

Government 62: Research Practice in Qualitative Methods Spring 2019

Wednesday 3:00 to 5:45 PM in CGIS K354

Instructors

Dr. George Soroka

Office: CGIS-K151C (in Gov Dept.)

Email: soroka@fas.harvard.edu

Office Hours: Mondays 1:00-3:00 PM, or by
Appointment

Mr. Chris Chaky

Email: chaky@g.harvard.edu

Office Hours: Tuesdays 3:00-5:00 PM in
CGIS Cafe

Course Objectives

The objectives of this course are straightforward: to introduce students to the basic principles of good research design and familiarize them with the various qualitative tools that are available in the social sciences as they prepare to undertake original research for their senior thesis projects. Sophomores who are planning to write a thesis later are welcome to take the course, though the course is designed to be most relevant to students in their junior year.

Topics covered in Gov 62 include causal inference, comparative research design and selection bias, theoretical generalizability, and conceptualization and measurement. We will also examine such methods as field and natural experiments, process tracing, archival research, interviews, and political ethnography. To better understand how to craft a good research design and how to most effectively utilize the methods covered in the course, for most of our meetings students will read at least one empirical study that exemplifies the method or research design under discussion for that week. By the end of Gov 62, students will produce a research prospectus that incorporates the lessons and tools covered in the course and combines several short papers they have written throughout the term. Students will present this prospectus to the class at the end of the semester.

Course Requirements and Grading

1. Class and Section Participation. Weekly class meetings are scheduled from 3:00 to 5:45 pm on Wednesdays (days and times of section meetings are TBD). Students are expected to come to both class and section each week having done the reading for that week and ready to participate in discussions (*20% of the grade*).

We will note your weekly lecture & section participation on a scale from 0-2. If you attend class and section in a given week and participate actively and thoughtfully, you will receive 2/2 points. If you attend but do not participate (or do not demonstrate that you've done the assigned readings for the week), you will receive 1/2 points. If you do not attend class or section, you will receive 0/2 points. If at any point during the semester you would like to know how you are doing in terms of participation, please contact either the Instructor or TF.

2. Four Reading Responses. During four of the ten weeks that include "exemplary works," we will ask you to submit a short memo (no more than 750 words) that utilizes one or more of the

methods readings to assess/critique one of the “exemplary works” assigned for that week. The goal of these reading responses is to reflect on how the author’s research design dealt with the concerns raised in the methods readings and to see if there were any other issues with the design that you can identify. Lastly, we would like to see at least a sentence or two suggesting possible improvements to the research design (or even alternative designs that you would employ) if you had to do a similar study. To receive full credit, reading responses must be submitted via Canvas no later than noon before the Wed. seminar meeting. (*Each reading response counts toward 5% of the grade; the reading responses together constitute 20% of the grade*).

3. Four Short Papers. There will be four short papers (no more than 500 words) designed to build toward the final research prospectus, which is the final assignment for the course.

The first short paper requires students to frame a puzzle, ask a specific research question, and provide a theory and guiding hypotheses (4% of grade).

The second short paper requires students to consider the concepts they will employ in their prospectus and how they plan to measure them (4% of the grade).

The third short paper requires students to propose a research design for their study, drawing from one or more of the designs presented in the course (6% of grade).

The fourth short paper requires students to select a specific methodological technique as the principle method for their research project. In this paper, students will discuss the method’s advantages and disadvantages for addressing their question, and how exactly they will apply it (e.g., who will be interviewed?) (6% of the grade).

4. Student Research Workshops. We will devote at least two class sessions at the end of the semester to workshopping research projects. Three days before the specified sessions, students will circulate a two-page, single-spaced synopsis of their research prospectus to the entire class (including an abstract, a statement of the question to be addressed, hypotheses, and a discussion of any preliminary research). Students will read each other’s synopses prior to the workshops and post comments on the course homepage. Every student is required, at a minimum, to post at least one comment on each classmate’s project. Authors will then review the comments they’ve received prior to their prospectus session. During the in-class presentation, students will give a two-minute overview of their research and discuss any revisions needed in light of the feedback received (5% of the grade for your synopsis, and 5% for peer comments, for a total of 10%).

5. Research Prospectus. As their final project, students will produce a 12-15 page prospectus for their research project that builds on and incorporates the four short papers described above. The Instructor and Teaching Fellow will arrange individual meetings with students to discuss their research interests in advance of this assignment (30% of the grade).

Late Policy

Reading responses must be deposited on Canvas by noon before class in order to receive credit. They will not be read (or receive credit) if turned in after noon. All other assignments will be

graded down by 1/3 of a letter grade for every 24-hour period they are late. Extensions will only be granted for medical or personal emergencies, which must be certified by a doctor or a resident dean.

Course Readings

Expectations for required and suggested reading:

- Students are expected to do all the readings listed as required.
- Suggested readings on a given topic are recommended for students wishing to acquire deeper background on that topic and strongly recommended for students writing a prospectus that will utilize the methods explored therein.

Accessing course materials:

All course readings, except for assignments from the books listed below, will be available on the course website (or through HOLLIS as noted below). Required books may be purchased from the COOP or online retailers (note: two are also available as e-books through HOLLIS):

Brady, Henry and David Collier, eds. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. 2nd ed. Rowman & Littlefield, 2010. (Also available online through HOLLIS.)

King, Gary, Robert Keohane, and Sidney Verba. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton UP, 1994. (Also available online through HOLLIS.)

Mosley, Layna, ed., *Interview Research in Political Science*. Cornell UP, 2013.

Dunning, Thad. *Natural Experiments in the Social Sciences: A Design-Based Approach*. Cambridge UP, 2012.

- The above books will also be available on reserve at Lamont Library (LRES).
- We will also assign selections from recent Senior Theses and a PhD Dissertation during certain weeks (readings TBD).

Academic Integrity and Collaboration

For all written work in this class, students' ideas must be their own. Students may read each other's papers and reading responses and offer feedback, but idea-generation and writing for submitted assignments must be done individually. Students must likewise adhere to standard citation practices and properly cite any books, articles, websites, lectures, etc. that have helped them with their work. Students should also follow their Houses' dual submission policies if they plan to turn in papers this semester that substantially overlap with one another.

Accommodations for Students with Disabilities:

Students needing academic adjustments or accommodations because of a documented disability should present their Faculty Letter from the Accessible Education Office (AEO) and speak with the Instructor no later than the third week of class. All discussions will remain confidential.

Outline of Readings

Part I: Introduction: Framing Puzzles and Drawing Inferences

Jan 30: Course Introduction; Asking Questions, Framing Puzzles; Funding and IRB

Required Reading:

Keohane, Robert. "Political Science as a Vocation" *PS* 42:2 (April 2009): 359-363.

Gerring, John. *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework*. Cambridge UP (2012), pp. 27-57. (Available online through HOLLIS.)

C. Wright Mills, "On Intellectual Craftsmanship," *The Sociological Imagination*. Oxford UP (1959), appendix.

Brooks, Sarah. "The Ethical Treatment of Human Subjects and the Institutional Review Board Process," pp.45-66 in Mosley, *Interview Research in Political Science*.

If you have not taken Gov 50 or any other courses in research methods, please also consult:

Gerring, John. *Social Science Methodology: A Criterial Framework*. Cambridge UP (2001), pp. 155-199.

If you are preparing a grant proposal, the following readings are highly recommended:

Barrett, Christopher and Jeffrey Cason. *Overseas Research: A Practical Guide*. Johns Hopkins UP, 1997, pp. 6-26.

Przeworski, Adam and Frank Salomon. "The Art of Writing Proposals: Some Candid Suggestions for Applicants to Social Science Research Council Competitions." *Social Science Research Council* (1995): 1-8.

Suggested Reading:

Gerring, John. *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework*. Cambridge UP (2012), pp. 58-73.

Mahoney, James. "After KKV: The New Methodology of Qualitative Research." *World Politics* 62.1 (2010): 120-147.

Sewell, William. *Logics of History: Social Theory and Social Transformation*. U. of Chicago Press (2005), ch. 10. (Available online through HOLLIS.)

Feb 6: The Logic of Inference in the Social Sciences

Required Reading:

Van Evera, Stephen. *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*. Cornell UP (1997), pp. 9-21 (pp. 21-48 suggested for Week 4)

King, Gary, Robert Keohane, and Sidney Verba. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton UP (1994), pp. 99-114.

Collier, David, Henry Brady, and Jason Seawright. "Sources of Leverage in Causal Inference: Toward an Alternative View of Methodology," in Brady and Collier, *Rethinking Social Inquiry*, pp. 177-191.

Exemplary Work(s): *For an illustration of different research designs applied to similar causal questions about one puzzle (variation in women's political participation), skim:*

Krook, Mona Lena. *Quotas for Women in Politics: Gender and Candidate Selection Reform Worldwide*. Oxford UP (2010), pp.3-14.

Beath, Andrew, Fotini Christia, and Ruben Enikolopov. "Empowering Women Through Development Aid: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Afghanistan." *APSR* 107.03 (2013): 540-548.

Fox, Richard, and Jennifer Lawless. "Uncovering the Origins of the Gender Gap in Political Ambition." *APSR* 108.03 (2014): 499-505.

Suggested Reading:

Gerring, John. *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework*. Cambridge UP (2012), ch. 8-9, 11. (Available online through HOLLIS.)

Grzymala-Busse, Anna. "Time Will Tell?" Temporality and the Analysis of Causal Mechanisms and Processes." *CPS* 44.9 (2011): 1267-1297.

Mahoney, James and Gary Goertz. "A Tale of Two Cultures: Contrasting Quantitative and Qualitative Research." *Political Analysis* 14 (2006): 227-249.

Hall, Peter. "Aligning Ontology and Methodology," in James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, eds. *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge UP (2003), pp. 373-391. (NB: Do not read beyond p. 391)

Short Paper 1 due by 5 PM on Friday, February 8

Weeks of Feb 4-8 and Feb 11-15: Make individual appointments with instructors via Canvas calendar to discuss ideas for research questions. Appointments are 20 minutes each. Come prepared to give a 5-minute overview of the research question(s) you are considering.

Part II: The Elements, Dilemmas, and Opportunities of Research Design

Feb 13: Middle-Range Theory, Conceptualization, and Measurement

Required Reading:

Ziblatt, Daniel. "Of Course Generalize, But How? Returning to Middle Range Theory in Comparative Politics." *APSA-Comparative Politics Newsletter* 17.2 (2006): 8-11.

Collier, David and James Mahon. "Conceptual 'Stretching' Revisited: Adapting Categories in Comparative Analysis." *APSR* 87.4 (1993): 845-855.

Adcock, Robert and David Collier. "Measurement Validity: Toward a Shared Framework for Qualitative and Quantitative Research." *APSR* (September 2001): 529-546.

Exemplary Work(s):

Putnam, Robert D. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton UP (1993), ch. 3-4.

Suggested Reading:

Levitsky, Steven and Lucan Way, *Competitive Authoritarianism: Hybrid Regimes after the Cold War*. Cambridge UP (2010), ch. 1, appendix I.

Gerring, John. *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework*. Cambridge UP (2012), ch. 5, 7. (Available online through HOLLIS.)

Collier, David, Jody LaPorte and Jason Seawright. "Putting Typologies to Work: Concept-Formation, Measurement, and Analytic Rigor." *Political Research Quarterly* 65.2 (2012): 217-232.

Sartori, Giovanni. "Concept Misinformation in Comparative Politics." *APSR* 64 (1970): 1033-1053.

Feb 20: Comparative Designs and Selection Bias

Required Reading:

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton UP (1994), ch. 4.

Geddes, Barbara. "How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get." *Political Analysis* 2 (1990): 131-149.

Jasjeet Sekhon. "Quality Meets Quantity: Case Studies, Conditional Probability, and Counterfactuals." *Perspectives of Politics* 2.2 (June 2004): 281-293.

Mahoney, James and Goertz, Gary. "The Possibility Principle: Choosing Negative Cases in Comparative Research." *APSR* 98:4 (2004), 653-69.

Seawright, Jason and John Gerring. "Case Selection Techniques in Case Study Research." *Political Research Quarterly* 61.2 (June 2008): 294-308.

Exemplary Work(s):

Varshney, Ashutosh. *Ethnic Conflict and Civic Life: Hindus and Muslims in India*. Yale UP (2002), ch. 1.

Wood, Elisabeth Jean. *Forging Democracy from Below: Insurgent Transitions in South Africa and El Salvador*. Cambridge UP (2000), ch. 1.

Suggested Reading:

Lijphart, Arend. "The Comparable Cases Strategy in Comparative Research." *CPS* (July 1975): 158-177.

Collier, David, James Mahoney, and Jason Seawright. "Claiming Too Much: Warnings about Selection Bias," in Brady and Collier, *Rethinking Social Inquiry*, pp. pp. 85-102.

Dion, Douglas. "Evidence and Inference in the Comparative Case Study." *Comparative Politics* 30.2 (1998): 127-45.

Ashworth, Scott, et al. "Design, Inference, and the Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism." *APSR* 102.02 (2008): 269-273.

Snyder, Richard. "Scaling Down: The Subnational Comparative Method." *Studies in Comparative International Development* 36:1 (Spring 2001): 93-110.

Feb 27: Case Study Design**Required Reading:**

Gerring, John. "The Case Study: What It is and What It Does," in Carles Boix and Susan C. Stokes, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*. Oxford UP (2007), pp. 90-122.

Rueschemeyer, Dietrich. "Can One or a Few Cases Yield Theoretical Gains?" in James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, eds. *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge UP (2003), pp. 305-336.

King, Gary, Robert Keohane, and Sidney Verba. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton UP (1994), ch. 6.

Exemplary Work(s):

Berman, Sheri. "Civil Society and the Collapse of the Weimar Republic," *World Politics* 49 (April 1997), pp. 401-429.

Bernhard, Michael and Jan Kubik, eds. *Twenty Years after Communism: The Politics of Memory and Commemoration*. Oxford UP (2014), ch. 1, 12.

Senior Thesis (TBD)

Suggested Reading:

Eckstein, Harry. "Case-Study and Theory in Political Science" in Fred Greenstein and Nelson Polsby, eds. *Handbook of Political Science*. Vol. 7. Addison-Wesley (1975), pp. 113-132.

Bennett, Andrew and Colin Elman. "Qualitative Research: Recent Developments in Case Study Methods." *Annual Review of Political Science* 9.1 (2006): 455-476.

Tarrow, Sidney. "The Strategy of Paired Comparison: Toward a Theory of Practice." *CPS* 43.2 (2010): 230-259.

Mahoney, James. "Nominal, Ordinal and Narrative Appraisal in Macrocausal Analysis." *AJS* 104.4 (January 1999): 1154-96.

George, Alexander L. and Andrew Bennett. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. MIT Press (2005), ch. 1.

Short Paper 2 due by 5 PM on Friday, March 1

March 6: Field, Natural, and Quasi-Experiments

Required Reading:

Dunning, Thad. *Natural Experiments in the Social Sciences: Design-Based Inference*. Cambridge UP (2012), chs, 1, 3, 7.

Rachel Glennerster and Kudzai Takavarasha. *Running Randomized Evaluations: A Practical Guide* (2013), pp. 24-30, 44-65.

Sekhon, Jasjeet S. and Rocio Titunuk. "When Natural Experiments Are Neither Natural nor Experiments." *APSR* 106.1 (February 2012): 35-57.

Exemplary Work(s):

Lerman, Amy. *The Modern Prison Paradox: Politics, Punishment and Social Community*. Cambridge UP (2013), pp.68-94.

Posner, Daniel. "The Political Salience of Cultural Difference: Why Chewas and Tumbukas are Allies in Zambia and Adversaries in Malawi." *APSR* 98.4 (November 2004): 529-545.

PhD Dissertation (TBD)

Suggested Reading:

Gerber, Alan S. and Donald P. Green. "Field Experiments and Natural Experiments," in Janet Box-Steffensmeier, Henry Brady and David Collier, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. Oxford UP (2008), pp. 357-384.

John Gerring, *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework*. Cambridge UP (2012), pp. 256-290. [Available online through Harvard Libraries website.]

Note: If you plan to incorporate an experiment into your thesis, we strongly urged you to read all of Dunning, *Natural Experiments in the Social Sciences: A Design-Based Approach*.

March 13: Mixed Methods & Further Thoughts on Research Design

Required Reading:

Lieberman, Evan. "Nested Analysis as a Mixed Method Strategy for Comparative Research." *APSR* 99.3 (2005): 435-52.

Seawright, Jason. *Multi-Method Social Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP (2016): pp. 1-12, 45-74, 150-170.

Slater, Dan and Daniel Ziblatt. "The Enduring Indispensability of Controlled Comparison." *Comparative Political Studies* 46.10 (2013): 1301-1327.

Exemplary Work(s):

Tsai, Lily. "Solidary Groups, Informal Accountability, and Local Public Goods Provision in Rural China." *APSR* 101.2 (May 2007): 355-372.

Paluck, Elizabeth Levy and Donald Green. "Deference, Dissent, and Dispute Resolution: An Experimental Intervention Using Mass Media to Change Norms and Behavior in Rwanda." *APSR* 103.4 (2009): 622-644.

Senior Thesis (TBD)

Suggested Reading:

Fearon, James D. and David D. Laitin. "Integrating Qualitative and Quantitative Methods." in Janet Box-Steffensmeier, Henry Brady and David Collier, eds. *Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. Oxford UP (2008), pp. 756-777.

Small, Mario Luis. "How to Conduct a Mixed Methods Study: Recent Trends in a Rapidly Growing Literature." *Annual Review of Sociology* 37 (2011): 57-86.

Ahmed, Amel and Rudra Sil. "When Multi-Method Research Subverts Methodological Pluralism—Or, Why We Still Need Single-Method Research." *Perspectives on Politics* 10.4 (2012): 935-953.

Short Paper 3 due by 5pm on Friday, March 15

No Class March 20th – Spring Break.

Part III: Strategies and Tools for Collecting Evidence

March 27: Process Tracing

Required Reading:

Andrew Bennett and Jeffrey Checkel, eds., *Process Tracing: From Metaphor to Analytic Tool*. Cambridge UP (2015), ch. 1, 5.

Collier, David. "Understanding Process Tracing." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 44.4 (October 2011): 823-30.

Hall, Peter. "Systematic Process Analysis: When and How to Use It." *European Management Review* 3.1 (Spring 2006): 24-31.

Exemplary Work(s):

Snyder, Jack, and Erica Borghard. "The Cost of Empty Threats: A Penny, Not a Pound." *APSR* 105.03 (2011): 437-456.

Stathis Kalyvas. *The Rise of Christian Democracy in Europe*. Cornell UP (1996), pp. 167-221.

Yuen Fong Khong. *Analogies at War: Korea, Munich, Dien Bien Phu and the Vietnam Decisions of 1965*. Princeton UP (1992), ch. 1-3.

Senior Thesis (TBD)

Suggested Reading:

Bates, Robert H., Avner Greif, Margaret Levi, Jean-Laurent Rosenthal, and Barry Weingast. *Analytic Narratives*. Princeton UP (1998), pp. 3-22, 231-238.

Mahoney, James. "The Logic of Process Tracing Tests in the Social Sciences." *Sociological Methods and Research* 41.4 (2012): 570-597.

Fairfield, Tasha and Andrew Charman. "Explicit Bayesian Analysis for Process Tracing: Guidelines, Opportunities, Caveats." *Political Analysis* 25.3 (2017): 363-380.

George, Alexander and Andrew Bennett. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. MIT Press (2005), pp. 205-232.

Capoccia, Giovanni. "Critical Junctures and Institutional Change" in James Mahoney and Kathleen Thelen, eds. *Advances in Comparative Historical Analysis*. Cambridge UP (2015), pp. 147-179.

Pierson, Paul. *Politics in Time: History, Institutions, and Social Analysis*. Princeton UP (2004), ch. 1-2.

Weeks of March 25-29 and April 1-5: Make individual appointments with instructors via Canvas calendar to discuss research projects.

April 3. Archival Research

Required Reading:

Ian Lustick, "History, Historiography, and Political Science: Multiple Historical Records and the Problem of Selection Bias." *APSR* 90.3 (1996): 605-618.

Thies, Cameron. "A Pragmatic Guide to Qualitative Historical Analysis in the Study of International Relations." *International Studies Perspectives* 3.4 (2002): 351-372.

Howell, Martha and Walter Prevenier. *From Reliable Sources: An Introduction to Historical Methods*. Cornell UP (2001), pp.17-34.

Exemplary Work(s):

Alisha Holland, *Forbearance as Redistribution: The Politics of Informal Welfare in Latin America*. Cambridge UP (2017), pp. 156-209, 334-337.

Senior Thesis (TBD)

Suggested Reading:

Frisch, et al. *Doing Archival Research in Political Science*, Cambria Press (2012), ch. 1, 2, 4, 11.

Week 10, April 10: Interviews**Required Reading:**

Martin, Cathie Joe. "Crafting Interviews to Capture Cause and Effect," pp. 109-124 in Mosley, *Interview Research in Political Science*.

Beckmann, Matthew and Richard Hall, "Elite Interviewing in Washington, DC," pp. 196-208 in Mosley, *Interview Research in Political Science*.

Leech, Beth, et al. "Lessons from the 'Lobbying and Political Change' Project," pp.209-224 in Mosley, *Interview Research in Political Science*.

Exemplary Work(s):

Johnston, Alastair Ian. *Social States: China in International Institutions, 1980-2000*. Princeton UP (2008), pp. xiii-xxvii, 155-96.

Hochschild, Jennifer. *What's Fair? American Beliefs about Distributive Justice*. Harvard UP (1981), pp. 17-26, 192-237.

Senior Thesis (TBD)

Suggested Reading:

Schwedler, Jillian. "The Third Gender: Western Female Researchers in the Middle East." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 39.3 (July 2006): 425-428

Gray, Paul, John Williamson, David Karp, and John Dalphin. *The Research Imagination: An Introduction to Qualitative and Quantitative Methods*. Cambridge UP (2007), pp. 151-178.

Wood, Elisabeth. "The Ethical Challenges of Field Research in Conflict Zones." *Qualitative Sociology* 29.3 (2006): 307-341.

Rathbun, Brian. "Interviewing and Qualitative Field Methods: Pragmatism and Practicalities," in Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier, Henry Brady and David Collier, eds. *Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. Oxford UP (2008), pp. 685-701.

Salganik, Matthew and Douglas Heckathorn. "Sampling and Estimation in Hidden Populations Using Respondent-Driven Sampling." *Social Methodology* 34 (2004): 193-239.

Short Paper 4 due by 5PM on Friday April 12**Week 11, April 17: Ethnography and Cultural Analysis****Required Reading:**

Kubik, Jan. "Ethnography of Politics: Foundations, Applications, Prospects," in Edward Schatz, ed. *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power*. U. of Chicago Press (2009), pp. 25-52.

Wedeen, Lisa. "Conceptualizing Culture: Possibilities for Political Science," *APSR* 96.4 (December 2002): 713-28.

Swidler, Ann, "Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies," *ASR* 51 (April 1986): 273-286.

Exemplary Work(s):

Walsh, Katherine Cramer. "Putting Inequality in Its Place: Rural Consciousness and the Power of Perspective." *APSR* 106.03 (2012): 517-532.

Parkinson, Sarah Elizabeth. "Organizing Rebellion: Rethinking High-Risk Mobilization and Social Networks in War." *APSR* 107.03 (2013): 418-432.

Putnam, Robert. "Studying Elite Political Culture: The Case of 'Ideology'." *APSR* 65.3 (1971): 651-681.

Suggested Reading:

Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. Basic Books (1973), pp. 3-30, 412-453.

Taylor, Charles. "Interpretation and the Sciences of Man." *Review of Metaphysics* 25.1 (September 1971): 3-51.

Weber, Max. *Methodology of the Social Sciences*. Transaction (2011), pp. 1-47; 51-85.

Schmidt, Vivien. "Discursive Institutionalism: The Explanatory Power of Ideas and Discourse." *Annual Review of Political Science* 11 (2008): 303-326.

Scott, James. *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. Yale UP (1985), pp. 28-47, 138-183. [Available on Harvard Libraries website.]

PART V: PRESENTATION OF STUDENT WORK

April 24: Student Research Workshop

Two-page synopses due April 21

Peer comments due April 23

May 1: Student Research Workshop

Two-page synopses due April 28

Peer comments due April 30

Final Research Prospectus due by 5 PM on Thursday, May 16th