

PAD 6707
Logics of Inquiry

Instructor: Rick Feiock
Office: 665 Bellamy

Telephone: 644-3525
Email: rfeiock@cos.s.fsu.edu

Objectives:

If you learn only one thing in graduate school, it should be how to do scholarly research. You should be able to critically evaluate literatures, identify interesting and important questions, formulate strategies for answering them, understand the methodological tools with which to conduct the research, and write up the results so they can be published. Although most graduate level courses address these issues indirectly, this course provides an explicit analysis of each. We do this in the context of a variety of strategies of empirical social science inquiry. We will focus on the logic of inquiry (how to know) rather than what to know. In other words, this course is about investigating relationships, designing studies to test relationships, and critiquing the methods employed by other researchers in existing studies of administrative and policy phenomena. The course web page is at: <http://campus.fsu.edu>

Course Requirements and Grading:

Students will be expected to be full participants in shaping the character of the seminar; that requires all students to come to class prepared to discuss the readings for each session. To ensure participation, students will be evaluated on their contribution to the class and on-line discussion of the readings. Student performance will be evaluated as follows:

Research Question and Significance	10%
Final Research Proposal	40%
Proposal Critique	5%
Class Participation	35%
Final Exam	10%

Students will also be responsible for leading the discussion of the readings at least one time during the semester. The class (myself included) will have the opportunity to ask questions of the presenter and to discuss the article in more detail. I will serve as both moderator and participant in our weekly class discussions. The purpose of these presentations is *not* to merely summarize the content of the readings. Each presentation will indicate how ideas in that particular reading relate to others in the same week. Presentations should raise critical issues and questions for discussion. Presenters who fail to follow these guidelines will be stopped by the instructor. Each presenter will post on the online discussion board a couple of pages of commentary on the readings that highlights the major arguments of his or her presentation. This must be posted at 48 hours prior to class. All other students must post a brief response to this commentary within 24 hours of class. You should bring researchable ideas to class each week. I will occasionally ask for (oral) descriptions of these and will then ask questions such as: How would you do that? What makes that an interesting question? What contributions would this question make to the scholarly literature? You should be able to concise answers.

On week three, you should provide the instructor two copies of an empirical research article from a PAR or JPART you believe to be well done and are willing to defend. You should also post on the discussion board the citation and abstract. The following week you will receive a copy of someone else's article and on week six you will present in class a methodological critique of that article.

Papers will be submitted through www.turnitin.com. The research proposal paper assignment will be prepared in two parts. The first assignment is a short theory/literature review (about 5 pages) that explains the theoretical contributions and significance of the proposed research. This paper will be submitted by Week 12 and earlier submission is encouraged. The final proposal will extend the first essay into a complete (15-20 page) research proposal and be submitted in the format of a specific grant program (if none is specified I will assume the NSF Dissertation Improvement Grant Program). My expectation is that this will reflect the best work you are capable of and be in a form suitable for submission. The proposal will be presented in class week fifteen and is to be submitted and posted at least 24 hours in advance. You will also write a 1 page critique of fellow student's final proposal

For the final exam I will ask you to answer one of the questions listed on the last page of this syllabus. You will have three hours to complete your response.

I do not plan to give any incompletes and papers turned in late will be judged according to proportionately higher standards. I reserve the right to use my judgment in calculating the final grade. If you chose especially challenging assignments for yourself, or tended to go the easy route or free ride, I will take that into account. Any time you want more feedback on your work, ask. Any time you want more information about what I expect of you, ask. Any time you are unsure about how to complete an assignment, ask.

Honor Code:

The Academic Honor System of the University is based on the premise that each student has the responsibility (1) to uphold the highest standards of academic honesty in his/her own work (2) to refuse to tolerate academic dishonesty in the University community, and (3) to foster a high sense of honor and social responsibility on the part of students. *By staying enrolled in this course* you indicate your acceptance this code which includes giving full credit to any other person whose research, ideas, or writing you incorporate into your own assignments in whole or in part, by direct quotation or paraphrase. You may not use the same assignment for this course and another unless you obtain permission *in advance* from the instructors of both courses. If you have any questions about the appropriate interpretation of the honor code, seek advice before handing in an assignment.

Students with Disabilities:

Students with disabilities covered by the Americans with Disabilities Act should follow these steps: (1) provide documentation of your disability to the Student Disability Resource Center (08 Kellum Hall, 644-9566); (2) bring a statement from the Student Disability Resource Center indicating that you have registered with them to your instructor the first week of class. The statement should indicate the special accommodations you require.

Required Books:

- John Gerring 2001. *Social Science Methodology: A Criterial Framework*. Cambridge University Press.
- Jon Elster. 1989. *Nuts and Bolts for the Social Sciences*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gary King, Robert Keohane, and Sidney Verba, 1996. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*, Princeton University Press
- Charles C. Ragin. 1987. *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. University of California Press.
- Royce Singleton Jr. and Bruce C. Straits. 1999. *Approaches to Social Research*. Oxford University Press.
- Aaron Wildavsky. 1993. *Craftways: On the Organization of Scholarly Work* Transaction Publishing

Recommended Books:

- William R. Shadish, Thomas D. Cook, and Donald T. Campbell. 2001. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Larry Laudan. 1990. *Science and Relativism*. University of Chicago Press.
- Herbert A. Simon 1991. *Models of My Life*. Basic Books.
- Louis Menand *The Metaphysical Club: A Story of Ideas in America*, Farrar, Straus & Giroux. [also available as an audio book]

READINGS AND ASSIGNMENTS

Week 1: Organizational Meeting 8/23

Gary King et al. *Designing Social Inquiry* Ch.1 (especially pp12-22)
http://pup.princeton.edu/sample_chapters/king/chapter_one.pdf

Discuss the research design flowchart: <http://polisci.wisc.edu/users/sapiro/ps817/flow.pdf>

Week 2: Philosophy of Science, Social Science, and Public Administration 8/30

READINGS:

Singleton and Straits, *Approaches to Social Research* Chs.1-2.

Karl Popper *Objective Knowledge, "A Realist View of Logic, Physics, and History"*
<http://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/at/popper.htm>

Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Ch. 9 "The Nature and Necessity of Scientific Revolutions"
<http://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/us/kuhn.htm>

Terrence Ball. 1976. ["From Paradigms to Research Programs: Toward a Post-Kuhnian Political Science"](#). *American Journal of Political Science* 20 (1):151-177.

Recommended:

Larry Laudan, *Science and Relativism*

Louis Menand *The Metaphysical Club: A Story of Ideas in America*, Farrar, Straus & Giroux.

Week 3: Labor Day 9/16

ASSIGNMENT:

Post on the discussion board the citation and abstract for an empirical research article from a PAR in the last 3 years (or from another journal with permission) you that you believe is a strong piece of empirical research that you are willing to defend. Provide two copies of the article to the instructor.

Week 4: Theory & Method for the Study of Politics and Public Administration 9/13

READINGS:

John Gerring 2001. *Social Science Methodology: A Criterial Framework*, Chs. 1-2

Lupia, Arthur. 2000. "Evaluating Political Science Research: Information for Buyers and Sellers." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 33(1): 7-13.

<http://www.apsanet.org/ps/march00/lupia.cfm>

Melvin Dubnick "Demons Sprits and Elephants: Reflections of the Failure of Public Administration Theory"

<http://www.andromeda.rutgers.edu/~dubnick/papers/apsa99/spirits.html>

Jeff Gill and Kenneth Meier. 2000. "Public Administration Research and Practice a Methodological Manifesto" *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 10: 570-99. <http://bush.tamu.edu/research/cpg/pa-archive/Browse/Index.asp>

Lisa DeLorenzo 2001. "Stars Aren't Stupid, But Our Methodological Training Is" *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 11:139-45.

<http://bush.tamu.edu/research/cpg/pa-archive/Browse/Index.asp>

Ball, Terence. 1987. "Is There Progress in Political Science?" *In Idioms of Inquiry*, ed. Terence Ball. Albany: State University of New York Press. <Blackboard>

Recommended:

Herbert A. Simon, "Public Administration in Today's World of Organizations and Markets" <http://apsanet.org/PS/dec00/simon.cfm>

Dryzek, John S. 1986. "Progress in Political Science." *Journal of Politics* 48:301-320.
<JSTOR>

Gunnell, John G. 1995. "Realizing Theory: The Philosophy of Science Revisited." *Journal of Politics* 57:923-40. <JSTOR>

Polsby, Nelson W. 1998. "Social Science and Scientific Change: A Note on Thomas S. Kuhn's Contribution." in *Annual Review of Political Science*, Vol. 1, ed. Nelson W. Polsby. Palo Alto: Annual Reviews. < Blackboard Course Documents>

Week 5: Theory, Explanation and Inference 9/20

READINGS:

Singleton and Straits, *Approaches to Social Research* Chs. 3.

John Gerring 2001. *Social Science Methodology: A Criterial Framework*, Chs. 3-7

Gary King, Robert Keohane, and Sidney Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research* Chapters. 2-3

Jon Elster, *Nuts and Bolts for the Social Sciences*. Chapters 1-3.

Recommended:

Jon Bendor 1988. "Formal Models of Bureaucracy," *British Journal of Political Science* 18: 353-95, JSTOR

Bear F. Braumoeller, "[Explaining Variance](#)," manuscript, Harvard University, 2003; under review

Samuel Bacharach. 1989. "Organizational Theories: Some Criteria for Evaluation" *Academy of Management Review* 14: 496-515.

Week 6: The Scholarly Enterprise 9/27

IN-CLASS ASSIGNMENT:

Provide a brief methodological critique of the research article you were assigned.

READINGS:

Singleton and Straits, *Approaches to Social Research* Ch. 17.

Gary King, Robert Keohane, and Sidney Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research* Chapter 1 [again].

Aaron Wildavsky, 1993. *Craftways: On the Organization of Scholarly Work*, Chapter 1-3, 5

C. Wright Mills “On Intellectual Craftsmanship” appendix to *The Sociological Imagination*. Oxford University Press 1959. <http://www.angelfire.com/or3/tss/millsoic.html>

Richard Feiock and Mark Lubell NSF Proposal: “Institutions and the Politics of Land Use Plan Amendments”

Review the NSF Proposals Guide http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2002/nsf022/nsf0202_2.html and resources on grant writing at <http://www.pitt.edu/~offres/proposal/propwriting/websites.html>

Recommended:

Richard Feiock and Annette Steinacker NSF Proposal: “A Strategic Approach to Economic Development”

Herbert A. Simon, *Models of My Life*, Chapters 4-6, 23, and Afterwards

Feiock’s NSF Proposal evaluations reviews

Week 8: SECOPA Conference 10/4

Week 7: Measurement, Models, and Data Collection 10/11

READINGS:

Singleton and Straits, *Approaches to Social Research* Chs. 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 14.

Jon Elster, *Nuts and Bolts for the Social Sciences*. New York, Cambridge University Press, 1989. Chs. 4 – 16

Marsden, Peter V. 1990. “Network Data and Measurement.” *Annual Review of Sociology*. 16: 435-63.

Joel D. Aberbach and Bert A. Rockman, “Conducting and Coding Elite Interviews,” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 35 (4): 663-88 (2002).
<http://www.apsanet.org/PS/dec02/aberbach.cfm>

Jeffrey M. Berry "Validity and Reliability Issues In Elite Interviewing" *Paper prepared for delivery at the Workshop on Elite Interviewing, Political Organizations and Parties section, American Political Science Association, San Francisco, August 29, 2001*
<http://ase.tufts.edu/polsci/faculty/berry/paper-validity.asp>

Review sample questionnaire: "Strategic Economic Development"

Recommended:

Hubert Blalock "Measurement and Conceptualization Problems: The Major Obstacles to Integrating Theory and Research" *American Sociological Review* 54:447-460.

Don Dillman, *Mail, Telephone and Internet Surveys: The Total Design Method*

Online Surveys <http://www.surveymonkey.com> (get login from instructor)

Week 9: Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Design 10/18

READINGS:

Singleton and Straits, *Approaches to Social Research* Ch. 7-7

Karl L. Wuensch "Quasi-Experimental Design"

<http://core.ecu.edu/psyc/wuenschk/docs2210/Research-8-QuasiExpDesign.doc>

Axelrod, Robert. 1981. "The Emergence of Cooperation Among Egoists." *American Political Science Review* 75(2): 306-18.

McDermott, Rose. 2002. "Experimental Methods in Political Science." *Annual Review of Political Science* 5: 31-61.

David Garson "Time Series Analysis: Key Concepts and Terms"

<http://www2.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/pa765/time.htm>

Gene V. Glass. 1995. "Interrupted Time Series Quasi-Experiments"

<http://glass.ed.asu.edu/gene/papers/tsx.html>

Richard C. Feiock and Jered B. Carr. "A Reassessment of City/county Consolidation: Economic Development Impacts," *State and Local Government Review*, Vol. 29, No. 3 (Fall): 166-171.

Recommended:

Shadish, Cook, and Campbell. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*, Chs. 2-8 & 11-14

Thomas G. Bowers” Quasi-experiments: Nonequivalent Control Group Designs”
Power point presentation, Penn State University 2003.

<http://www.personal.psu.edu/faculty/d/v/dvo/8design.ppt>

Campbell, Donald T. and H. Laurence Ross. 1968. “The Connecticut Crackdown on Speeding: Time Series Data in Quasi-Experimental Analysis.” *Law and Society Review* 3 (August): 33-53.

Anirudh V. S. Ruhil, 2003. “Structural Change and Fiscal Flows: A Framework for Analyzing the Effects of Urban Events,” *Urban Affairs Review* 38 (3) 396-417.

Week 10: Qualitative Approaches 10/25

READINGS:

Singleton and Straits, *Approaches to Social Research* Ch.10.

John Gerring 2001. *Social Science Methodology: A Criterial Framework*, Chs. 3-7

Gareth Morgan; Linda Smircich. The Case for Qualitative Research. *The Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 5, No. 4. (Oct., 1980), pp. 491-500.

http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~maccoun/PP279_Morgan.pdf

Gary King, Robert Keohane, and Sidney Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research* Chapters. 4-6

Charles C. Ragin. 1987. *The Comparative Method*, Chapters 1-5 (skim chs. 6-9)

Recommended:

Bear F. Braumoeller ["Causal Complexity and the Study of Politics,"](#) *Political Analysis*, vol. 11 #3 (summer 2003), pp. 209-233. and [Boolean Logit/Probit Software Page](#),

Andrew Bennett and Alexander L. George, “Research Design Tasks in Case Study Methods” <http://www.georgetown.edu/bennett/RESDES.htm>

Robert Bates, Avner Greif, Margaret Levi, Jean-Laurent Rosenthal, and Barry Weingast, *Analytic Narratives Revisited* http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/social_science_history/v024/24.4bates.html

Chong Ho Yu, “Misconceived relationships between logical positivism and quantitative research” <http://seamonkey.ed.asu.edu/~alex/computer/sas/positivism.html>

Linda Johnson and Jered Carr 2003. "Attitudes, Stakeholders, and Outcomes: A QCA Analysis of Consolidation Referenda" in *Perspectives on City-County Consolidation and its Alternatives*. Edited by Jered B. Carr and Richard C. Feiock, M.E. Sharpe Publishing.

Week 11: ASSIGNMENT:

Proposal theory/literature review paper assignment due 11/1

Week 12: Analysis and Interpretation 11/8

READINGS:

Singleton and Straits, *Approaches to Social Research* Chs. 12, 15.

Christopher H. Achen 2002. "Toward A New Political Methodology: Microfoundations and ART" *Annual Review of Political Science* Vol. 5, pp. 423-450

Gary King. "[How Not to Lie With Statistics: Avoiding Common Mistakes in Quantitative Political Science](#)," *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 30, No. 3 (August, 1986): Pp. 666-687. <JSTOR>

Gary King, Michael Tomz; and Jason Witten. "[Making the Most of Statistical Analyses: Improving Interpretation and Presentation](#)," *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 44, No. 2 (April, 2000): 341-355

Recommended:

Svend Juul, "Introduction to Stata 8"

<http://www.biostat.au.dk/teaching/software/STATA/Stata8.pdf>

Gary King, Michael Tomz; and Jason Witten. "Clarify: Software for Interpreting and Presenting Statistical Results

<http://gking.harvard.edu/clarify/docs/clarify.html>

Aaron Wildavsky, 1993. *Craftways: On the Organization of Scholarly Work*, Chapters 4, 6, 7

Week 13: Time, Space, History and Hierarchy: Complex Relationships 11/15

READINGS:

Jim Granato, Frank Scioli, "Puzzles, Proverbs, and Omega Matrices: The Scientific and Social Significance of Empirical Implications of Theoretical Models (EITM)" [\[PDF\]](#) [\[HTM\]](#)

Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier and Brad Jones. 1997. "Time is of the Essence: Event History Models in Political Science." *American Journal of Political Science* 41(October): 1414-1461. JSTOR

Luc Anselin, "Spatial Econometrics" April 26, 1999.

Nathaniel Beck TIME-SERIES–CROSS-SECTION DATA: What Have We Learned in the Past Few Years? *Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci.* 2001. 4:271-293.

Carolyn Heinrich and Laurence Lynn Jr. 2001. "Means and Ends: A Comparative Study of Empirical Methods for Investigating Governance and Performance" *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 11:109-38. <http://bush.tamu.edu/research/cpg/pa-archive/Browse/Index.asp>

Bear F. Braumoeller, research note on [hypothesis testing and interaction terms](#), forthcoming in *International Organization*.

Week 13: The Ethics, Politics, and Responsibilities of Designing, Executing, Communicating, and Interpreting Scholarly Research 11/22

Singleton and Straits, *Approaches to Social Research* Ch.16

American Political Science Association [Guide to Professional Ethics](#).

Grofman, Bernard. 1991. "Multivariate methods and the analysis of racially polarized voting: Pitfalls in the use of social science by the courts." *Social Science Quarterly* 72 (Dec.): 826-33.

Milgram, Stanley. 1964 "Behavioral study of obedience," *American Psychologist* 19: 421-23.

Stanley A. Milgram, "A reply to Baumrind," *American Psychologist* 19 (1964): 848-52.

Gary King. ``[Replication, Replication](#)," *PS: Political Science and Politics*, with comments from nineteen authors and a response, ``[A Revised Proposal, Proposal](#)," Vol. XXVIII, No. 3 (September, 1995): Pp. 443-499. <http://gking.harvard.edu/files/replication.pdf>

Alan Sokal "A Physicist Experiments with Cultural Studies"
<http://www.physics.nyu.edu/faculty/sokal/#papers>

Review FSU Office of Humans Subjects web page
<http://www.research.fsu.edu/humansubjects/index.html>

Recommended:

Christopher Shea "Don't Talk to the Humans The Crackdown on Social Science Research" *Lingua Franca* Volume 10, No. 6 - September 2000 <http://mailer.fsu.edu/~njumonvi/irb-article.htm>

Smith, Rogers M. 1997. "Still blowing in the wind: The American quest for a democratic, scientific political science." *Daedalus* 123 (1): 253-87.

Deason, Ellen E. 1999. "Incompatible versions of authority in law and science." *Social Epistemology* 13 (2).

Long, Clarisa. 1999. "The dissonance of scientific and legal norms." *Social Epistemology* 13 (2).

Week 14: 11/24

ASSIGNMENT: Final proposal must be posted to the discussion board on or before 11/28.

Week 15: Proposal Presentations 11/29

ASSIGNMENT: Proposal Critiques to be posted by 12/3 .

Week 16: Final Exam 12/6

POSSIBLE FINAL EXAMINATION QUESTIONS:

1. Is progress possible in social science generally and the study of public administration in particular? Explain.
2. Gary King argues that differences between quantitative and qualitative are only stylistic and are methodologically and substantively unimportant because all good research derives from the same underlying logic of inference. Critically evaluate this claim. In doing so, address the critical components of research design including: the research question; theory; data; and the use of data.
3. What criteria should we use to evaluate theory? Explain each criterion and apply the criteria you identify to evaluate a theory from the literature of PA.
4. Formulate a research question that interests you. Provide a brief description of how you could answer the question using 1) a qualitative case analysis; 2) a cross-sectional comparative analysis; and 3) a time series analysis.
5. Discuss how Thomas Kuhn's philosophy of science would lead (or has led) scholars in public administration and policy to understand the field, to conduct research, to divide their labors (say, between theorizing and researching, etc.), and to train graduate students. Conclude by giving your own view of the work of Kuhn and other philosophers of science have influenced the fields of public administration and policy.
- 6 It has been argued that characteristics desired in a research design include:
 - a. Good estimation of treatment effects
 - b. Good estimation of random variation
 - c. Absence of bias
 - d. Precision and accuracy
 - e. Wide range of applicability, and

f. Simplicity in execution and analysis.

Why are these features so highly valued? Specifically, how do they contribute to the answer of a question the design is intended to produce? How are such characteristics ensured and what impact do deviations have on the answers that result?