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**Course Overview**

This seminar is designed to introduce public affairs doctoral students to a range of issues surrounding the logic and conduct of scientific and social-scientific inquiry. We will explore varied philosophies of science, asking how they warrant knowledge claims, matter in practical ways for research, and suggest different normative ideals and evaluative standards for our work. By reflecting on important historical episodes, we will ask how scientific ideas and practices are shaped by the broader societies in which they are embedded and how we should think about the ethical and political dimensions of (social-)scientific projects. We will compare and contrast methodological traditions and work to clarify the varied ways scholars pursue understanding and explanation in the interdisciplinary field of public affairs.

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

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

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

The Discussion page on our course Canvas site can also serve as a venue for these sorts of conversations. I invite you to take advantage of this space for pre- and post-seminar discussions if you would like. Just bear in mind that these online discussions will lack some of the advantages of informal face-to-face conversation and include the instructor as a participant.

At the risk of stating the obvious, we differ considerably in our scholarly interests, methodological commitments, and previous training – not to mention our positions in social, economic, and political life. Inn seminar discussions, please show respect for these differences and try to be constructive in the ways you engage one another. Remember that actively listening to others is at least as important as talking – and not the same thing as merely hearing the words a person says.

Please also bear in mind that in a graduate seminar we are supposed to question one another’s ideas and explain our reasons for agreement or disagreement. If you don’t speak up when you think I’ve got it wrong, you deprive me of an opportunity to address your concern (possibly to your satisfaction) and deprive the entire group of a learning opportunity. Dismissive, judgmental silence is rarely helpful for learning, even if it is motivated by a desire to be polite. If you want to show real respect for others’ viewpoints, you should treat them as worthy of a serious response. Whatever work you choose to do in public affairs, my assumption is that you will be well served by learning to have a respectful discussion with people whose views you find maddening. I hope this class will give us all an opportunity to improve on this front. For our class meetings to be productive, people will need to feel comfortable expressing minority views, engaging in respectful debate, asking basic questions, and sometimes saying, “I really don’t understand, and I need some help with this.” Please make sure that, in class and beyond, you do what you can to make this kind of atmosphere possible.

*Class Participation*

Class participation will count for **20 percent** of your overall course grade. I hope everyone will feel that participation in this class is about more than getting a grade. But grades matter, so I want to be clear up front that there are subjective elements to evaluating participation. People contribute to class in different ways; quality is at least as important as quantity; and when it comes to quality, listening is as important as talking. So be aware that I do not take a “bean-counting” approach to grading student participation: More is not necessarily better than less, and I don’t have a set number of statements I expect people to make.

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

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

*Major Writing Assignments*

Students in this course are responsible for two major writing assignments. Each assignment is designed to minimize the need for outside research and intensify student engagement with course readings. The goal is for students to develop well-informed, critical perspectives on the issues raised by course readings. Toward this end, the assignments ask students to put readings into dialogue with one another and put them to use as building blocks for analytic arguments. Each assignment counts for **40 percent** of your overall course grade.

**Paper Assignment 1** consists of two essays. The paper as a whole (the two essays together) should total no more than 15 pages, double-spaced, with twelve-point Times New Roman font and one-inch margins.

For essay 1, you will conduct a 30-minute interview with your advisor about the field they work in, focusing on themes from Section 1 of the course that you deem important and relevant. Prior to the interview, you will need to develop your interview questions in consultation with the course instructor. I encourage you to begin by assuming your advisor is unfamiliar with the readings and issues we’ve discussed in class. *It’s* *your responsibility to translate these issues into questions that will make sense to your advisor and be generative for your paper*. Your essay should put your advisor’s views of their field into dialogue with the varied perspectives on “science, social science, and society” we read for Section 1, so that each illuminates the other. For example, you might use one of your advisor’s observations or stories to illustrate a general dynamic suggested by the readings – or to contest, question, elaborate on, or critique an argument from the readings. Conversely, you might use the readings to critique your advisor’s field (as presented in the interview) or to develop a position on some issue that contrasts with your advisor’s view. We will talk about this essay in much more detail in class.

Essay 2 shifts attention to your own work and to Section 2 of the course. Thinking broadly about the kinds of work you hope to do in the decade ahead, write an essay that locates your work in relation to the positivist, interpretive, and critical traditions of social science. Your essay should address **two of the three** traditions.

* Begin by explaining the kind of work you hope to do in the context of the tradition that fits it best: (1) What priorities and strengths of this tradition make it the best fit for your goals and approaches? (2) What weaknesses or limitations do you see in this tradition, and how might they matter for your research?
* If you believe your work will fall entirely outside the second tradition you consider: (1) Explain why the priorities, strengths, and weaknesses of this tradition make it unsuitable for your research, aiming for an argument that would be convincing to someonewho values and works in this tradition. (2) Draw directly on this tradition of social science to advance one reasonable critique of the work you hope to do.
* If you believe your work will intersect in a partial with this second tradition: (1) Identify the priorities and strengths of the tradition you expect to engage in your work and explain why. (2) Explain why some aspects of the tradition strike you as less helpful for your work, aiming for an argument that would be convincing to someonewho values and works in this tradition.

**Paper Assignment 2** consists of one essay in three parts. The paper as a whole should total no more than 15 pages, double-spaced, with twelve-point Times New Roman font and one-inch margins. The essay will be based on a single article of your own choosing – presumably from a field that interests you as a site of future study, but that’s up to you. To be suitable, the article must include theoretical, conceptual, and empirical elements and approach analysis in a way that you consider to be relational or causal. This assignment can be quite difficult if you try to do it with a poorly chosen article. I strongly recommend that you consult with me as you get close to making a selection.

Part I. Analysis: Treat your article as a “case” of scholarship, and subject it to careful analysis. This part of your essay should (1) specify the kind of intervention the author is trying to make, (2) clarify the article’s main theoretical, conceptual, and empirical elements (including their implicit aspects), and (3) *explain how the article works* by breaking down the author’s key “moves” and describing how the pieces get put together in a way that is (primarily) causal or relational. Part I is analytic, *not* evaluative.

Part II. Critique: Write a critique of the article’s strengths and weaknesses. How well does the author develop each aspect of the article (theoretical, conceptual, and empirical) in its own right, and how effectively do the pieces get put together. Evaluate the analysis on its own terms: What are its strengths and weaknesses *as a piece of causal or relational analysis*? How could it be made stronger *on its own terms* – i.e., taking the author’s goals and general methodological approach as given?

Part III. Design: Propose an article-length study directly related to your original article (OA). Your proposal might aim to build on, challenge, or bring greater specificity to the OA’s analysis. If the OA presented a primarily causal analysis, you should propose an analysis that is primarily relational (or vice versa). In presenting your proposal, state your research question and explain your intervention as clearly as possible. Broadly speaking, you should consider the same kinds of issues addressed in Part I of your essay.

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

**Please note:** Letter grades are assigned as follows. 97-100=A+, 94-96=A, 90-93=A-, 87-89=B+, 84-86=B, 80-83=B-, and so on. Unless prior arrangements have been made, late papers will be penalized three points immediately and then again for each 48 hours that passes after the due date/time.

**Readings**

There are no required books for this course. All readings are available to download and print from the course website on Canvas. You can access our Canvas site through your myU portal (<http://www.myu.umn.edu>) or directly at <https://canvas.umn.edu/courses/91014>

*Technology in Class*

Unless you have an emergency situation, please turn off cell phones during class. Laptops and similar devices are allowed. If you find them helpful, don’t hesitate to use them. But please note that a mixed-but-growing body of research suggests that computer-assisted note-taking can increase distractions, encourage rote transcription, and inhibit learning.

*Mental Health, Stress Management, and Sexual Harassment/Assault*

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

*Food and Housing Resources*

Many university students experience difficulties affording groceries, accessing enough food to meet daily needs, and/or securing a safe and stable place to live. These sorts of challenges can have a significant impact on students’ abilities to participate in class and perform well on class assignments. If you are in this situation, I encourage you to make use of some of the resources listed here: [z.umn.edu/POLinNeed](https://z.umn.edu/POLinNeed).

I also encourage you to notify me if you are comfortable doing so. This will enable me to provide any other resources I may possess.

*Accommodations for Ability and Faith*

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

*Equity, Diversity, and Equal Opportunity*

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

**READING SCHEDULE**

**I. Science, Social Science, and Society**

Week 1, 1/22: A Human Endeavor: All Science is Social. How and Why Does that Matter?

Martha Beck. 1999. “You’re a Good Man, Dr. Smurf” *Expecting Adam: A True Story of Birth, Rebirth, and Everyday Magic*. New York: Harmony. Very Brief Excerpt.

Stephen Jay Gould. 1981. “Introduction.” *The Mismeasure of Man*. New York: Norton. pp.19-29, 73-112.

Ava Kofman. 2018. “[Bruno Latour, the Post-Truth Philosopher, Mounts a Defense of Science](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/10/25/magazine/bruno-latour-post-truth-philosopher-science.html#click=https://t.co/QIpiK9DVvw).” *The New York Times Magazine.* October 25.

Gideon Kunda. 2013. “Reflections on Becoming an Ethnographer.” *Journal of Organizational Ethnography.* 2(1): 4-22.

Steven Rose. 2018. “[The Limits to Science](https://jacobinmag.com/2018/05/science-ideology-ethics-inequality-genetics).” *Jacobin.* May 2.

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

Aldon Morris. 2017. “W.E.B. Du Bois at the Center: From Science, Civil Rights Movement, to Black Lives Matter.” *British Journal of Sociology*. 68(1): 3-16.

Week 2, 1/29: Philosophies and Histories of Science: How Do Sciences Work… and for Whom?

Paul Diesing. 1991. “Popper and His Followers,” “Kuhn and Stegmüller,” and “Pragmatism.” *How Does Social Science Work? Reflections on Practice.* Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press. Pp.29-103.

Sandra Harding. 2006. “Thinking about Race and Science,” “Seeing Ourselves as Others See Us: Postcolonial Science Studies,” and “Discriminatory Epistemologies and Philosophies of Science.” *Science and Social Inequality: Feminist and Postcolonial Issues.* Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press. Pp.1-49, 80-97.

Week 3, 2/5: Professional Ethics and Moral Dilemmas: Dirty Hands and the Doing of Research

National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research. 1979. [*Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research*](https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/belmont-report/read-the-belmont-report/index.html)[The Belmont Report].

Dvora Yanow & Peregrine Schwartz-Shea. 2018. “Framing ‘Deception’ and ‘Covertness’ in Research: Do Milgram, Humphreys, and Zimbardo Justify Regulating Social Science Research Ethics?” *FQS*. 19(3): Article 15.

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

Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang. 2014. “Unbecoming Claims: Pedagogies of Refusal in Qualitative Research.” *Qualitative Inquiry.* 20(7): 1-8.

Short Takes: Consider the Following Cases…

Jesse Singal. 2015. “The Case of the Amazing Gay-Marriage Data: How a Graduate Student Reluctantly Uncovered a Huge Scientific Fraud.” *New York Magazine.* May 29.

Tina Hesman Saey. 2018. “[Chinese Scientists Raise Ethical Questions with First Gene-Edited Babies](https://www.sciencenews.org/article/chinese-scientists-raise-ethical-questions-first-crispr-gene-edited-babies).” *ScienceNews.* November 27.

Charlotte Allen. 1997. “Spies Like Us.” *Lingua Franca* 10(6): 31-39.

Beth McMurtrie. 2014. “Secrets from Belfast.” *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. January 26.

Week 4, 2/12: Connecting Knowledge and Expertise to Policy and Law, Democracy and Power

Michel Foucault. 1978. “About the Concept of the ‘Dangerous Individual’ in 19th Century Legal Psychiatry.” *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*. 1: l-l8.

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

Naomi Oreskes. 2004. “Science and Public Policy: What’s Proof Got to Do with It?” *Environmental Science & Policy.* 7: 369-83.

Jessica F. Green. 2018. “[Why We Need a More Activist Academy](https://www.chronicle.com/article/Why-We-Need-a-More-Activist/243924).” *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* July 15.

Frank Fischer. 2000. “Rethinking Expertise,” “Scientific Inquiry and Local Knowledge in Postpositivist Perspective,” and “The Politicization of Expertise.” *Citizens, Experts, and the Environment: The Politics of Local Knowledge.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press. pp.29-46, 68-85, 89-108.

**NOTE: All students must meet with the instructor *before* our Week 5 class meeting to review a draft questionnaire for your advisor interview.**

**II. Varied Traditions of Social Science**

Week 5, 2/19: Positivist Traditions of Social Science

David Marsh, Selen A. Ercen, and Paul Furlong. 2018. “A Skin Not a Sweater: Ontology and Epistemology in Political Science.” [*Theory and Methods in Political Science*](https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=AJc3DwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA177&dq=a+skin+not+a+sweater&ots=lBoKOwZqbf&sig=PlBZqlaT4WCsibN32VIhJuahVt0#v=onepage&q=a%20skin%20not%20a%20sweater&f=false)*.* Pp.177-98.

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

David Collier, Henry E. Brady, and Jason Seawright. 2010. “Introduction to the Second Edition.” H.E. Brady and D. Collier, eds. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield. Pp.1-10.

The Case of Poverty Scholarship (broadly defined)

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

Kathryn Edin and Laura Lein. 1997. “Work, Welfare, and Single Mothers' Economic Survival Strategies.” *American Sociological Review*. 62(2): 253-266

Week 6. 2/26: Interpretive Traditions of Social Science

Peregrine Schwartz-Shea. 2015. “[Interpretive Social Science](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/9781118474396.wbept0533).” *The Encyclopedia of Political Thought* [Electronic]. Pp.1-6.

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

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

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

The Case of Poverty Scholarship (broadly defined)

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

Linda Gordon. 1992. “Social Insurance and Public Assistance: The Influence of Gender in Welfare Thought in the United States, 1890-1935.” *American Historical Review*. 97(1): 19-54.

Week 7, 3/5: Critical Traditions of Social Science

Joan Eakin et al. 1996. “Towards a Critical Social Science Perspective on Health Promotion Research.” *Health Promotion International* 11(2): 157–165.

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

Joan Wallach Scott. 2004. “Feminism’s History.” *Journal of Women's History*. 16(2): 10-29.

Dorinne Kondo. 1995. “Poststructuralist Theory as Political Necessity.” *Amerasia Journal.* 21(1-2): 95-100.

The Case of Poverty Scholarship (broadly defined)

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

Frances Fox Piven. 2003. “Retrospective Comments.” *Perspectives on Politics.* 1(4): 707-10.

Herbert J. Gans. 1972. “The Positive Functions of Poverty.” *American Journal of Sociology* 78(2): 275-289.

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

Week 8, 3/12: Reflections on the Course So Far and an Introduction to What Comes Next

*I’ve assigned a very light reading load for this week. This should provide students with some extra time to finish up papers during the week prior to class. We will use the first part of class to reflect on what we’ve learned so far and discuss any course- and paper-related points in need of clarification.* ***Papers are due two days after this seminar meeting, by noon on Thursday.*** *The second part of class will be framed by the assigned reading. We will take some first steps toward engaging the questions of methodology, analysis, and explanation that will occupy us for the remainder of the course.*

Andrew Abbott. 2004. “Explanation” and “Basic Debates and Methodological Practices.” *Methods of Discovery: Heuristics for the Social Sciences.* New York, NY: W.W. Norton. Pp.3-79.

**III. Elements of Understanding, Insight, and Explanation**

Week 9, 3/26. Theories, Models, and Types

Marysia Zalewski. 1996. “‘All These Theories yet the Bodies Keep Piling Up’: Theory, Theorists, and Theorising.” In S. Smith, K. Booth, and M. Zalewski, eds. *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond.* New York: Cambridge University Press. Pp.340-53.

Jonathan Simon. 1996. “Discipline and Punish: The Birth of a Middle-Range Research Strategy” [Book Review]. *Contemporary Sociology*. 25(3): 316-19.

Charles A. Lave and James G. March. 1993. *An Introduction to Models in the Social Sciences.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America. Pp.1-84.

James Johnson. 2018. “Formal Models in Political Science: Conceptual, Not Empirical” [Book Review Essay]. *Journal of Politics.* 81(1): Advance Online [5 pages]

D. Harold Doty and William H. Glick. 1994. “Typologies as a Unique Form of Theory Building: Toward Improved Understanding and Modeling.” *The Academy of Management Review*. 19(2): 230-251

Laura Pulido. 2017. “Geographies of Race and Ethnicity II: Environmental Racism, Racial Capitalism and State-Sanctioned Violence.” *Progress in Human Geography.* 41(4): 524-33.

Week 10 4/2, . Concepts and Their Varied Uses

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

John Gerring. 1999. “What Makes a Concept Good? A Criterial Framework for Understanding Concept Formation in the Social Sciences.” *Polity.* 31(3): 357-393.

Gary Goertz and James Mahoney. 2012. “Concepts and Measurement: Ontology and Epistemology.” *Social Science Information.* 51(2): 205-16.

Frederic Charles Schaffer. 2016. *Elucidating Social Science Concepts: An Interpretivist Guide.* New York Routledge. Pp.1-25, 74-98.

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

Week 11. 4/9. Putting Ideas and Evidence into Dialogue through Cases, Casings, and Comparisons

Leo Szilard. 1948/1961. “Report on ‘Grand Central Terminal’.” *The Voices of Dolphins and Other Stories*. New York: Simon & Schuster. pp.115-22.

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

Dietrich Reuschemeyer. 2003. “Can One or a Few Cases Yield Theoretical Gains?” In J. Mahoney and D. Reuschemeyer, eds. Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. Pp.305-36.

Kathryn S. Quick and Martha S. Feldman. 2014. “Distinguishing Participation and Inclusion.” *Journal of Education Planning and Research.* 31(3): 272-90.

Joe Soss. 2018. “On Casing a Study versus Studying a Case.” *Qualitative and Multi-Method Research.* Forthcoming.

Joe Soss. 2005. “Making Clients and Citizens: Welfare Policy as a Source of Status, Belief, and Action.” In A. L. Schneider and H. M. Ingram, eds., *Deserving and Entitled: Social Constructions and Public Policy*. Albany: State University of New York Press. pp. 291-328.

Week 12, 4/16. Causal Analysis I: Logics of Control and Conjunction

John Gerring. 2012. “Causal Arguments.” *Social Science Methodology,* 2nd ed. New York: Cambridge University Press. pp.197-217.

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

Thad Dunning. 2010. “Design-Based Inference: Beyond the Pitfalls of Regression Analysis.” In H. Brady and D. Collier, eds. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards* 2nd ed. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield. Pp.273-311.

Kuhika Gupta. 2012. “Comparative Public Policy: Using the Comparative Method to Advance Our Understanding of the Policy Process.” *Policy Studies Journal*. 40(S1): 11-26.

Charles Ragin. 2000. Fuzzy Set Social Science. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. Pp.21-42, 64-119.

David J. Harding, Cybelle Fox, and Jal D. Mehta. 2002. “Studying Rare Events through Qualitative Case Studies: Lessons from a Study of Rampage School Shootings.” *Sociological Methods & Research*. 31(2): 174-217.

Week 13, 4/23. Causal Analysis II: Processes, Mechanisms, and Path Dynamics

Peter A. Hall. 2003. “Aligning Ontology and Methodology in Comparative Politics.” In J. Mahoney and D. Rueschemeyer, eds. *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*. New York: Cambridge University Press. pp. 337-372.

Kimberly Morgan. 2016. “Process Tracing and the Causal Identification Revolution.” *New Political Economy* 21(5): 489-92.

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

Adrian Kay and Phillip Baker. 2015. “What Can Causal Process Tracing Offer to Policy Studies? A Review of the Literature.” *Policy Studies Journal.* 43(1): 1-21.

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

Peter Malpass. 2011. “Path Dependence and the Measurement of Change in Housing Policy.” *Housing, Theory and Society*. 28(4): 305-319.

Week 14, 4/30. Relational Analysis I: Positions and Mechanisms, Construction and Constitution

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

Donald Tomaskovic-Devey. 2014. “The Relational Generation of Workplace Inequalities.” *Social Currents*. 1(1): 51-73.

Rogers Brubaker. “Ethnicity without Groups.” *Ethnicity without Groups*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Pp.7-27.

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

Thomas Medvetz. 2012. *Think Tanks in America*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. pp.23-46, 84-180.

Week 15, 5/7. Relational Analysis II: Structures and Discourses, Interactions and Agency

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

Ian Hacking. 2004. “Between Michel Foucault and Erving Goffman: Between Discourse in the Abstract and Face-to-Face Interaction.” *Economy and Society*. 33(3): 277-302.

Murray Edelman. 1977. “The Political Language of the Helping Professions.” *Political Language: Words that Succeed and Policies that Fail.* New York: Academic Press. Pp.57-75.

William H. Sewell, Jr. 1992. “A Theory of Structure: Duality, Agency, and Transformation.” *American Journal of Sociology.* 98(1): 1-29.

Karen Ho. 2009. “Introduction: Anthropology Goes to Wall Street.” *Liquidated: An Ethnography of Wall Street.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press. pp.1-38