PH.D.-KURSER FORÅR 2010

Institut for Statskundskab,
Aarhus Universitet

i samarbejde med

Institut for Statskundskab,
Syddansk Universitet

INSTITUT FOR STATSKUNDSKAB
DET SAMFUNDSVIDENSKABELIGE FAKULTET
AARHUS UNIVERSITET

INDHOLDSFORTEGNELSE

KURSER I FORÅRET 2010 3

GOOD RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND APPROPRIATE FRAMEWORKS (5 ECTS) 4

SOCIAL RESEARCH AS A CRAFT (10 ects) 7

KVANTITATIV METODE (10 ECTS): 10

TILMELDINGSBLANKET: 13

KURSER I FORÅRET 2010

I foråret 2010 udbyder Institut for Statskundskab tre kurser.

Kurserne fokuserer på at forbedre deltagernes forskningsmæssige og praktiske færdigheder. Derfor skal deltagerne løbende diskutere de gennemgåede metoder og relatere dem til konkrete politologiske problemstillinger.

Såfremt der er plads, fyldes kurserne op med overbygningsstuderende, men det faglige niveau sættes efter, at deltagerne efter kurserne på kvalificeret vis skal kunne lave en ph.d.-afhandling med brug af de på kurset gennemgåede metoder. Undervisningen er lagt an på, at kursisternes eget materiale og egne problemstillinger spiller en stor rolle. Kurset egner sig derfor bedst for kursister, der er i gang med eller står overfor at skulle lave et større videnskabeligt arbejde (ph.d. afhandling eller speciale). Undervisning og opgaver vil blive differentieret efter deltagernes forudsætninger og forskningsfelt.

Rækkefølgen af kurserne er som følger:

26. januar – 3 marts 2010 (kl. 10.00-12.30):

Good Research Questions and Appropriate Frameworks (Georg Sørensen & Kasper Lippert Rasmussen)

Lokale oplyses senere

5. februar – 19. marts 2010 (kl. 10.00-15.00):

Social Research as a Craft (Asbjørn Sonne Nørgaard, Svend-Erik Skaaning)

Lokale oplyses senere

25.marts – 20. maj 2010 (kl. 10.00-14.00):

Kvantitativ metode (Robert Klemmensen & Jens Peter Frølund Thomsen)

Undervisningen finder sted i Bygning 1332, lokale 115

Tilmelding til alle kurser senest 6. januar 2010

Tilmeldingsskema på
http://www.samfundsvidenskab.au.dk/da/forskning/phd-skolen/faglige-programmer/statskundskab/kurser/kurser-foraar-2010/

eller på det særlige skema sidst i denne pjece.

Yderligere oplysninger kan fås hos:
Anne-Grethe Gammelgaard • Institut for Statskundskab • Aarhus Universitet • Bartholins Allé • Bygning 1331 • 8000 Århus C
E-mail: agg@ps.au.dk

Good Research Questions and Appropriate Frameworks (5 ECTS)

Georg Sørensen & Kasper Lippert Rasmussen
Department of Political Science, University of Aarhus

Time: 10.00-12.30 on the following days: 26 January • 3 February • 10 February • 17 February • 24 February • 3 March

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course wants to emphasize the necessity and core relevance of problem-driven and theory-driven research as crucial undertakings in the study of politics. In so doing the course raises a series of meta-theoretical and other issues relevant for any research project. It will help students clarify what kind of ambitions and directions are the most productive and helpful ones in their own research. It will also elucidate major aspects of the ontological and epistemological context that is necessary for any project.

How to do the best possible political science—what are the criteria for a successful project? Do those criteria concern the employment of certain methods, the engagement with particular substantial issues, or are some other criteria more relevant? In recent years, there has been a tendency to focus on the employment of a certain set of methods; those methods, in turn, are frequently reduced to techniques that most often concern various aspects of data processing.

Method-driven research is a legitimate undertaking and sophisticated quantitative and qualitative techniques are certainly useful. But the study politics cannot and must not be reduced to method-driven research for the simple reason that there are only relatively few areas in which such techniques can be applied meaningfully.

> *The subject matter of politics is so causally complex and so normatively infused that honest researchers can only make ordinal probabilistic statements on most important political topics, of the following form: Our best judgment is that X is less likely to be true than Y (Smith 2002: 202).*

> *… political science has veered heavily, in recent years, toward methods at the expense of substance. … our discipline could become intellectually narrowed by an overemphasis on methods; that we could exclude fascinating political problems, which our discipline should help understand, because we cannot deal with them (Keohane 2003: 9).*

We want to argue that any research project should begin with theoretically informed questions about substantial issues. This can be called problem-driven and theory-driven research. Such research has room for all kinds of methodologies of course, but it sets those methodologies in a larger framework which reflects on theory, substance, and the choice of appropriate approaches.

COURSE PLAN

26 January 2010

1. Where does a good research question come from? The debate about research design in political science and the possible advantages of a study driven by problems and theory rather than method.

- Rogers Smith (2002). 'Should we make political science more of a science or more about politics?', *PS, Political Science and Politics*, 35(2): 199-204.
- Susanne Hoeber Rudolph (2002): 'In defense of diverse forms of knowledge', *PS, Political Science and Politics*, 35(2): 193-97.

- Robert Keohane (2003). 'Disciplinary Schizophrenia: Implications for graduate education in political science', *Qualitative Methods*, Spring, 9-12.
- Samuel Barkin (2007). 'What defines research as qualitative?', *International Studies Review*, 9: 754-58.
- Gerry Stoker and David Marsh (2002). 'Introduction', pp. 1-17 in Stoker and Marsh (eds), *Theory and Methods in Political Science*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Richard Snyder (2007). 'The Human Dimension of Comparative Research', PP. 1-31 in GL Munck and R Snyder, *Passion, Craft, and Method in Comparative Politics*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins.

Student assignment: write a 2-3-page essay on the basis of the major sources of the research question(s) you intend to explore. Reflect briefly on what are the best sources of good research questions.

3 February 2010

2. Ontology and epistemology: where do I belong and why? We take the cue from Samuel Barkin: "We should begin with the principles of epistemology, methodology, and research design. The major issues confronting political science scholars do not correlate with a quantitative/qualitative design" and from Robert Keohane: "Ontology suggests that students should study contingency, unintended consequences of historical conjunctures, leadership, and models of complexity. … Be broad – work across subfields … think about concepts and theorizing before grabbing operational indicators and running regressions". In other words, we need the broadest possible ideas about our options in terms of interesting questions and different ways of approaching them.

- David Marsh and Paul Furlong (2002). 'A Skin not a sweater: Ontology and Epistemology in Political Science', pp. 17-45 in Stoker and Marsh (eds), *Theory and Methods in Political Science*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jonathon Moses and Torbjørn Knutsen (2007). 'Introduction', pp 1-19 in Moses and Knutsen, *Ways of Knowing*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Steve Smith (1995). 'The self-images of a discipline: A genealogy of international relations theory', pp. 1-37 in Ken Booth & Steve Smith (eds), *International Relations Theory Today*, Pennsylvania: Penn State University Press.
- Atul Kohli, Peter Evans, Peter Katzenstein, Adam Przeworski, Susanne H. Rudolph, James C. Scott, Theda Skocpol (1996). 'The role of theory in comparative politics: A Symposium' *World Politics*, 48(1): 1-49.

Student assignment: write a 2-3-page essay situating your project in the ontological and epistemological landscape; why have you made these choices?

10 February 2010

3. Values in political science: Values have an uncertain and contested place in political science. On the one hand, like ontological assumptions, value assumptions play an important and ineradicable role in political science. Clearly, epistemic values do as well when political scientists favor one explanation over another because it is more fruitful, more economical, or, for other reasons, better. Moreover, moral values often define, and legitimately so, research questions asked and explanations offered (as when moral values lie behind the sorting of different causally relevant conditions into causes, on the one hand, and background factors, on the other hand). On the other hand, many political scientists believe that values, unlike facts, express mere personal preferences, are not truth-apt, and in the end cannot be discussed rationally. This session explores this tension. It offers illustration of the different ways in which values assumptions play a role in political science and reflects on the extent to which such influence is avoidable and illegitimate. Also, it offers a brief survey of some of the recent reflections on the epistemic justifiability of value judgments.

- Daniels, N. (1979). 'Wide Reflective Equilibrium and Theory Acceptance in Ethics' *Journal of Philosophy*, 76(5): 256-82.
- Mackie, J. *Ethics: Inventing Right and Wrong*, excerpts.

- Brink, David (1989). *Moral Realism and the Foundation of Ethics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, excerpts.
- Various brief excerpts from political science articles etc.
- Myrdal, Gunnar (1969). *Objectivity in Social Research*, New York: Pantheon Books.

Student assignment: Identify one or more value assumptions that seem to underpin your research project. Reflect on how it(/they) influences(/influence) your project and whether this influence is problematic.(2-3 page essay).

17 February 2010

4. Are there benefits of mixing it up? In recent years a number of scholars argue in favour of some form of eclecticism, mixing approaches coming from different traditions. Others argue that this is an impossible undertaking because once a certain framework is adopted it excludes other frameworks based on different premises and assumptions. Where should we stand on this?

- Sanford F Schram (forthcoming). *Political Science Research: From Theory to Practice, International Encyclopedia of Political Science*
- Nuno P. Monteiro and Keven G. Ruby (2009). 'IR and the false promise of philosophical foundations', *International Theory*, 1(1): 15-48.
- Peter Katzenstein and Rudra Sil (2008). 'Theorizing in the Study and Practice of International Relations', pp. 109-31 in C. Reus-Smit and D. Snidal, *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*, Oxford: OUP.
- Jack Levy (2001). 'Explaining Events and Developing Theories: History, Political Science, and the Analysis of International Relations', pp. 39-83 i C. Elman and MF Elman, *Bridges and Boundaries*, Cambridge: MIT.
- Georg Sørensen (2008). 'The Case for Combining Material Forces and Ideas in the Study of IR', *European Journal of International Relations*, 14(5): 5-32.
- Jörg Friedrichs and Friedrich Kratochwil (2009). 'On Acting and Knowing: How Pragmatism Can Advance International Relations Research and Methodology', *International Organization*, 63(Fall): 701-31.

Student assignment: Are you mixing up your project in terms of combining different approaches and theories from different traditions? Why or why not? Write a 2-3-page essay on the subject.

24 February 2010

5. Major contributions in political science: What did they say and how did they say it? This session looks at some of the most quoted contributions to our discipline over the last 25 years, seeking to clarify their qualities in terms of problem-focus, ontological and epistemological foundation, use of theory and method, etc.

- Francis Fukuyama (1989). 'The end of history?' *The National Interest*.
- Samuel Huntington (1993). 'The Clash of Civilizations?', *Foreign Affairs*
- Terry Moe (1984). 'The New Economics of Organization', http://www.jstor.org/stable/2110997
- Charles Taylor (1994). 'The Politics of Recognition', in Amy Gutmann (ed), *Examining the Politics of Recognition*, Princeton: Princeton UP.
- Pierre Bordieu (1997). 'I statens ånd', pp. 97-135 i Bordieu, *Af praktiske grunde*, København: Hans Reitzel.

Student assignment: Which of these contributions is the best and why? 2-3 page essay.

3 March 2010

6. Defining your own contribution: What do I have to say and how will I say it? This session uses your own work as basis. You must provide a 2-3 page overview defining your project and the debate to which you want to contribute. The samples will be discussed in light of the seminars' insights on problems, theory, and method.

- Stephen van Evera: 'Helpful hints on writing a political science dissertation', pp. 97-128 in *Guide to methods for students of political science*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Papers from students, 4-5 pp.

SOCIAL RESEARCH AS A CRAFT (10 ects)

Asbjørn Sonne Nørgaard, Institut for Statskundskab, Syddansk Universitet, Odense
Svend-Erik Skaaning, Institut for Statskundskab, Aarhus Universitet

Time: 10.00-15.00 on the following days: 5. February • 12 February • 19 February • 26 February • 5 March • 12 March • 19 March 2010

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

All researchers, young or old, who are in the process of making a large scholarly analysis, are faced with a set of common challenges that relates to the art and craft of making a good study. Social science in general and political science in particular, is not an easily defined type of work or process. Even a superficial inspection of the articles appearing in scholarly journals will reveal an almost infinite number of themes covered, an abundant use of research methods signifying a plurality of ideals of best practice, and a true myriad of seemingly relevant sources and data. Notwithstanding the absence of agreed upon shared standards of good science, most scholars agree that doing good social science is also a craft – a craft that can be learned.

This course is an invitation to PhD scholars who want to learn more about how to systematically tackle some of the issues pertaining to the craft of making good social science. We will only pay scant attention to the different techniques of data collection and analysis (interviewing techniques, statistical methods, etc.), and there will be no thematic umbrella for the course, although themes related to political science will be in focus.

The teachers, Asbjørn Sonne Nørgaard and Svend-Erik Skaaning, are political scientists with a broad interest in comparative politics, historical sociology, public administration, public policy, and methodology. Our methodological point of departure is the scholarly conventions that guide mainstream empirical social science. This implies that we as scholars develop theoretically informed hypotheses about the social world and hold open the possibility that these hypotheses can be proven wrong depending upon the results of empirical analysis. Unless we can be proven wrong we can never be proven right either.

The focus of the seminar will be on the interplay between the 'Why, What, and How' of the research design and process. The correspondence between the motivation and normative concern of a research project (the why) and a particular research question is never one to one. There are always more ways to pose a research question. A concern for the practice of local government may lead to an interest in the cause and effect of governance networks. But it could also focus on the role of professionals, central government regulation and incentives, the role of unions, etc. A concern for governance networks is compatible with numerous research questions and numerous perspectives, e.g. in relation to policy processes and impacts, democratic participation, accountability, party politics, etc.

However, particularly the relation between 'what' and 'how' is open-ended and debatable from a craft perspective. Continuing the example of governance networks, should the study be a few cases in-depth analysis of the policy-making process in one or two localities, and if so, should it mainly be based on interviews, observation, or written records; should it be a broad comparative study based on surveys and other large data bases; etc.

The trust of the course is that any research project can be improved by paying more attention to the additional ways and means to probe ones themes of interest. Even if you yourself are neither posing these additional questions nor making these additional analyses, awareness of the fact that they are relevant will make your own study better and more focused.

THEMES:

In particular, we will focus on the following themes:

Social science as a craft vis-à-vis history and the humanities:

- Thinking in units and variables
- Thinking in sources and data
- Description, interpretation and explanation
- Causality and causal modeling
- Improving research questions: the double relevance demand
- Drawing inference: analytical and statistical inference/generalization
- Correlational evidence versus sequence and process

Case-studies, comparative enquiry, statistics, (quasi-)experiments

LITERATURE:

The main text books are Gary King et al. (1994), *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*, Princeton UP (required to buy) and John Gerring (2010), Social Science Methodology, Cambridge UP (download from Gerring's homepage).

COURSE REQUIREMENTS:

All participants produce a 3 to 5 pages description of their project. All project descriptions will be distributed to the participants.

Each project description includes:

- A brief declaration of intent
- The research question/problem to be studied, and preferably propositions/hypotheses
- A comment on relevance of the project and the literature which the project is debating
- A brief account of the research design
- A brief discussion of the data and sources of the project
- And if relevant, preliminary findings

A revised 2 pages project description is produced during the course.

COURSE PLAN:

The course is organized as six meetings, each time five hours. Half of the time, we will have lectures and discussions of one or more themes. In the other half, we will discuss the participants' project descriptions.

Lesson 1: 5 February 2010: On Science and Social Science

- The triangle subject-theory-method
- What is science?
- What is social science?
- Tension between cultural embeddedness, individual choice, and patterns of behavior
- The role of rationality

Lesson 2: 12 February 2010: On Modelling and Proposing to the World

Theory, conceptualization and variable specification

- From research problem to propositions
- From general relationships to specified hypotheses
- Causation and causal hypotheses
- Complex causation and the theory of controls
- Cross-sectional vs. cross-time modeling: problems of time

Lesson 3: 19 February 2010: On Data and Its Dangers

- The selection of observations (max plausible variation on independent variables)
- Operationalization (indicators, scales, counting - or not)
- Data sources (problems of obtrusiveness, bias and incomplete perspectives)

Lesson 4: 26 February 2010: On Testing and Drawing Inference

- Description and pattern-finding (central tendencies and variance)
- Inference and generalization ('significance', the null hypothesis)
- Statistical v. analytical generalization
- Different tests: experiments, quasi-experiments, matched comparison, case studies
- Matched comparison: maximize leverage over data, rigor of inference

Lesson 5: 5 March 2010: Work Shop

- Revised project descriptions: Subject, Theory, Method
- Choices and justification
- Theory, propositions, data and operationalization, testing and logic of inference
- Presentation, comments and discussion

Lesson 6: 12 March 2010:
What is the Good of Social Science? Heuristics and knowledge production in the social science perspective

- Practice: Does anyone actually do it?
- Normative concerns?
- Alternative research strategies and perspectives
- The teachers (or a guest teacher) present one of their own research projects and the choices and challenges they have addressed.

Lesson 7: 19 March 2010:
Additional session if many participants

LANGUAGE

The course will be held in English unless all participants are fluent in one of the Scandinavian languages. In that case, we will speak Danish.

GRADING

All participants are graded passed or not passed. The evaluation is based on active participation in the course and the presentation of their project.

KVANTITATIV METODE (10 ECTS):

ved Robert Klemmensen, Institut for Statskundskab, Syddansk Universitet
Jens Peter Frølund Thomsen, Institut for Statskundskab, Aarhus Universitet

Tid: Kl. 10.00-14.00 på følgende dage: 25. marts • 8. april • 15. april • 11. april • 29. april • 6. maj • 20. maj 2010

KURSUSBESKRIVELSE

De fleste beskæftiger sig med statskundskab, fordi de ønsker at få indsigt i samfundsmæssige fænomeners indbyrdes sammenhæng. Hvad er årsag, og hvad er effekt? Vi vil især gerne finde årsagerne til, at fænomener ser ud, som de gør. I så henseende er kvantitativ metode et nyttigt redskab. Denne metode giver os mulighed for at få overblik over store datamængder og identificere sammenhænge mellem variable. Solid dataanalyse forudsætter imidlertid en række færdigheder, og sådanne færdigheder bliver mere og mere centrale kompetencer både inden for forskningsverdenen og i forhold til omverdenens krav til statskundskabskandidater. Dette seminar har til formål at opøve brug af kontrol- og kausalitetslogik og gøre deltagerne bedre til at anvende kvantitative metoder som analyseredskaber. Seminaret genopfrisker og udvikler derfor deltagernes evner til at behandle og analysere kvantitative data, og alle teknikkerne afprøves i praksis. Efter seminaret skal deltagerne selv være i stand til at konstruere kausalmodeller, konstruere indeks, lave spørgeskemaer og analysere kvantitative data på tilfredsstillende vis.

Seminaret består af tre hoveddele. For det første sætter vi fokus på kontrol- og kausalitetslogik, der videre vil være seminarets bærende fundament. For det andet skal vi drøfte, hvordan vi med kvantitative metoder kobler teori og empiri. Vi skal f.eks. udvikle kvantitative indikatorer for komplekse begreber og arbejde med konstruktion af spørgeskemaer og stikprøveudvælgelse. Endelig skal vi for det tredje blive bedre til at udnytte kvantitative data bedst muligt. Vi skal med andre ord beskæftige os med analysen af datamaterialerne. I den forbindelse fokuserer vi på anvendelsen af centrale teknikker inden for statskundskaben, herunder især lineær regression og faktoranalyse.

Et vigtigt formål med seminaret er at forbedre deltagernes praktiske færdigheder. Derfor skal deltagerne løbende anvende metoderne på konkrete politologiske problemstillinger. Hver uge får deltagerne en konkret opgave (f.eks. konstruktion af spørgsmål til et spørgeskema). Disse opgaver løses skriftligt, afleveres til underviserne og udgør eksamen i seminaret. Underviserne giver en faglig tilbagemelding på hver opgave, herunder om den kan godkendes, men der gives ikke karakterer.

Som nævnt efterspørges færdigheder inden for dataindsamling og dataanalyse både inden for og uden for forskningsverdenen, og seminaret er derfor relevant både for overbygningsstuderende og ph.d. stipendiater. Deltagerne skal imidlertid være indstillet på et ret højt fagligt niveau og store krav til arbejdsindsatsen, eftersom kurset også udbydes som et ph.d.-kursus. Der undervises torsdage fra klokken 10.00 i syv uger.

LITTERATURLISTE

Seminaret vil bl.a. bruge følgende litteratur (i uddrag):

- Agresti & B. Finlay (1997) *Statistical Methods for the Social Sciences*, third edition, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall (genopfriskning)
- Diamantopoulos, Adamantios; Winklhofer, Heidi M. (2001) "Index Construction with Formative Indicators: An Alternative to Scale Development", *Journal of Marketing Research*, 38(2): 269-277.
- Gujarati, Damodar N. (2003). *Basic Econometrics*, Boston: McGrawHill.
- Kempf-Leonard, Kimberly, Editor-in-Chief (2005) *Encyclopedia of Social Measurement*, Elsevier.
  (Vi bruger forskellige artikler fra denne encyklopædi. Der er online adgang fra universitets maskiner på http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/referenceworks/0123693985).

- Rosenberg, Morris (1968) *The Logic of Survey Analysis*, New York, London: Basic Books.
- Rummel, R. J. (1967)'Understanding Factor Analysis', *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 11(4): 444-80.

TILMELDINGSBLANKET:

Jeg ønsker at tilmelde mig følgende af de udbudte kurser:

❑ **Good Research Questions and Approprite Frameworks (5 ECTS)**
ved Georg Sørensen og Kasper Lippert Rasmussen,
26. januar • 3. februar • 10. februar • 17. februar • 24. februar • 3. marts (kl. 10.00-12.30)
Århus Universitet, bygning og lokale oplyses senere

❑ **Social Research as a Craft (10 ECTS)**
ved Asbjørn Sonne Nørgaard og Svend-Erik Skaaning
5. februar • 12. februar • 19. februar • 26. februar • 5. marts • 12. marts • 19. marts (kl. 10.00-15.00)
Århus Universitet, bygning og lokale oplyses senere

❑ **Kvantitativ metode (10 ECTS):**
ved Robert Klemmensen og Jens Peter Frølund Thomsen
25. marts • 8. april • 15. april • 22. april • 29. april • 6. maj • 20. maj (kl. xx-xx)
Århus Universitet, bygning 1332, lokale 115

Navn: _____

_____

Ansættelsessted: _____

_____

E-mail: _____

Indsendes senest 6. januar 2010 til:
Anne-Grethe Gammelgaard agg@ps.au.dk • Institut for Statskundskab • Aarhus Universitet • Bartholins Allé 7, Bygning 1331 • 8000 Århus C
eller på:
http://www.samfundsvidenskab.au.dk/da/forskning/phd-skolen/faglige-programmer/statskundskab/kurser/kurser-foraar-2010/

Institut for Statskundskab
Aarhus Universitet
Bartholins Allé, bygning 1331
8000 Århus C

Tlf.: 89421111

www.au.dk/statskundskab