

# Scope and Epistemologies of Political Science POS 6716

University of Florida

Fall 2025

<b>Instructor:</b>	Cristian Pérez Muñoz
<b>E-mail</b>	<a href="mailto:cperezmunoz@ufl.edu">cperezmunoz@ufl.edu</a>
<b>Office</b>	Anderson 334
<b>Class Hours</b>	Thursdays, Period 2 - 4 (8:30 AM - 11:30 AM)
<b>Classroom</b>	MAT0006
<b>Office Hours</b>	Mondays (10 am–1 pm) (by appointment)

## Course Description

This graduate seminar investigates the epistemological foundations of contemporary political science research. We will confront basic questions about political knowledge: How do social scientists construct valid inquiries? What links explanation to prediction in political phenomena? Does political science research reflect objective reality or the researcher's own values? How do individual behaviors connect to collective political outcomes? These questions divide the discipline, as do debates over whether prediction or explanation should take priority in social scientific research.

Classical and contemporary debates over explanation models, causality, and research design constitute the course's core content. We will analyze major theoretical traditions: causal mechanisms, qualitative interpretation, rational choice theory, and institutional analysis. This exercise will provide analytical tools to better understand how political scientists generate knowledge. Special attention goes to ongoing tensions between different research traditions. The course balances theoretical rigor with practical application. Students will acquire critical tools for evaluating existing research and theoretical foundations for developing their own investigations.

## Course Objectives:

- Analyze competing epistemological foundations of political science research
- Build strong knowledge of causality and causal inference
- Better understand research design principles

## Course Requirements

---

This course will have three instances of evaluation. Students will be evaluated based on their participation in class, a personal epistemological journey statement, and a final paper ( 5000-7000 words long, single spaced). The characteristics of each instance of evaluation are explained below.

1. **Participation:** This is the most important component of the course. Students are expected to come to class with the readings completed and prepared for discussion. This is a graduate seminar course in which each student must participate actively and substantively in every single class session. I expect multiple contributions from each student per class. This is not negotiable. Passive attendance or sporadic participation will result in a failing participation grade. Any unjustified absence will adversely affect your participation evaluation, and repeated unjustified absences may result in course failure. On October 16, I will provide each student with a **midterm participation** grade including detailed comments about their performance in class. Participation will represent **50% of the final grade**.
2. **Personal Epistemological Journey: Part 1:** Write a reflective essay (1,000 words) about your current assumptions regarding political science knowledge and research. Address: What do you consider "legitimate" or "good" political science research? How do you understand the relationship between theory and empirical work? What is your position on prediction vs. explanation? Where do these assumptions come from (previous coursework, research experience, disciplinary training)? Be specific about methodological approaches you favor and why. This serves as your intellectual starting point. The assignment asks for honest reflection rather than "correct" answers. **(Due Week 3, September 4)**  
**Part 2:** Write a second reflective essay (approximately 1,000 words) comparing your current epistemological position to the one presented in your first statement. Which readings or class discussions changed your thinking most? How did your views on causation, explanation, or research design shift? What ideas do you see in a new light? How will this influence your future research approach? **(Due Week 14, November 20)** My evaluation will consider both statements. They will represent **20 % of the final grade** .
3. **Final paper:** The final paper should be 5000-7000 words long (single spaced, Times New Roman 12 or equivalent). Students will develop a detailed research proposal for their own future research that explicitly justifies every methodological choice through the epistemological frameworks covered in class. The paper must address: What causal claims are you making? What model of explanation are you employing? How do you justify your level of analysis? What are the trade-offs of your chosen approach compared to alternative epistemological frameworks? The proposal should demonstrate coherent integration between epistemological commitments and research design choices. Further details of how to write this assignment will be given to you in class and on the course website. This item will represent **30% of the final grade**. **Final paper is due on Friday 12/12**

### Grade Distribution:

---

Class participation	50%
Personal Epistemological Journey:	20%
Final Paper	30%

### Letter Grade Distribution:

>= 94	A	74 - 76	C
90 - 93	A-	70 - 73	C-
87 - 89	B+	67 - 69	D+
84 - 86	B	64 - 66	D
80 - 83	B-	60 - 63	D-
77 - 79	C+	<61	F

## Course Policies<sup>1</sup>

### Grading Policy\*

My approach to grading will emphasize substantive feedback over letter grades. For all assignments, excluding the final paper, students will receive comprehensive qualitative/quantitative feedback focusing on their class participation. This feedback aims to highlight strengths, identify areas for improvement, and evaluate overall performance. Following this, students are required to submit a written response to the feedback, reflecting on their performance and suggesting a grade they feel accurately represents their efforts and understanding, as indicated by my assessment. While the final grading decision rests with me, I will seriously consider the students' self-evaluations.

The final paper will be graded based on a specific rubric provided early in the course, focusing on set criteria for evaluating academic manuscripts. This paper will not involve a student self-assessment component.

This reflective exercise is designed to foster a deeper engagement with the readings and to encourage students to develop critical self-assessment skills. The overarching goal of this grading policy is to shift the focus from pursuing grades to understanding and internalizing the learning process. By separating grades from learning feedback, I aim to create an environment where constructive critique is the foundation for professional development.<sup>2</sup>

### Class Modality

This class will be offered on campus. You will be notified in advance in case we need to move the class to an online setting. However, this will be only in exceptional circumstances (i.e. a global pandemic).

---

<sup>1</sup>The items with an asterisk(\*) are textually copied from [UF Policy on Course Syllabi](#).

<sup>2</sup>This course is consistent with current UF grading policies for assigning grade points. For detailed information, visit this [link](#).

## **During Class**

---

Unless I explicitly declare so, nothing I say in this class will be my personal opinion on the topics covered. Instead, I will focus on presenting different points of view on the topics discussed. When issuing a subjective opinion on a given issue, students will hear me say something along the lines of "I personally believe," "according to how I see this issue," and so on. In any case, my personal opinions will be announced and infrequent.

I have carefully chosen a manageable number of readings and references that come from academic sources. These viewpoints have been discussed and debated within political science or other academic disciplines and have been collectively judged by experts in that field to be well-argued and rigorous.

While I have chosen a wide range of viewpoints to present to you, it would be impossible to show all viewpoints on all issues. The debate in class will help us to identify, address and evaluate any alternative perspective on the topics covered in class.

We are a diverse group of people, and every one of us has a different opinions. It is crucial to treat your instructor and classmates with respect and kindness during class meetings and activities. For more information on netiquette guidelines, see the [UF Netiquette Guide for Online Courses](#).

## **AI tools and Writing assignments\***

This course recognizes the evolving phenomenon of using artificial intelligence (AI) tools in academic research and writing. This syllabus emphasizes the importance of original thought, critical analysis, and teacher-student interaction to ensure the integrity and educational value of writing assignments.

- *Original Thought and Critical Analysis:* Students are expected to develop their own ideas and arguments in their essays. AI tools may assist in refining these ideas, but the core analysis and argumentation must be the student's own work.
- *Teacher-Student Interaction:* Students are encouraged to engage actively with the instructor about their essay writing process. This includes discussing the development of their essay, their understanding of the topic, and the analytical approach taken. Such interactions are vital for fostering a deeper understanding and ensuring the authenticity of the student's work.
- *Use of AI Tools:* While AI can be a valuable tool for certain aspects of writing, such as grammar checking or initial research, it should not be used to generate substantial parts of the essay. Students should use AI responsibly and in a manner that supports their own learning and intellectual growth.

## **Attendance Policy\***

Attendance at all classes is mandatory and will be registered. A penalty of one point will be subtracted from the final grade for each unexcused absence. Late work is not accepted. Exceptions include documented illness, legal, or civic/university duty situations. If you miss an assignment

and have a valid excuse, please email me within the same week to evaluate the situation and eventually arrange a makeup. "The requirements for class attendance and make-up exams, assignments, and other work in this course are consistent with university policies". [Click here to read the university attendance policies.](#)"

## **Recording\***

Students are allowed to record video or audio of class lectures. However, the purposes for which these recordings may be used are strictly controlled. The only allowable purposes are (1) for personal educational use, (2) in connection with a complaint to the university, or (3) as evidence in, or in preparation for, a criminal or civil proceeding. All other purposes are prohibited. Specifically, students may not publish recorded lectures without the written consent of the instructor.

A "class lecture" is an educational presentation intended to inform or teach enrolled students about a particular subject, including any instructor-led discussions that form part of the presentation, and delivered by any instructor hired or appointed by the University, or by a guest instructor, as part of a University of Florida course. A class lecture does not include lab sessions, student presentations, clinical presentations such as patient history, academic exercises involving solely student participation, assessments (quizzes, tests, exams), field trips, private conversations between students in the class or between a student and the faculty or lecturer during a class session.

Publication without permission of the instructor is prohibited. To "publish" means to share, transmit, circulate, distribute, or provide access to a recording, regardless of format or medium, to another person (or persons), including but not limited to another student within the same class section. Additionally, a recording, or transcript of a recording, is considered published if it is posted on or uploaded to, in whole or in part, any media platform, including but not limited to social media, book, magazine, newspaper, leaflet, or third party note/tutoring services. A student who publishes a recording without written consent may be subject to a civil cause of action instituted by a person injured by the publication and/or discipline under UF Regulation 4.040 Student Honor Code and Student Conduct Code.

## **Student Privacy\***

There are federal laws protecting your privacy with regards to grades earned in courses and on individual assignments. For more information, please see the Notification to Students of FERPA Rights.

## **Software Use\***

All faculty, staff, and students of the University are required and expected to obey the laws and legal agreements governing software use. Failure to do so can lead to monetary damages and/or criminal penalties for the individual violator. Because such violations are also against University policies and rules, disciplinary action will be taken as appropriate. We, the members

of the University of Florida community, pledge to uphold ourselves and our peers to the highest standards of honesty and integrity.

### **Academic Integrity and Honesty\***

UF students are bound by The Honor Pledge which states, We, the members of the University of Florida community, pledge to hold ourselves and our peers to the highest standards of honor and integrity by abiding by the Honor Code. On all work submitted for credit by students at the University of Florida, the following pledge is either required or implied: On my honor, I have neither given nor received unauthorized aid in doing this assignment. The Honor Code specifies a number of behaviors that are in violation of this code and the possible sanctions. [Click here to read the Honor Code](#). Furthermore, you are obligated to report any condition that facilitates academic misconduct to appropriate personnel. If you have any questions or concerns, please consult with the instructor or TAs in this class.

### **Accommodations for Disabilities\***

Students with disabilities who experience learning barriers and would like to request academic accommodations should connect with the disability Resource Center. [Click here to get started with the Disability Resource Center](#). It is important for students to share their accommodation letter with their instructor and discuss their access needs, as early as possible in the semester.

### **Online Course Evaluation\***

Students are expected to provide professional and respectful feedback on the quality of instruction in this course by completing course evaluations online via GatorEvals. [Click here for guidance on how to give feedback in a professional and respectful manner](#). Students will be notified when the evaluation period opens, and can complete evaluations through the email they receive from GatorEvals, in their Canvas course menu under GatorEvals, or via [ufl.bluer.com/ufl/](https://ufl.bluer.com/ufl/). Summaries of course evaluation results are available to students here.

### **Technical Support\***

E-learning technical support: Contact the [UF Computing Help Desk](#) at 352-392-4357 or via e-mail at [helpdesk@ufl.edu](mailto:helpdesk@ufl.edu).

### **Health and Wellness\***

- U Matter, We Care: If you or someone you know is in distress, please contact [umatter@ufl.edu](mailto:umatter@ufl.edu), 352-392-1575, or visit [U Matter, We Care](#) website to refer or report a concern and a team member will reach out to the student in distress.
- Counseling and Wellness Center: Visit the [Counseling and Wellness Center website](#) or call 352-392-1575 for information on crisis services as well as non-crisis services.

- 
- Student Health Care Center: Call 352-392-1161 for 24/7 information to help you find the care you need, or [visit the Student Health Care Center website](#).
  - University Police Department: [Visit UF Police Department website](#) or call 352-392-1111 (or 9-1-1 for emergencies).
  - UF Health Shands Emergency Room / Trauma Center: For immediate medical care call 352-733-0111 or go to the emergency room at 1515 SW Archer Road, Gainesville, FL 32608; [Visit the UF Health Emergency Room and Trauma Center website](#).

## Disclaimer

The syllabus is a statement of intent. Please note that the schedule of activities and procedures in this course are subject to change due to unforeseen circumstances. Any change in the syllabus will be communicated to all students in the class. Changes will be posted on Canvas and announced in class.

## Course Outline

**Readings:** Required readings are available in [Canvas](#). The only exception is the following book:

- Elster, Jon. 2015. *Explaining Social Behavior*, Cambridge University Press

The following are some recommended readings that can further your understanding on some of the topics we will address in class.

- Brady, Henry E., and David Collier (eds.). 2010. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. 2nd edition.
- Gerring, John. 2012. *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework*. 2nd edition.
- Goertz, Gary, and James Mahoney. 2012. *A Tale of Two Cultures: Qualitative and Quantitative Research in the Social Sciences*.
- Little, Daniel. 1991. *Varieties of Social Explanation: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Social Science*.

Week	Content/Reading assignments
Week 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Introduction - The Nature and Scope of Political Science</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Thursday (August 21)</li> <li>– Ian Shapiro. 2002. "Problems, methods, and theories in the study of politics, or what's wrong with political science and what to do about it." <i>Political theory</i> 30.4 (2002): 596-619.</li> <li>– Mansbridge, Jane. "What is political science for?." <i>Perspectives on politics</i> 12, no. 1 (2014): 8-17.</li> <li>– Lowi, Theodore J. "The state in political science: How we became what we study." <i>American Political Science Review</i> 86, no. 1 (1992): 1-7.</li> <li>– <b>Interview:</b> Robert A. Dahl, Normative Theory, Empirical Research, and Democracy, in <i>Passion, craft, and method in comparative politics</i>, edited by Gerardo L. Munck and Richard Snyder (Johns Hopkins University Press in 2007, pp. 113-149)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Week 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Epistemological Foundations - What Counts as Knowledge?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Thursday (August 28)</li> <li>– Elster, Jon. 2015. "Explanation." In <i>Explaining Social Behavior</i>, 1-55 (Section I).</li> <li>– Weber, Max. 1949. "The Meaning of Ethical Neutrality in Sociology and Economics." In <i>The Methodology of the Social Sciences</i>, 1-47.</li> <li>– Abend Gabriel. 2023. <i>Words and Distinctions for the Common Good: Practical Reason in the Logic of the Social Science</i>. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press, pp. (xii-xxi) and (3-65)</li> <li>– <b>Interview:</b> Juan J. Linz, Political Regimes and the Quest for Knowledge, in <i>Passion, craft, and method in comparative politics</i>, edited by Gerardo L. Munck and Richard Snyder (Johns Hopkins University Press in 2007, pp. 150-209)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Models of Explanation I - Covering Laws vs. Interpretive Understanding</b></li> </ul>
Week 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Thursday (September 4)</li> <li>– Hempel, Carl G. 1962. "Deductive-nomological vs. statistical explanation " In <i>Scientific Explanation, Space &amp; Time</i>, (Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science, vol. III), Herbert Feigl and Gordon Maxwell (eds.), Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 98–169.</li> <li>– Friedman, Milton. 1994. "The Methodology of Positive Economics", In Hausman, Daniel M., ed. <i>The philosophy of economics: An anthology</i>. Cambridge University Press, 1994, pp. 145-178.</li> <li>– Taylor, Charles. 1971. "Interpretation and the Sciences of Man." <i>Review of Metaphysics</i> 25(1): 3-51.</li> <li>– Wendt, Alexander. 1998. "On Constitution and Causation in International Relations." <i>Review of International Studies</i> 24(5): 101-118.</li> <li>– <b>Interview:</b> Interview with Elinor Ostrom (Annual Review) Available at: <a href="https://youtu.be/kzHrBM6CHfE?si=JgJvCCyieMu3SE2d">https://youtu.be/kzHrBM6CHfE?si=JgJvCCyieMu3SE2d</a></li> </ul>
Week 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Models of Explanation II - Mechanisms and Causal Stories</b></li> <li>– Thursday (September 11)</li> <li>– Hedström, Peter, and Petri Ylikoski. 2010. "Causal Mechanisms in the Social Sciences." <i>Annual Review of Sociology</i> 36: 49-67.</li> <li>– Tilly, Charles. 2001. "Mechanisms in Political Processes." <i>Annual Review of Political Science</i> 4: 21-41.</li> <li>– Gerring, John. 2005. "Causation: A Unified Framework for the Social Sciences." <i>Journal of Theoretical Politics</i> 17(2): 163-198.</li> <li>– <b>Interview:</b> Alfred Stepan, Democratic Governance and the Craft of Case-Based Research, in <i>Passion, craft, and method in comparative politics</i>, edited by Gerardo L. Munck and Richard Snyder (Johns Hopkins University Press in 2007, pp. 392-455)</li> </ul>
Week 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Causality and Causal Inference</b></li> <li>– Thursday (September 18)</li> <li>– Pearl, Judea, and Dana Mackenzie. 2018. "The Ladder of Causation." In <i>The Book of Why</i>, Introduction and Chapter 1.</li> <li>– Lewis, David. "Causation." <i>The Journal of Philosophy</i>, 70, no. 17 (1973): 556-567.</li> <li>– Morgan, Stephen L., and Christopher Winship. <i>Counterfactuals and causal inference: Methods and principles for social research</i>. Cambridge University Press, 2014. (Chapter 1), pp. 3-30</li> <li>– Mahoney, James, and Gary Goertz. "A tale of two cultures: Contrasting quantitative and qualitative research." <i>Political analysis</i> 14, no. 3 (2006): 227-249.</li> <li>– <b>Interview:</b> Theda Skocpol, States, Revolutions, and the Comparative Historical Imagination, in <i>Passion, craft, and method in comparative politics</i>, edited by Gerardo L. Munck and Richard Snyder (Johns Hopkins University Press in 2007, pp. 649-707)</li> </ul>

Week 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Prediction vs. Explanation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Thursday (September 25)</li> <li>– Dowding, Keith, and Charles Miller. "On prediction in political science." <i>European Journal of Political Research</i> 58, no. 3 (2019): 1001-1018.</li> <li>– Shmueli, Galit. 2010. "To Explain or to Predict?" <i>Statistical Science</i> 25(3): 289-310.</li> <li>– Hofman, Jake M., Amit Sharma, and Duncan J. Watts. 2017. "Prediction and Explanation in Social Systems." <i>Science</i> 355(6324): 486-488.</li> <li>– <b>Supplementary:</b> Breiman, Leo. 2001. "Statistical Modeling: The Two Cultures." <i>Statistical Science</i> 16(3): 199-231.</li> <li>– <b>Interview:</b> James C. Scott, <i>Peasants, Power, and the Art of Resistance</i>, in <i>Passion, craft, and method in comparative politics</i>, edited by Gerardo L. Munck and Richard Snyder (Johns Hopkins University Press in 2007, pp. 351-391)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Week 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Rational Choice and Models of Individual Behavior</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Thursday (October 2)</li> <li>– Elster, Jon. 2015. "Action." In <i>Explaining Social Behavior</i>, (Part 3) 187-283.</li> <li>– Sen, Amartya. 1977. "Rational Fools: A Critique of the Behavioral Foundations of Economic Theory." <i>Philosophy &amp; Public Affairs</i> 6(4): 317-344.</li> <li>– Green, Donald P., and Ian Shapiro. 1994. "The Pathologies of Rational Choice Theory." In <i>Pathologies of Rational Choice Theory</i>, Chapters 1-2.</li> <li>– <b>Interview:</b> Interview with Evelyne Huber, Interviewed by John Gerring, Available at: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IL9CBHv8QQo">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IL9CBHv8QQo</a></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Week 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The Individual and the Social - Levels of Analysis (I)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Thursday (October 9)</li> <li>– Jackson, Frank, and Philip Pettit. 1992. "Structural Explanation in Social Theory." In <i>Reduction, Explanation and Realism</i>, 97-131.</li> <li>– Coleman, James S. 1990. "Foundations of Social Theory." Chapter 1: "The Purpose of Social Theory."</li> <li>– Ostrom, Elinor. 2009. "Collective Action Theory." In <i>The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics</i>, Chapter 7.</li> <li>– <b>Interview:</b> Gabriel A. Almond "Structural Functionalism and Political Development" , in the book edited by Gerardo L. Munck and Richard Snyder (published by Johns Hopkins University Press in 2007, pp. 63-85)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Week	Content/Reading assignments
Week 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The Individual and the Social - Levels of Analysis (II)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– <u>Thursday (October 16)</u></li> <li>– Elster, Jon. 2007. "Interactions." In <i>Explaining Social Behavior</i>, (Part 4) 295-451.</li> <li>– Elster, Jon. "The case for methodological individualism." <i>Theory and society</i> 11, no. 4 (1982): 453-482.</li> <li>– Cohen, Gerald A. "Reply to Elster on" marxism, functionalism, and game theory"." <i>Theory and Society</i> 11, no. 4 (1982): 483-495.</li> <li>– <b>Interview:</b> Interview with Margaret Levi, Interviewed by John Gerring, available at: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZjnUny40pwg">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZjnUny40pwg</a></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Week 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Research Design and Method Selection</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– <u>Thursday (October 23)</u></li> <li>– King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. "The Science in Social Science." In <i>Designing Social Inquiry</i>, Chapters 1-2.</li> <li>– Brady, Henry E., and David Collier. 2004. "Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards." Introduction and Chapter 1.</li> <li>– Gerring, John. 2012. "Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework." Chapters 1-2.</li> <li>– Achen, Christopher H. 2005. "Let's Put Garbage Can Regressions and Garbage Can Probits Where They Belong." <i>Conflict Management and Peace Science</i> 22(4): 327-339.</li> <li>– <b>Interview:</b> Adam Przeworski, Capitalism, Democracy, and Science, in <i>Passion, craft, and method in comparative politics</i>, edited by Gerardo L. Munck and Richard Snyder (Johns Hopkins University Press in 2007, pp. 456-503)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Week 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Experiments and Natural Experiments</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– <u>Thursday (October 30)</u></li> <li>– McDermott, Rose. 2002. "Experimental Methods in Political Science." <i>Annual Review of Political Science</i> 5: 31-61.</li> <li>– Dunning, Thad. 2012. "Natural Experiments in the Social Sciences." Chapters 1-2.</li> <li>– Teele, Dawn Langan (ed.). 2014. "Field Experiments and Their Critics." Introduction and Chapter 1.</li> <li>– Stokes, Susan C. 2014. "A Defense of Observational Research." In <i>Field Experiments and Their Critics</i>, 33-57.</li> <li>– <b>Interview:</b> Interview with Elizabeth Anderson, available at: <a href="https://www.richardcarrier.info/archives/1251">https://www.richardcarrier.info/archives/1251</a></li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Week	Content/Reading assignments
Week 12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Comparative Method and Case Studies</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– <u>Thursday (November 6)</u></li> <li>– Gerring, John. 2017. "Qualitative Methods." <i>Annual Review of Political Science</i> 20: 15-36.</li> <li>– Slater, Dan, and Daniel Ziblatt. 2013. "The Enduring Indispensability of the Controlled Comparison." <i>Comparative Political Studies</i> 46(10): 1301-1327.</li> <li>– Seawright, Jason, and John Gerring. 2008. "Case Selection Techniques in Case Study Research." <i>Political Research Quarterly</i> 61(2): 294-308.</li> <li>– Geddes, Barbara. 1990. "How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get." <i>Political Analysis</i> 2: 131-150.</li> <li>– <b>Interview:</b> Barrington Moore, Jr. The Critical Spirit and Comparative Historical Analysis, in <i>Passion, craft, and method in comparative politics</i>, edited by Gerardo L. Munck and Richard Snyder (Johns Hopkins University Press in 2007, pp. 86-112)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Week 13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Generalization and External Validity</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– <u>Thursday (November 13)</u></li> <li>– Yarkoni, Tal. 2021. "The Generalizability Crisis." <i>Behavioral and Brain Sciences</i> 45: 1-37.</li> <li>– Bassan-Nygate, Lotem, Jonathan Renshon, Jessica LP Weeks, and Chagai M. Weiss. "The Generalizability of IR Experiments beyond the United States." <i>American Political Science Review</i> (2024): 1-16.</li> <li>– Goertz, G. and Mahoney, J. "Generalization", in Goertz, G. and Mahoney, J., 2012. <i>A tale of two cultures: Qualitative and quantitative research in the social sciences</i>. In <i>A Tale of Two Cultures</i>. Princeton University Press. (chapter 15), pp. 192-204.</li> <li>– Mook, Douglas G. 1983. "In Defense of External Invalidity." <i>American Psychologist</i> 38(4): 379-387.</li> <li>– Collier, David, James Mahoney, and Jason Seawright. "Claiming too much: Warnings about selection bias." In <i>Rethinking social inquiry: Diverse tools, shared standards</i>, pp. 85-102. Rowman and Littlefield, 2004.</li> <li>– <b>Interview:</b> David D. Laitin, Culture, Rationality, and the Search for Discipline, in <i>Passion, craft, and method in comparative politics</i>, edited by Gerardo L. Munck and Richard Snyder (Johns Hopkins University Press in 2007, pp. 601-648)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Week 14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The Value and Future of Political Science</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– <u>Thursday (November 20)</u></li> <li>– Elster, Jon. 2015. "Conclusions: Is Social Science Possible?." In <i>Explaining Social Behavior</i>, pp. 452-493.</li> <li>– Watts, Duncan J. 2017/12 "Should Social Science Be More Solution-Oriented?" <i>Nature Human Behaviour</i> 1: 0015.</li> <li>– <b>Interview:</b> Interview with Pipa Norris, Interviewed by John Gerring, available at: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iezPlybqciw">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iezPlybqciw</a></li> </ul> </li> </ul>