

Contemporary Political Research, POSC 6101, Fall 2009, Sec. 701, M 4:00-6:30 p.m.
Prof. Lowell Barrington, Office: 478 WWP; Office Phone: 288-5234.
E-mail: Lowell.Barrington@mu.edu; Office Hrs: MWF 1:00-3:00 and by appt.

Our knowledge is a little island in a great ocean of nonknowledge.
— Isaac Singer

Method without substance may be sterile, but substance without method is only fortuitously substantial.
— V.O. Key, Jr. (1958 APSA Presidential Address)

Overview. This course is designed to give you an overview of the various approaches to the study of political science. Because so many topics are covered, you are unlikely to leave this class an expert in any of them. But, you will leave better able to understand research articles or books you will read in your other political science courses. I hope you will also have a better idea about the value of understanding and employing multiple methods in a research project and a confidence in your own ability to begin to use primary source data in your own research. To start, we will consider questions such as “what is science?” and “how can political science be more scientific?” since they will shape our discussions of data collection and analysis. The second part of the course examines various ways to collect primary source data related to politics, including experiments, participant observation, elite interviewing and mass surveys, focus groups, and content analysis. Finally, we will conclude with how one analyzes different numbers of cases, through an overview of case study, comparative, and statistical analysis.

Requirements. Course requirements include serving two times as discussion leader. This involves a short (5 to 10 minute) presentation on a given week’s readings and responsibility for *guiding* (not monopolizing) discussion of that week’s readings. Presentations should include topics such as what you found most interesting in the readings, your answers to the “questions for consideration” for the week on the syllabus, your suggestions for further discussion questions that will shape the discussion portion of the class session, and anything else you would include in a written critique of the week’s readings. In preparing for your presentations and discussion leading, you should also look at the twelve questions for analyzing research reports on pp. 550-551 of Johnson, Reynolds, and Mycoff, as well as the checklist on p. 18 of Ethridge. You will sign up for the weeks ahead of time in class. Presenting on a given week’s readings does not excuse you from discussing readings in other weeks. *Everyone* will do the readings before class; to encourage this, class participation is a significant portion of your final grade.

Other requirements are: (1) three short assignments handed out the week before they are due (one of these will likely be during the statistics section of the course), (2) considerable participation in the post-class session D2L discussions, and (3) a final research proposal that is due at the end of the semester. On the D2L website, there will be a forum for discussion threads that will run from the end of each class session until the following class session. A non-trivial portion of your class participation grade will come from these D2L discussions. We will talk about the D2L requirement in more detail at the first class session. The research proposal should be between 20 and 25 pages. You must have a “literature review” and a meaningful section laying out and justifying the methods you propose to use. The proposal is not necessarily easier than a typical research paper you will write in your research seminars. Because you are not presenting results, you must be *extremely* convincing that it is a worthy project and that your approach makes sense; you will be writing the proposal as if you are trying to convince someone to fund the research. Note: I take plagiarism on such papers *very* seriously; do not put yourself in a position to find out.

There are four books that you are required to purchase: Janet B. Johnson, H. T. Reynolds, and Jason D. Mycoff, *Political Science Research Methods* (6th edition, 2008); Peter Burnham, Karin Gilland, Wyn Grant, and Zig Layton-Henry, *Research Methods in Politics* (2nd edition; 2008); Gary King, Robert Keohane, and Sidney Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry* (1st edition; 1994); Marcus E. Ethridge, *The Political Research Experience* (3rd edition, 2002). Please make sure that you have the correct edition of each book! Other required readings are on reserve, including a number of my articles, giving you a chance to critique my research. You should also become familiar with the Web site for the Johnson, Reynolds, and Mycoff book: <http://psrm.cqpress.com>.

Semester Grade: The breakdown is as follows: (A) final paper, 40%; (B) short assignments, 15% total; (C) presentations/discussion leading on readings, 10% total; and (D) class participation (in class and D2L), 35%.

CLASS SCHEDULE AND READING ASSIGNMENTS

* = Reading on D2L; ** = Reading available at the listed website

Part I: Designing Scientific Studies of Politics.

Week 1 (Aug. 31): Science and social science.

Readings:

Johnson, Reynolds, and Mycoff, *Political Science Research Methods* (2008), ch. 2 (pp. 27-45 only).

Ethridge, *The Political Research Experience* (2002), ch. 1 (“Introduction: A Science of Politics”).

*Karl Popper, 1934/1968. *The Logic of Scientific Discovery* (New York: Harper & Row), chs. 1-2, 10.

*Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 2nd edition (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962/1970), pp. 23-65, 160-210.

*Martin A. Schwartz, “The Importance of Stupidity in Scientific Research,” *Journal of Cell Science* 121: 1771.

*Alan D. Sokal, “Transgressing the Boundaries: Toward a Transformative Hermeneutics of Quantum Gravity,” *Social Text* 46/47 (Spring-Summer 1996): 217-252 (**skim this article**).

*Alan D. Sokal, “Transgressing the Boundaries: An Afterword,” *Dissent* 43, no 4 (Fall 1996): 93-99.

Question for consideration: What is the difference between knowledge and “scientific knowledge”?

Question for consideration: Do you agree with Schwartz that good science requires us to be “stupid”?

Question for consideration: What lessons can we draw from Sokal’s initial article and his subsequent explanation of it in his “Afterword”?

Week 2 (Sept. 7): No Class, Labor Day.

Week 3 (Sept. 14): The scientific study of politics?

Readings:

Johnson, Reynolds, and Mycoff, ch. 1, ch. 2 (pp. 45-59 only).

Burnham et al., *Research Methods in Politics* (2004), ch. 1.

King, Keohane, and Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry*, ch. 1 (pp. 3-11 only).

*Marsh and Furlong, “A Skin Not a Sweater: Ontology and Epistemology in Political Science,” in Marsh and Stoker, eds., *Theory and Methods in Political Science* (2002), pp. 17-41.

*Gabriel A. Almond, “Separate Tables: Schools and Sects in Political Science,” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 21, no. 4 (Autumn 1988) 828-842.

*“An Open Letter to the APSA Leadership and Members,” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 33, no. 4 (December 2000): 735-737.

*Ada W. Finifter, “Editor’s Notes,” *American Political Science Review* 94, no. 4 (Dec 2000): viii-xi.

*Andrew Bennett, Aharon Barth, and Kenneth R. Rutherford, “Do We Preach What We Practice? A Survey of Methods in Political Science Journals and Curricula,” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 36, no. 03 (July 2003): 373-378.

*Emanuel Adler, “Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics,” *European Journal Of International Relations* 3, no. 3 (September 1997): pp. 319-363.

Question for consideration: In what ways does political science differ from the natural sciences? Is political science a science?

Question for consideration: Far from a single and coherent discipline, political science has been called “a discipline divided.” How much of a problem is the lack of unity and coherence in political science?

Question for consideration: Do you accept Adler’s claim that constructivism provides a “middle ground” for the study of international relations?

Week 4 (Sept. 21): Research questions, causal claims, and the importance of theory.

Readings:

Johnson, Reynolds, and Mycoff, ch. 3 (pp. 60-70 only).

Burnham et al., ch 2, ch. 6 (pp. 143-151 only).

King, Keohane, and Verba, ch. 1 (pp. 14-27 only), ch. 3.

*Paul Diesing, *How Does Social Science Work? Reflections on Practice*, ch. 8 (“Science Politics”).

*Benjamin A. Most, “Getting Started on Political Research.” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 23, no. 4 (December 1990): 592-596.

*Jim Mahoney, “Strategies of Causal Inference in Small-N Analysis,” *Sociological Methods and Research* 28, no. 4 (May 2000): 387-424.

*John Gerring, “Causation: A Unified Framework for the Social Sciences,” *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 17, no. 2 (April 2005) 163-98.

*Milton Friedman, *Essays in Positive Economics* (1962): pp. 3-43.

*Stuart McAnulla, “Structure and Agency,” in Marsh and Stoker, eds., *Theory and Methods in Political Science* (2002), pp. 271-291.

**“The Role of Theory in Comparative Politics: A Symposium,” *World Politics* 48, no. 1 (October 1995): 1-48 (Focus specifically on the contributions by Peter Evans and Adam Przeworski). Available at: http://0-muse.jhu.edu.libus.csd.mu.edu/journals/world_politics/v048/48.1kohli.html

Question for consideration: Diesing provides a provocative account of why certain research questions get asked and others do not. How does his discussion of “science politics” shape your view of political science research?

Question for consideration: Does Gerring’s discussion of causation convince you that there is a rather unified approach to this concept in social science?

Question for consideration: Do you agree with Friedman’s position on theories needing logical assumptions?

Question for consideration: To what extent does the structure versus agency approach discussed by McAnulla help us make sense of the myriad theories in political science? What are the limitations of this approach?

Week 5 (Sept. 28): The role of the literature review.

Readings:

Johnson, Reynolds, and Mycoff, ch. 6.

*Jose L. Galvan, *Writing Literature Reviews* (1999), chapter 1. **NOTE:** I would strongly encourage you to buy this book (used copies should be very inexpensive). It will come in handy in your research seminars. There are new editions (the 4th edition came out in 2009).

*David Thunder, “Back to Basics: Twelve Rules for Writing a Publishable Article,” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 37, no. 3 (July 2004): pp 493-495.

*Gary King, “Publication, Publication,” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 39, no. 1 (Jan. 2006): 119-125.

*Kevin Smith, “Data Don’t Matter?: Academic Research and School Choice,” *Perspectives on Politics* 3, no. 2 (June 2005): 285-99.

*Lowell Barrington and Brian Silver, “Ethnic Minorities and Political Support,” National Science Foundation Research Grant Proposal Statement, 1997.

Question for consideration: If your literature review does only one thing, what should that be?

Question for consideration: Why should the sources for your literature review come primarily from books and academic journals rather than the internet?

Question for consideration: Kevin Smith’s article lays out a number of things to look for when evaluating a research study about school choice. Can we apply these criteria to our critique of any research work?

Question for consideration: What are the strengths and weaknesses of the case, based on their review of the literature, that Barrington and Silver made to the National Science Foundation about the need for a new project on Russian-speaking ethnic minorities?

Week 6 (Oct. 5): From research questions to hypotheses: Traditional and formal approaches.

Readings:

Johnson, Reynolds, and Mycoff, ch. 3 (pp. 70-81 only).

King, Keohane, and Verba, ch. 2.

Ethridge, ch. 9 (“Rational Choice Analysis”).

Excerpt 12. Fiorina, “Divided Government in the American States: A Byproduct of Legislative Professionalism?”

*Rogers M. Smith, “Identities, Interests, and the Future of Political Science,” *Perspectives on Politics* 2, no. 2 (June 2004): 301-312.

*Anthony Downs, *An Economic Theory of Democracy*, chs. 3, 14, and 16.

*D. H. Judson, “Human Migration Decision Making: A Formal Model,” *Behavioral Science* 35 (1990): 281-189.

*Lowell Barrington, “Examining Rival Theories of Demographic Influences on Political Support: The Power of Regional, Ethnic, and Linguistic Divisions in Ukraine,” *European Journal of Political Research* 41, no. 4 (2002): 455-491 (pp. 455-471 only).

*Bronston T. Mayes and Daniel C. Ganster, “Exit and Voice: A Test of Hypotheses Based on Fight/Flight Responses to Job Stress,” *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 9, no. 3: 199-216. **Read pp. 199-203 only.**

Question for consideration: Probably because they require some knowledge of math, formal models are usually seen as something more consistent with quantitative research than with qualitative research. In ch. 2 of KKV, the authors argue that formal models can be used in qualitative research. Are you convinced?

Question for consideration: Think back to our Week 4 discussion about Friedman and assumptions. Although the math may be somewhat hard to follow in formal arguments, it is important to pay close attention to their assumptions. Which assumptions of both Downs and Judson make sense and which ones don't?

Question for consideration: Both Barrington and Mayes and Ganster produce theoretically-based, testable hypotheses in a less than formal way. Downs and Judson employ a more formal approach to the derivation of testable hypotheses. What are the advantages and disadvantages of both approaches?

Week 7 (Oct. 12): The “conceptualization,” “operationalization,” and coding of variables.

Readings:

Johnson, Reynolds, and Mycoff, ch. 3 (pp. 81-87 only), ch. 4.

Ethridge, ch. 3. (“Measurement and Operationalization I: Variables Pertaining to Aggregate Units”).

Excerpt 3. Berry et al., “Measuring Citizen and Government Ideology in the American States, 1960-1993.”

Excerpt 4. Brockett, “Measuring Political Violence and Land Inequality in Central America.”

Ethridge, ch. 4. (“Measurement and Operationalization II: Variables Pertaining to Individual Behavior.”)

Excerpt 5. Ragsdale and Rusk, “Who Are Nonvoters? Profiles from the 1990 Senate Elections.”

Excerpt 6. Burns, Schlozman, and Verba, “The Public Consequences of Private Inequality: Family Life and Citizen Participation.”

Ethridge, ch. 6 (“Indexing”).

Excerpt 9. Holbrook and Van Dunk, “Electoral Competition in the American States.”

*John Gerring, “What Makes a Concept Good?,” *Polity* 31, no. 3. (Spring 1999): 357-393.

*Giovanni Sartori, “Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics,” *American Political Science Review* 64, no. 4: 1033-1053.

**David Collier and Steven Levitsky, “Democracy with Adjectives: Conceptual Innovation in Comparative Research,” *World Politics* 49, no. 3 (April 1997) pp. 430-451. Available at:
http://0-muse.jhu.edu.libus.csd.mu.edu/journals/world_politics/v049/49.3collier.html

Question for consideration: Think of a political science example of “conceptual stretching.”

Question for consideration: Why is it difficult to make the transition from the idea of a variable to its operationalization? Is this harder in political science than other disciplines? Why or why not?

Part II: Gathering Data.

Week 8 (Oct. 19): The “experimental ideal.”

Readings:

Johnson, Reynolds, and Mycoff, ch. 5.

*Lundervold and Belwood, “The Best Kept Secret in Counseling,” *Annual Editions: Research Methods 01/02* (1st edition, 2001), pp. 78-90.

*Rose McDermott, “Experimental Methods in Political Science,” *Annual Review of Political Science* 5 (2002): 31-61.
Ethridge, ch. 2 (“The Logic of Research Design: Experiments and Quasi-Experiments”)

Excerpt 1. Gilliam and Iyengar, “Prime Suspects: The Influence of Local Television News on the Viewing Public.”

Excerpt 2. Oliver and Mendelberg, “Reconsidering the Environmental Determinants of White Racial Attitudes.”

*Andrew Barrett and Lowell Barrington, “Newspaper Photographs and Voter Evaluations of Political Candidates,” *Press/Politics* 10, no. 4 (2005): 98-113.

Question for consideration: I call experiments an “ideal” approach in the title for this week above. Why? What issues/concerns related to experiments might call into question the labeling of them as “ideal”?

Question for consideration: The Lundervold and Belwood reading on counseling research discusses the concept of an experiment based on a single case. Is this a valid form of experimentation?

Question for consideration: What are the strengths and, more interesting, the weaknesses of the Barrett and Barrington experiment?

Week 9 (Oct. 26): Participant and nonparticipant observation.

FIRST PRESENTATIONS ON PROGRESS TO DATE ON THE FINAL PAPER, AT THE START OF CLASS.

Readings:

Johnson, Reynolds, and Mycoff, ch. 8.

Burnham et al., chapter 10 (pp. 221-236 only).

*Jennifer H. Elder, “Videotaped Behavioral Observations,” *Annual Editions*, pp. 106-110.

*David Laitin, *Identity in Formation*, ch. 5 (“Family Strategies in Response to the Cataclysm”).

*Richard Fenno, *Homestyle: House Members in Their Districts* (1978), pp. 101-135, 249-295.

Question for consideration: What are the problems with being a “participant observer” for the collection and interpretation of one’s data?

Question for consideration: After reading Fenno’s methodological appendix, are you more or less confident in the other part of his book that you read for this week?

Week 10 (Nov. 2): Content analysis.

Readings:

Johnson, Reynolds, and Mycoff, ch. 9.

Burnham et al., chapter 7 and chapter 10 (pp. 236-249 only).

Ethridge, ch. 7 (“Content Analysis”).

Excerpt 10. Dalton, Beck, and Huckfeldt, “Partisan Cues and the Media: Information Flows in the 1992 Presidential Election.”

*Andrew W. Barrett and Lowell W. Barrington, “Bias in Newspaper Photograph Selection,” *Political Research Quarterly* 58, no. 4 (Dec. 2005): 609-618.

Question for consideration: The issue of “replication” has been an important topic among political scientists in recent years. Does content analysis pose particular challenges for replication?

Question for consideration: In chapter 10, Burnham et al. discuss “discourse analysis.” What assumptions underlie this approach? How well does it fit with ideas of political science research we’ve discussed?

Week 11 (Nov. 9): Talking to people: Mass surveys, elite interviewing and focus groups.

Readings:

Johnson, Reynolds, and Mycoff, ch. 10.

Burnham et al., ch. 4 (pp. 80-85 and 92-113 only).

Ethridge, ch. 5 ("Surveys").

Excerpt 7. Feldman and Zaller, "The Political Culture of Ambivalence: Ideological Responses to the Welfare State."

Excerpt 8. Gibson, "Social Networks, Civil Society, & Prospects for Consolidating Russia's Democratic Transition."

*Morin, "When the Improbable Becomes Inexplicable," *Washington Post Weekly*, Aug. 19-25, 1996: 34.

*Richard A. Krueger, "The Future of Focus Groups," *Annual Editions*, pp. 111-113.

*Joel D. Aberbach and Bert A. Rockman, "Conducting and Coding Elite Interviews," *PS: Political Science & Politics* 35, no. 4 (Dec 2002): 673-676.

*Lowell Barrington, "The Making of Citizenship Policy in the Baltic States," *Georgetown Immigration Law Journal* 13, no. 2. (1999): 159-199. **NOTE:** This is a long (and "thick") piece; focus on the use of elite interviews as data.

*Lowell Barrington, "Views of the 'Ethnic Other' in Ukraine," *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 8, no. 2 (2002): 83-96.

Question for consideration: Can we trust what people tell us when we interview them? How might we design a research project to enhance our confidence in what we are being told?

Question for consideration: Given what you know so far about sampling and response issues in surveying, what is your view of tracking polls used by the media during U.S. campaigns?

Question for consideration: Barrington's work on citizenship relies heavily on elite interviews. What concerns do you have about the validity of these data? Are these concerns fatal to his conclusions? Why or why not?

Question for consideration: What are the advantages of focus groups compared to mass surveys for understanding attitudes of ordinary people? What are their limitations?

Part III: How Many Cases?: Case Studies, the Comparative Method, and Statistical Analysis.

Week 12 (Nov. 16): Case studies and the comparative method.

Readings:

King, Keohane, and Verba, chs. 4 and 6.

**Flyvbjerg, "Five Misunderstandings about Case-Study Research," *Qualitative Inquiry* 12, no. 2 (April 2006): 219-245. Available at: <http://flyvbjerg.plan.aau.dk/Publications2006/0604FIVEMISPUBL2006.pdf>

*Lijphart, "Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method," *American Political Science Review* 65 (1971): 682-693.

*Collier, "The Comparative Method: Two Decades of Change," in Rustow and Erickson (eds.), *Comparative Political Dynamics: Global Research Perspectives* (1991), pp. 7-31.

*Theodore Meckstroth, "'Most Different Systems' and 'Most Similar Systems': A Study in the Logic of Comparative Inquiry," *Comparative Political Studies*, July 1975, pp. 133-177.

*Dan Posner, "The Political Salience of Cultural Difference: Why Chewas and Tumbukas Are Allies in Zambia and Adversaries in Malawi," *American Political Science Review* 98 (November 2004): 529-546.

*Huber, "Letter from the President: The Role of Cross-regional Comparison," *APSA-CP Newsletter* 14, no. 2 (Summer 2003): 1-6.

*Geddes, "How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics," *Political Analysis* 2 (1990): 131-150.

*Collier, Mahoney, and Seawright, "Claiming Too Much: Warnings about Selection Bias," in Brady and Collier, eds., *Rethinking Social Inquiry* (2004), pp. 85-102.

Question for consideration: What can case studies tell us and what can they not tell us? Given your answer to the first question, are case studies something that should be encouraged or discouraged in political science?

Question for consideration: Evaluate the argument by Geddes in light of the critique by Collier, Mahoney, and Seawright. Are there other problems with Geddes's argument that they miss?

Week 13 (Nov. 23): Univariate and bivariate statistical analysis: Central tendencies, difference of means tests, cross-tabulations, correlation, and bivariate OLS regression.

SECOND PRESENTATIONS ON PROGRESS TO DATE ON FINAL PAPER, AT THE START OF CLASS.

Readings:

Johnson, Reynolds, and Mycoff, chs. 11-12.

Burnham et al., chapter 5.

Ethridge, ch. 10 (“Univariate Analysis: Statistics of a Single Variable”).

Excerpt 13. Greenstein, “The Benevolent Leader Revisited: Children’s Images of Political Leaders in Three Democracies.”

Ethridge, ch. 11 (“Bivariate Analysis: Statistics of Two Variables”).

Excerpt 14. Cameron, Epstein, and O’Halloran, “Do Majority-Minority Districts Maximize Substantive Black Representation in Congress?”

Question for consideration: Why would someone examine the characteristics of just one variable?

Question for consideration: What are the advantages and limitations of bivariate analysis? In what situations would bivariate analysis be quite limited?

Week 14 (Nov. 30): Multivariate regression.

Readings:

Johnson, Reynolds, and Mycoff, ch. 13.

Ethridge, ch. 12 (“Multivariate Analysis: Statistics of More Than Two Variables”).

Excerpt 15. Oliver, “City Size and Civic Involvement in Metropolitan America.”

Excerpt 16. Mutz, “Mass Media and the Depoliticization of Personal Experience.”

*Barrington, “Examining Rival Theories of Demographic Influences on Political Support: The Power of Regional, Ethnic, and Linguistic Divisions in Ukraine,” *European Journal of Political Research* 41, no. 4 (2002): 455-491.

Question for consideration: In what situations would it *not* be appropriate to estimate multivariate statistical models?

Question for consideration: Barrington uses a large number of “dummy variables” in his statistical model. In what situations is it appropriate to use dummy variables?

Week 15 (Dec. 7): Determining statistical significance and “explained variance” in statistical analyses: Probability, error, confidence intervals, and R^2 .

Readings:

Johnson, Reynolds, and Mycoff, ch. 7.

Burnham et al., chapter 4 (pp. 86-92 only) and chapter 6 (pp. 151-164 only).

King, Keohane, and Verba, ch. 5.

Ethridge, ch. 8. (“Sampling”).

Excerpt 11. Oliver, “City Size and Civic Involvement in Metropolitan America.”

Matt Wilkerson and Mary R. Olson, “Misconceptions about Sample Size...,” *Annual Editions*, pp. 140-142.

*Gary King, “How Not to Lie With Statistics,” *American Journal of Political Science* 30, no. 3 : 669-678.

Question for consideration: One of the discussion questions for week 10 related to tracking polls. Given what you now know about confidence intervals, what is your view of the media’s use of tracking polls during U.S. campaigns *now*?

Question for consideration: Johnson, Reynolds, and Mycoff present regression results which include “standardized regression coefficients.” What is the logic behind this statistic (see especially pp. 521-524)? According to King in his “How Not to Lie with Statistics” article, why is this logic flawed? (Also see J & R’s emphasis on, and description of, R^2 – pp. 524-525 – compared to that in King).

Part IV: Conclusion

Week 16 (Dec. 14, Optional additional class session): The marriage of methods, and continuing debates.

Readings:

Johnson, Reynolds, and Mycoff, ch. 14 (pp. 550-551 and 567-572 only).

Burnham et al., chs 11-12.

Ethridge, ch. 13 (“Scientific Principles in Political Study: Some Enduring Controversies”).

*Evan Lieberman, “Nested Analysis as a Mixed-Method Strategy for Comparative Research,” *American Political Science Review* 99, no. 3 (August 2005): 435-52.

*Lowell W. Barrington, Brian D. Silver, and Erik S. Herron, “The Motherland is Calling: Views of Homeland among Russians in the Near Abroad,” *World Politics* 55 (January 2003): 290–313.

*Lowell Barrington, “Russian-speakers in Ukraine and Kazakhstan: ‘Nationality,’ ‘Population,’ or Neither?,” *Post-Soviet Affairs* 17 (April-June 2001), pp. 129-158.

*David Laitin, “Comment on Lowell Barrington,” *Post-Soviet Affairs* 17 (April-June 2001), pp. 159-163.

*Lowell Barrington, “A Reply to David Laitin,” *Post-Soviet Affairs* 17 (April-June 2001), pp. 164-166.

*David Laitin, “The Perestroikan Challenge to Social Science,” *Politics & Society* 31, no. 1 (March 2003): 163-184.

*Bent Flyvbjerg, “A Perestroikan Straw Man Answers Back: David Laitin and Phronetic Political Science,” *Politics & Society* 32, no. 3 (September 2004): 389-416.

Question for consideration: Johnson, Reynolds, and Mycoff’s Chapter 14 paints a rather rosy picture of the Barrett and Barrington newspaper photograph article you read in Week 9. Add some thorns. Using their “12 questions,” what criticisms should have they included that they missed?

Question for consideration: After this semester, do you think the study of politics is more scientific or less scientific than you did at the beginning?

FINAL PAPER DUE: Thursday, December 17, 5:00 p.m. (in my department mailbox).