we are expected to question one another's ideas and explain our reasons for agreement or disagreement. If you don't speak up when you think someone has got it wrong, you deprive them of an opportunity to address your concern (possibly to your satisfaction) and deprive the entire group of a learning opportunity. Dismissive, judgmental silence is rarely helpful for learning, even if it is motivated by a desire to be polite. If you want to show real respect for others' viewpoints, you should treat them as worthy of a serious response. For our class meetings to be productive, people will need to feel comfortable expressing minority views, engaging in debate, asking basic questions, and sometimes saying, "I really don't understand, and I need some help with this." Please make sure that, in class and beyond, you do what you can to make this kind of atmosphere possible.

Class Participation
Class participation will count for **15 percent** of your overall course grade. I hope everyone will feel that participation in this class is about more than getting a grade. But grades matter, so I want to be clear up front that there are subjective elements to evaluating participation. People contribute to class in different ways; quality is at least as important as quantity; and when it comes to quality, listening and creating a generative space for others are at least as important as talking.

Important elements of participation include: consistent class attendance, strong preparation for seminar discussions (such as careful reading and arriving with well-developed questions and perspectives), active engagement in seminar discussions (e.g., listening carefully, responding to others, posing thoughtful questions for others, offering good reasons for the views you advance), constructive use of the email forum, deliberate efforts to step back from the conversation and help the group see its own unstated assumptions or biases, active use of office hours to discuss reading and writing assignments, and so on.

In class and beyond, students should aim for consistent engagement and make a good faith effort to advance our collective understanding. Be creative. Question what you read. Give us reasons to be persuaded. Direct us to evidence. Challenge our consensus. *Make trouble*. But please, bear in mind that the classroom and email forum are public academic spaces. Please be respectful and follow standards of ethics and etiquette appropriate to such a setting.

Written Assignments
Students in this course are responsible for two major writing assignments and one minor one. Each assignment is designed to minimize the need for outside research and intensify student engagement with course readings. The goal is to develop well-informed, critical perspectives on the issues raised by the seminar. Toward this end, the assignments ask you to put readings into dialogue with one another and put them to use as building blocks for analytic arguments.

Short Essay & Critical Reflection: This assignment has two parts. Part One: For one seminar session of your own choosing, you will write a brief critical essay in response to the readings and distribute it to the class *by no later than 6:00pm the day before our scheduled meeting.* (The essay should be no longer than two pages, single-spaced, twelve-point font.) Please do not use this essay to summarize the readings or simply state your personal reactions. Your essay should (1) present a specific question or issue for discussion, (2) use this issue/question to critically engage the texts, and (3) put the texts into dialogue as a way of developing *your own* perspective or argument. The issue you focus on could be a central theme that unites the week's readings, a minor thread connecting two or more readings, or an issue you believe is critical but inappropriately neglected (by some or all of the authors). Stage the conversation that *you* want, focusing on an issue you feel is important. Please strive to be *fair and generous* in interpreting what

the authors say, but also *critical* in analyzing and evaluating what you've read. By the end of the essay, readers should feel that you've *taught* them something important about the issue you've identified *and* about how the week's readings relate to one another.

Part Two: No later than 48 hours after the relevant class meeting (i.e., by Thursday, 2:15pm), you will send the instructor a one-page, single-spaced reflection on your Part One essay. With the hindsight provided by our class discussion, how do you view what you wrote? Is there anything you wish you had said differently or not said at all? If so, why? Your follow-up essay can be used as an opportunity to clarify or elaborate on your earlier essay. You might focus on something you don't feel you fully understood or appreciated about a reading prior to class. You might reconsider the question at the heart of your original essay or explain why you wish you'd written on a different question. Consider this an open-ended prompt to reflect on your own work. Together, the two parts of this assignment will count for **15 percent** of your course grade.

Midterm Paper: This paper covers Sections I and II of the seminar. It should be no more than **ten pages**, double-spaced, with twelve-point Times New Roman font and one-inch margins. Endnotes will not count toward the page limit. The goal is to use our class readings and discussions as a basis for thinking more systematically about the kind of work you'd like to do with a public affairs Ph.D. You can think of this essay as having two halves, staged in the reverse order of our class schedule.

In the first half, you should *locate* the work you hope to do in relation to the positivist, interpretive, and critical traditions of social science (weeks 5-7) and, if it's helpful, in relation to philosophies of science more broadly (week 4). Explain how your approach will fit into a broader landscape of alternatives; clarify the key assumptions and commitments you associate with this approach; articulate affirmative reasons for embracing this approach; and specify some of its limitations, weaknesses, or challenges relative to alternatives. Engage the readings as resources that can help you clarify (to yourself and others) what *kind* of social science you hope to pursue in the future. Please note: You are welcome to treat your future projects as likely to vary in the traditions they reflect or as operating at the intersection of two or more traditions.

The second half of your paper should take the first half as its starting point. *Given the kinds of work you hope to pursue*, how do you plan to navigate the kinds of social dynamics and political challenges highlighted in the first section of our course? In what specific ways do you expect your work to be "social and situated" (see week 1), and how will this positioning matter for how you approach your work? How will you think about the opportunities and risks of pursuing "publicly engaged research" at the intersection of public-affairs scholarship and practice (weeks 2-3). How, if at all, do you see your approach to these issues as informed by a specific philosophy of science (along the lines discussed in week 4)? The midterm paper will count for **35 percent** of your course grade and is due via email on **March 4 by 4:00pm.**

Final Paper: This paper covers Sections III and IV of our seminar. It should be no more than **twelve pages**, double-spaced, with twelve-point Times New Roman font and one-inch margins. Endnotes will not count toward the page limit. The essay will be based on a single article of your choosing – presumably from a field that interests you as a site of future study, but that's up to you. To be suitable, the article must include *theoretical and empirical* elements. This assignment can be quite difficult if you try to do it with a poorly chosen article. I strongly recommend that you consult with me during your selection process. The final paper will count for **35 percent** of your course grade and is due via email on **May 6 by 4:00pm.**

Part I. Analysis and Internal Critique: Treat your article as a "case" of scholarship, and subject it to careful analysis and critique. By "analysis," I mean that you should (1) specify the kind of intervention the author is trying to make (i.e., what are they trying to do or contribute?), (2) clarify the article's main

theoretical, conceptual, and empirical elements (including their implicit aspects), and (3) *explain how the article works* by breaking down the author's key "moves" and describing how the pieces get put together as a kind of analysis. In this part of your essay (either along the way or at the end), you should also present an internal critique of the article's strengths and weaknesses. An "internal" critique means you should evaluate the work *on its own terms*—that is, in terms of the author's own goals and relevant standards: What are its strengths and weaknesses *given* the type of analysis the author aims to pursue? Taking the author's goals and methodological approach as given, what changes, if any, would you recommend in order to strengthen the piece?

Part II. External Critique or Alternative Design: The goal of this section is to offer a different methodological perspective on the research presented in your original article (OA). If, for example, the OA adopts a variable-oriented approach that makes causal inferences based on a logic of control, you should adopt one of the other approaches explored in the readings from Weeks 12-14 of the course. **Option 1** is to propose an article-length study designed to follow up on the OA, based on the alternative analytic approach you've selected. Your proposal might aim to build on, challenge, or bring greater specificity to the OA's analysis. In presenting your proposal, state your research question and explain your intervention (or "contribution") as clearly as possible. **Option 2** is to write an "external" critique of the OA, grounded in an alternative analytic approach of your choice. Setting aside the standards directly implied by the author's chosen methodology, write a critique that is grounded in the priorities and standards of an alternative approach. Note: In pursuing Option 1 or 2, you are welcome to suggest alternative theoretical, conceptual, and empirical foundations for the analysis.

Please note: The assignments ask you to critically engage course concepts and perspectives in concrete ways. You should think of them as opportunities to demonstrate what you've learned and the perspectives you've developed on course themes. *Your grade will depend, first and foremost, on the ways you engage, explain, critique, and apply ideas from our readings and class discussions*. In developing your arguments, you should provide readers with *reasons* to be persuaded and do so by directly engaging and citing relevant course materials.

Letter grades: 97-100=A+, 94-96=A, 90-93=A-, 87-89=B+, 84-86=B, 80-83=B-, and so on.

Readings

There are no required books for this course. All readings are available to download from the course website on Canvas. You can access our Canvas site through your myU portal (http://www.myu.umn.edu) or directly at https://canvas.umn.edu/courses/283451.

Mental Health, Stress Management, and Sexual Harassment/Assault

As a student, you may experience a range of stressors and mental health challenges. It is not unusual for graduate students to experience increased anxiety, strained relationships, alcohol/drug problems, feeling down and perpetually tired, difficulty concentrating and/or lack of motivation. These conditions may diminish academic performance, reduce your ability to participate in daily activities, and pose a significant threat to individual wellbeing. Please know that I take this issue very seriously and want to do all I can to help. University of Minnesota services are available to assist you, and I hope you will not hesitate to speak with me if I can help with accommodations of any sort. You can learn more about the broad range of confidential mental health services available on campus via the Student Mental Health Website: http://www.mentalhealth.umn.edu. Equally significant challenges to graduate school performance and personal wellbeing can arise when students experience sexual harassment, a sexually hostile environment, stalking, relationship violence, or sexual assault. If you experience any issues of this sort, I encourage you to reach out to the Aurora Center (http://aurora.umn.edu/) and, if you feel comfortable, to me as well.

Food and Housing Resources
Many university students experience difficulties affording groceries, accessing enough food to meet daily needs, and/or securing a safe and stable place to live. These sorts of challenges can have a significant impact on students' abilities to participate in class and perform well on class assignments. If you are in this situation, I encourage you to make use of some of the resources listed here: z.umn.edu/POLinNeed. I also encourage you to notify me if you are comfortable doing so. This will enable me to provide any other resources I may possess.

Accommodations for Ability and Faith
I am eager to hear from anyone who may require accommodations in this class for reasons related to ability, life circumstances, or religion. Please let me know if I can help by modifying seating, deadlines, or other features of the class. It is University policy to provide reasonable accommodations and resources for students who have documented disability conditions (e.g., physical, learning, psychiatric, vision, hearing, or systemic). If you have questions or needs in this regard, I encourage you to contact UMN Disability Services: https://diversity.umn.edu/disability/home. I also encourage students to contact me to arrange reasonable and timely accommodations for religious practices. Please review the syllabus to determine if this course will present any conflicts regarding matters of faith and observance.

Equity, Diversity, and Equal Opportunity
The University of Minnesota has an explicit institutional commitment to providing equal access and opportunity in its programs and facilities, without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, gender, age, marital status, disability, public assistance status, veteran status, sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression. If you have any experience at University that you feel violates this commitment, I encourage you to reach out to the Office of Equity & Diversity for resources and assistance: https://oed.dl.umn.edu/. If you feel comfortable speaking with me about such issues, I hope you won't hesitate to do so.

READING SCHEDULE

I. Science, Social Science, and Society

Week 1, 1/18. A *Human* Endeavor: All Science is Social and Situated. How and Why Does that Matter?

William A. Wilson. 2016. "Scientific Regress." *First Things*. May.

Miranda Fricker. 2007. "Introduction." *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing*. New York: Oxford University Press. pp. 1-8.

Stephen Jay Gould. 1981. "Introduction" and "Measuring Heads." *The Mismeasure of Man*. New York: Norton. pp.19-29, 73-112.

Ava Kofman. 2018. "Bruno Latour, the Post-Truth Philosopher, Mounts a Defense of Science." *The New York Times Magazine.* October 25.

Julian Go. 2020. "Race, Empire, and Epistemic Exclusion: Or the Structures of Sociological Thought." *Sociological Theory* 38(2): 79-100.

Week 2, 1/25. Engaged Scholarship I: On Trying to Use Evidence and Expertise to Make Things Better

Brian W. Head. 2010. "Reconsidering Evidence-Based Policy: Key Issues and Challenges." *Policy and Society*. 29(2): 77-94.

José Luis Luján and Oliver Todt. 2020. "Evidence, What Evidence?" *Issues in Science and Technology.* June 10.

Wilfred M. McClay. 2009. "What Do Experts Know?" *National Affairs.* Fall.

Thomas Medvetz. 2010. "'Public Policy is Like Having a Vaudeville Act': Languages of Duty and Difference among Think Tank-Affiliated Policy Experts." *Qualitative Sociology.* 33: 549-62.

Frances Fox Piven. 2004. "The Politics of Policy Science." In I. Shapiro, R.M. Smith, and T.E. Masoud, eds. *Problems and Methods in the Study of Politics*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. Pp.83-105.

Week 3, 2/1. Engaged Scholarship II: Troubling Histories of Social Science and Power

Oren Yiftachel. 1998. "Planning and Social Control: Exploring the Dark Side." *Journal of Planning Literature.* 12(4): 395-406.

Todd Michley and LaDale Winling. 2021. "How Academia Laid the Groundwork for Redlining." *Platform.* November 1.

Deborah A. Stone. 1993. "Clinical Authority in the Construction of Citizenship." In H.M. Ingram and S.R. Smith, eds. *Public Policy for Democracy.* Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution. pp.45-67.

Alasdair Roberts. 2020. "Bearing the White Man's Burden: American Empire and the Origin of Public Administration." *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance*. 3(3): 185–196.

Talal Asad. 1979. "Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter." In G. Huizer and B. Mannheim, eds. *The Politics of Anthropology.* Mouton Publishers. Pp.85-94.

Week 4, 2/8: Philosophies of Science and Social Science: How Do Sciences Work… and for Whom?

John Horgan [Selected Essays]. "The Paradox of Karl Popper" (2018); "What Thomas Kuhn Really Thought about Scientific 'Truth.'" (2012); "Is 'Social Science an Oxymoron? Will That Ever Change?" (2013). *Scientific American.*

Jim Baggot. 2020. "How Science Fails" [on Imre Lakatos]. *Aeon.* May 5.

Molly Cochran. 2002. "Deweyan Pragmatism and Post-Positivist Social Science in IR." *Millennium*. 31(3): **Excerpt:** Read only "Deweyan Pragmatism, Science and Social Science," pp.527-34.

Joey Sprague. 2016. "Authority and Power" [on standpoint epistemologies] In *Feminist Methodologies for Critical Researchers: Bridging Differences.* 2nd ed. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers. pp.63-94.

II. Methodological Traditions of Social Science

Week 5, 2/15: Positivist Traditions of Social Science

Gary King, Robert Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. pp.3-49 (ch.1 and part of ch.2)

Lily Hu. 2021. "Race, Policing, and the Limits of Social Science." *Boston Review.* May 6.

Eunjung Lee, Faye Mishna, and Sarah Brennenstuhl. 2010. "How to Critically Evaluate Case Studies in Social Work." *Research on Social Work Practice*. 20(6): 682-689.

Examples

Devah Pager. 2004. "The Mark of a Criminal Record." *Focus.* 23(2): 44-6.

Robert J. Sampson and Stephen W. Raudenbush. 2004. "Seeing Disorder: Neighborhood Stigma and the Social Construction of 'Broken Windows'" *Social Psychology Quarterly.* 67(4): 319-42.

Week 6. 2/22: Interpretive Traditions of Social Science

Clifford Geertz. 1973. "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture." *The Interpretation of Cultures.* New York: Basic Books. Pp.3-32.

Ellen Pader. 2014. "Seeing with an Ethnographic Sensibility: Explorations Beneath the Surface of Public Policies." In D. Yanow and P. Schwartz-Shea, eds. *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn.* New York: Routledge. Pp.194-208.

Peregrine Schwartz-Shea and Dvora Yanow. 2012. "Ways of Knowing: Research Questions and Logics of Inquiry." *Interpretive Research Design: Concepts and Processes.* New York: Routledge. pp.24-44.

Examples

Priya Fielding-Singh. 2017. "A Taste of Inequality: Food's Symbolic Value across the Socioeconomic Spectrum." *Sociological Science*. 4: 424-48.

Timothy Pachirat. 2011. "Hidden in Plain Sight." *Every Twelve Seconds: Industrialized Slaughter and the Politics of Sight.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. Pp.1-19.

Week 7, 3/1: Critical Traditions of Social Science

Stan Houston. 2001. "Beyond Social Constructionism: Critical Realism and Social Work." *The British Journal of Social Work*. 31(6): 845-861.

Tony J. Watson. 2004. "HRM and Critical Social Science Analysis." *Journal of Management Studies* 41(3): 447-67.

Kathy Charmaz. 2017. "The Power of Constructivist Grounded Theory for Critical Inquiry." *Qualitative Inquiry.* 23(1): 34-45.

Examples

Frances Fox Piven and Richard A. Cloward. 1993. "Introduction" *Regulating the Poor: The Public Functions of Welfare.* New York: Vintage Books. pp.xv-xix.

Gloria Ladson-Billings and William F. Tate IV. 2016. "Toward a Critical Race Theory of Education." In A.D. Dixson, C.K.R. Anderson, and J.K. Donnor, eds. *Critical Race Theory in Education.* New York: Routledge. pp.11-31

Barbara Cruikshank. 1999. "The Will to Empower: Technologies of Citizenship and the War on Poverty." *The Will to Empower: Democratic Citizens and Other Subjects*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. pp.67-86.

*****Papers Due on Friday, March 4 by 4pm, via email*****
*****SPRING BREAK MARCH 7-11*****

III. Key Elements of Social Science Research

Week 8, 3/15: Ethical, Moral, and Legal Elements of Research

Joel Baum. 2018. "Counting on Dishonesty." Excerpt from "Reflections on Scientific Misconduct in Management: Unfortunate Incidents or a Normative Crisis." *Academy of Management Perspectives*. 32(4): 423-5.

Anonymous Academic. 2018. "Academia is built on exploitation. We must break this vicious circle." *The Guardian.* May 18.

Magnus Fiskesjö. 2020. "Research Ethics, Violated." *Allegra Lab.* May 7.

Jelena Subotić. 2020: "Ethics of Archival Research on Political Violence." *Journal of Peace Research*. [First View]: 1-13.

Dawn Teele. 2014. "Reflections on the Ethics of Field Experiments." In D. Teele, ed. *Field Experiments and Their Critics: Essays on the Uses and Abuses of Experimentation in the Social Sciences*. New Haven: Yale University Press. pp.115-140.

Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang. 2014. "R-Words: Refusing Research." In D. Paris and M.T. Winn, eds. *Humanizing research: Decolonizing Qualitative Inquiry with Youth and Communities*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications. Pp.223-47.

Week 9, 3/22: Theories and Theorizing, Models and Typologies

John Cassidy. 2015. "The Triumph (and Failure) of John Nash's Game Theory." *The New Yorker.* May 27.

James Johnson. 2018. "Formal Models in Political Science: Conceptual, Not Empirical" [Book Review Essay]. *Journal of Politics.* 81(1): e6-e10.

Gabriel Abend. 2008. "The Meaning of 'Theory.'" *Sociological Theory.* 26(2): **Excerpt:** Read only "The Multiple Meanings of Theory," pp.177-81.

D. Harold Doty and William H. Glick. 1994. "Typologies as a Unique Form of Theory Building: Toward Improved Understanding and Modeling." *The Academy of Management Review*. 19(2): **Excerpt**: pp.230-top of 236**.**

Richard Swedberg. 2016. "Before Theory Comes Theorizing or How to Make Social Science More Interesting." *The British Journal of Sociology.* 67(1): 5-22.

Charles W. Mills. 2005. "'Ideal Theory' as Ideology." *Hypatia.* 20(3): 165-84.

Week 10, 3/29. Concepts, Categories, and Measures

Mike Brown. 2010. *How I Killed Pluto and Why it Had it Coming*. Pp.182-203

Walter Alfredo Salas-Zapata and Sara Malina Ortiz-Muñoz. 2019. "Analysis of Meanings of the Concept of Sustainability." *Sustainable Development.* 27: 153-61.

Howard Becker. 1998. "Concepts." *Tricks of the Trade: How to Think about Your Research While Doing It*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. 109-45.

Frederic Charles Schaffer. 2016. *Elucidating Social Science Concepts: An Interpretivist Guide.* New York Routledge. Pp.1-54, 74-88.

Week 11, 4/5. Questions, Cases, and Casings

Jörgen Sandberg and Mats Alvesson. 2011. "Ways of Constructing Research Questions: Gap-Spotting or Problematization?" *Organization*. 18(1): 23-44.

Mario L. Small. 2009. "How Many Cases Do I Need? On Science and the Logic of Case Selection in Field-Based Research." *Ethnography*. 10(1): 5-38.

Jason Seawright and John Gerring. 2008. "Case Selection Techniques in Case Study Research." *Political Research Quarterly.*61(2): 294-308.

Joe Soss. 2021. "On Casing a Study versus Studying a Case." In E. Simmons and N. Smith, eds. *Rethinking Comparison.* New York: Cambridge University Press. Pp.84-106.

IV. Some Approaches to Analysis and Explanation

Week 12. 4/12. Control, Conjunction, and Comparison

Christopher B. Barrett and Michael R. Carter. 2014. "A Retreat from Radical Skepticism: Rebalancing, Theory, Observational Data, and Randomization in Development Economics." In D. Teele, ed. *Field Experiments and Their Critics: Essays on the Uses and Abuses of Experimentation in the Social Sciences*. New Haven: Yale University Press. pp.58-77.

Adam Przeworski. 2004. "Institutions Matter?" *Government and Opposition*. 40(4): 527-40.

Charles C. Ragin. 2014. "Introduction to the Second Edition." *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies.*2nd ed. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. pp.xix-xxx.

Frederic Charles Schaffer. 2021. "Two Ways to Compare." In E. Simmons and N. Smith, eds. *Rethinking Comparison.* New York: Cambridge University Press. Pp.47-63.

Week 13, 4/19. Processes, Mechanisms, and Paths of Development

Peter A. 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. 337-372.

Brady, Henry E. 2010. "Data-Set Observations versus Causal-Process Observations: The 2000 U.S. Presidential Election." In H.E. Brady and D. Collier, eds. *Rethinking Social Inquiry*. 2nd ed. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield. Pp.237-42.

Paul Vennesson. 2008. "Case Studies and Process Tracing: Theories and Practices." In D. Della Porta and M. Keating, eds. *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences.* Cambridge University Press. pp.232-9. **Excerpt only**.

Tulia Falleti and Julia Lynch. 2009. "Context and Causal Mechanisms in Political Research." *Comparative Political Studies* 42(9): 1143-1166.

Week 14, 4/26. Relational, Constitutive, and Structural Analyses

Iris Marion Young. 1990. "Displacing the Distributive Paradigm." *Justice and the Politics of Difference.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Pp.15-38.

Sarah E. Parkinson. 2021. "Composing Comparisons: Studying Configurations of Relations in Social Network Research." In E. Simmons and N. Smith, eds. *Rethinking Comparison.* New York: Cambridge University Press. Pp.152-71.

Rogers Brubaker. 2002. Ethnicity Without Groups." *European Journal of Sociology, 43*(2): 163-189.

Alexander Wendt. 1998. "On Constitution and Causation in International Relations." *Review of International Studies.* 24(5): 101-18.

Sally Haslanger. 2016. "What is a (social) structural explanation?**"** *Philosophical Studies.* 173(1): 113–130.

*****Final Paper due on May 6 by 4:00pm*****