

Sociology 260
Monday 2:00-5:00
Brown University

James Mahoney
410 Maxcy Hall
Office Hours: TBA

HISTORICAL SOCIOLOGY

This course provides a broad introduction to the field of historical sociology. The overall objective is to help students understand, appreciate, and critique excellent works of historical sociology. These skills in turn should help students who want to pursue research in this field to create their own excellent works of historical sociology.

The course workload falls into three categories: readings, weekly assignments, and seminar participation. The readings include both substantive studies of historical sociology (mostly books) and writings that discuss issues related to methodology, approach, and theory application (mostly articles). The overall organization of the syllabus is roughly to alternate between substantive studies and readings on method, approach, and theory.

There are seven assigned books, which can be purchased at the Brown Bookstore. In addition, there is a large course packet, which can be purchased at Alegra Copy Center (corner of Washington and Thayer). Many of the assigned articles not included in the course packet must be downloaded from JSTOR. The syllabus indicates which articles are in the packet, and which ones are to be downloaded from JSTOR.

Each week (starting on Feb. 7) students will be asked to turn in a short assignment. The assignments will generally require students to analyze a substantive reading in light of a key methodological issue or problem; they are intended to encourage students to think about the substantive readings in light of the issues raised in the explicitly analytical readings. These assignments will involve short essays and/or other exercises (e.g., creating charts and graphs). Because students may be especially busy during certain parts of the semester, they need only complete 9 of the 12 short assignments during the semester.

Seminar participation and discussion are crucial to the success of this course. I ask students to come to class each week prepared to discuss at least one key issue from the readings. I also expect students to be prepared to react to and discuss the issues raised by others. I will try to provide a comfortable setting that encourages exploration, exchange, and student fellowship.

The final grade for the course will be based on the following calculation:

Weekly Assignments: 60 percent of final grade.
Seminar Participation: 40 percent of final grade.

1. Introduction to the Field (January 31)

Skocpol, Theda, "Sociology's Historical Imagination," in Theda Skocpol, ed., *Vision and Method in Historical Sociology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984). [Packet]

Mahoney, James, and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, "Comparative Historical Analysis: Achievements and Agendas," in James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, eds., *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

Adams, Julia, Elisabeth S. Clemens, and Ann Shola Orloff, eds., "Social Theory, Modernity and the Three Waves of Historical Sociology," in Julia Adams, Elisabeth S. Clemens, and Ann Shola Orloff, *Remaking Modernity: Politics and Processes in Historical Sociology* (Duke University Press, forthcoming). [Packet]

2. Exemplar #1: Skocpol on Social Revolutions (Feb. 7)

Skocpol, Theda, *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia, and China* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), introduction and part 1.

Mahoney, James, "Nominal, Ordinal, Narrative Appraisal in Macrocausal Analysis," *American Journal of Sociology* 104 (January 1999), pp. 1154-1196 (esp. pp. 1154-1169). [JSTOR]

3. Debates over Small-N Analysis (Feb. 14)

Skocpol, Theda, *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia, and China* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), part 2.

Lieberson, Stanley, "Small N's and Big Conclusions: An Examination of the Reasoning in Comparative Studies Based on a Small Number of Cases," *Social Forces* 70: 2 (December 1991), pp. 307-320. [JSTOR]

Goldthorpe, John H., "Current Issues in Comparative Macrosociology: A Debate on Methodological Issues," *Comparative Social Research* 16 (1997), pp. 1-26. [Packet]

Rueschemeyer, Dietrich, and John D. Stephens, "Comparing Historical Sequences – A Powerful Tool for Causal Analysis," *Comparative Social Research* 16 (1997), pp. 55-72. [Packet]

Mahoney, James, "Strategies of Causal Assessment in Comparative Historical Analysis," in James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, eds., *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

4. Exemplar #2: Marx on Race and Nation (Feb. 28)

Marx, Anthony W., *Making Race and Nation: A Comparison of South Africa, the United States, and Brazil* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

5. The Debate over General Theory (March 7)

Skocpol, Theda, and Margaret Somers, "The Uses of Comparative History in Macrosocial Inquiry," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 22: 2 (1980), pp. 174-197. [JSTOR]

Kiser, Edgar, and Michael Hechter, "The Role of General Theory in Comparative-Historical Sociology," *American Journal of Sociology* 97: 1 (1991), pp. 1-30. [JSTOR]

Quadagno, Jill, and Stan J. Knapp, "Have Historical Sociologists Forsaken Theory? Thoughts on the History/Theory Relationship," *Sociological Methods and Research* 20: 4 (May 1992), pp. 481-507. [Packet]

Somers, Margaret R. "‘We’re No Angels’: Realism, Rational Choice, and Relationality in Social Science," *American Journal of Sociology* 104: 3 (November 1998), pp. 722-784. [JSTOR]

Mahoney, James, "Revisiting General Theory in Historical Sociology," *Social Forces* (December 2004). [Online or from me]

6. Exemplar #3: Gorski on Calvinism and States (March 14)

Gorski, Philip S., *The Disciplinary Revolution : Calvinism and the Rise of the State in Early Modern Europe* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003).

7. Conceptions of Time, Uses of Historical Narrative (March 21)

Abbott, Andrew, "Transcending General Linear Reality," *Sociological Theory* 6 (1988), pp. 169-186. [JSTOR]

Pierson, Paul. "Big, Slow-Moving, and . . . Invisible: Macrosocial Processes in the Study of Comparative Politics," in James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, eds., *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

Griffin, Larry J., "Narrative, Event-Structure Analysis, and Causal Interpretation in Historical Sociology," *American Journal of Sociology* 98: 5 (March 1993), pp. 1094-1133. [JSTOR]

Issac, Larry W., and Larry J. Griffin, "Ahistoricism in Time-Series Analysis," *American Sociological Review* 54 (1989), pp. 873-890. [JSTOR]

Haydu, Jeffrey. "Making Use of the Past: Time Periods as Cases to Compare and as Sequences of Problem Solving," *American Journal of Sociology* 104 (1998), pp. 339-371. [JSTOR]

8. Exemplar #4: Charrad on States and Women's Rights (April 4)

Charrad, Mourina M. *States and Women's Rights: The Making of Postcolonial Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001).

9. Sequences and Path Dependence (April 11)

Aminzade, Ronald, "Historical Sociology and Time," *Sociological Methods and Research* 20 (May 1992), pp. 456-480. [Packet]

Collier, Ruth Berins and David Collier, *Shaping the Political Arena: Critical Junctures, the Labor Movement, and Regime Dynamics in Latin America* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press), pp. 3-39. [Packet]

James Mahoney, "Path Dependence in Historical Sociology," *Theory and Society* 29:4 (August 2000), pp. 507-548. [Packet]

Pierson, Paul. "Increasing Returns, Path Dependence, and the Study of Politics." *American Political Science Review* 94 (2000), pp. 251-67. [JSTOR]

Thelen, Kathleen, "How Institutions Evolve: Insights from Comparative Historical Analysis," in James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, eds., *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

10. Exemplar #5: Kimeldorf on Labor Radicalism (April 18)

Kimeldorf, Howard, *Reds or Rackets?: The Making of Radical and Conservative Unions on the Waterfront* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988).

11. Using and Citing Sources (April 25)

Goldthorpe, John, "The Uses of History in Sociology: Reflections on Some Recent Tendencies," *British Journal of Sociology* 42 (1991), pp. 211-230. [JSTOR]

Lustick, Ian, "History, Historiography, and Political Science: Multiple Historical Records and the Problem of Selection Bias," *American Political Science Review* 90 (1996), pp. 605-618. [JSTOR]

Mariampolski, Hyman, and Dana C. Hughes, "The Use of Personal Documents in Historical Sociology," *The American Sociologist* 13 (May 1978), pp. 104-113. [Packet]

Dibble, Vernon K, "Four Types of Inference From Documents to Events," *History and Theory* 3 (1963), pp. 203-221. [JSTOR]

Milligan, John D., "The Treatment of an Historical Source," *History and Theory* 18: 2 (1979), pp. 177-196. [JSTOR]

Tosh, John, *The Pursuit of History: Aims, Methods, and New Directions in the Study of Modern History* (Harlow, England: Longman, 2000), pp. 36-70. [Packet]

12. Explaining English Development: Pick Any 3 (May 2)

Barrington Moore, Jr. *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1967), Introduction, Chapters 1 and 7. [Packet]

Downing, Brian M., *The Military Revolution and Political Change: Origins of Democracy and Autocracy in Early Modern Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), Chapters 1-3 and Chapter 7. [Packet]

Fulbrook, Mary, *Piety and Politics: Religion and the Rise of Absolutism in England, Wurttemberg and Prussia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), Chapters 1 and 5. [Packet]

Anderson, Perry, *Lineages of the Absolutist State* (London: Verso, 1974), Foreword, Chapters 1-2 and Chapter 5. [Packet]

Wallerstein, Immanuel, *The Modern World System I: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century* (San Diego: Academic Press, 1974), pp. 3-11; 225-262. [Packet]

Wallerstein, Immanuel, *The Modern World System III: The Second Era of Great Expansion of The Capitalist World Economy, 1730-1840s* (San Diego: Academic Press, 1989), pp. 3-33.

[Packet]

Mann, Michael, *The Sources of Social Power II: The Rise of Classes and Nation-States, 1760-1914* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993), chapter 4. [Packet]

Goldstone, Jack A., “Efflorescences and Economic Growth in World History: Rethinking the ‘Rise of the West’ and the Industrial Revolution,” *Journal of World History* 13: 2. (2002), pp. 323-389. [Online, we think]

Lachmann, Richard, *Capitalists in Spite of Themselves: Elite Conflict and Economic Transitions in Early Modern Europe* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), chaps. 1 and 2. [Packet]

Ertman, Thomas, *The Birth of the Leviathan: Building States and Regimes in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), chaps. 1 and 4. [Packet]

Rueschemeyer, Dietrich, Evelyne Huber Stephens, and John D. Stephens, *Capitalist Development and Democracy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), chaps. 1, 2, and 4. [Packet]

13. Formal Methods: fs/QCA (May 9)

Ragin, Charles C. *Fuzzy-Set Social Science* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000).

Mahoney, James. “Long-Run Development and the Legacy of Colonialism in Spanish America,” *American Journal of Sociology* 109:1 (July 2003), pp. 50-106. [Online]

NOTE: Please feel free to use or modify the following assignments. You can simply cite the original exercise as follows: “This exercise is a modified version of an assignment originally formulated in James Mahoney, “Historical Sociology,” Graduate Seminar, Brown University, Spring 2005.

**Assignment #1:
Diagramming Narrative in Light of a Causal Argument: Skocpol**

1. Read the first part of Skocpol’s *States and Social Revolutions* (pp. xi to 155) and Mahoney’s “Nominal, Ordinal, and Narrative Appraisal” (pp. 1154-1169).
2. Develop a diagram that summarizes Skocpol’s narrative for either state breakdown in China (pp. 67-80) or state breakdown in Russia (pp. 81-99). This diagram should roughly parallel the diagram that I created for state breakdown in France in figure 1 (pp. 1166-1167) of the article. You can use the same kinds of boxes as me if you like. Also, you can draw this diagram by hand.
3. Note that you do not have to include every single piece of Skocpol’s narrative in your diagram. Focus on those parts of the narrative that fit into the overall causal argument as presented by me in the article. That is, focus on those parts of the narrative that are related to the variables of agrarian backwardness, international pressure, state autonomy, and state breakdown.
4. Include a short and informal (e.g., 1-3 pages) discussion that reflects on the diagram that you have created. Your discussion may discuss problems that arose in diagramming the narrative.
5. Please note that this exercise is *very* difficult; it is also quite time consuming (but I know you have time during the first weeks!). I had great difficulty reconstructing Skocpol’s narrative on these pages. Thus, don’t be discouraged if you feel like your diagram can’t be made to fit neatly into all boxes like figure 1 of the article. I am positive that you’ll have to go through multiple attempts before you get something that seems at all right. So just do the best you can, and we’ll talk about the exercise in class.
6. The exercise is due in class on Monday, Feb. 7.

**Assignment #2:
Cases, Outcome, Explanation, and Test: Skocpol, Part II**

1. Transcribe the questions in the handout "Cases, Outcome, Explanation, and Test" (opposite page) onto your computer.
2. Fill in the answers for the second half of Skocpol's book, *States and Social Revolutions* (pp. 161-283). Please feel free to keep your answers short. Skocpol's argument in this part is complex, and you do not have to try to fully cover all aspects of the argument.
3. Please hand in your completed exercise in class on February 14.

Cases, Outcome, Explanation, and Test

1. Cases

- 1a. What cases are compared?
- 1b. What is the level of analysis of the cases (e.g., national level, individual level)?
- 1c. Are the cases compared across time, or at one point in time?

2. Outcome

- 2a. What outcome/s (dependent variable/s) is/are being explained?
- 2b. How specifically does the author define this outcome/s?
- 2d. What are the major similarities and contrasts among cases in terms of the outcome/s?
- 2e. Why are these similarities and contrasts interesting or important?
- 2f. Does the author use a clear label and vivid label for the outcome/s?
- 2g. What data does the author use to measure the outcome/s?

3. Explanation

- 3a. What is (are) the principal explanation(s) (independent variable[s]) being considered?
- 3b. How specifically does the author define the independent variable/s?
- 3c. What are the similarities/contrasts among cases in terms of the independent variables?
- 3d. Are the independent variables associated with a larger framework or theory?
- 3e. If there is more than one independent variables, how are they related in time?
- 3f. What is the "causal mechanism" that makes the explanation plausible?
- 3g. What data does the author use to measure the independent variable?

4. Test

- 4a. How does the author test the explanation?
- 4b. Does the author test for a "causal mechanism"?
- 4c. Do the tests seriously consider rival explanations?
- 4d. Do you find the test to be convincing?

Assignment #3:
Debating Methodological Issues in Marx's *Making Race and Nation*:
Lieberson and Goldthorpe vs. Rueschemeyer and Stephens

3. Pretend that you are Stanley Lieberson and John Goldthorpe. As these authors, write a critical review of Marx's *Making Race and Nation* (pp. xi – 190) focusing on methodological issues. Your review should be no more than 700 words. You should discuss the substance of Marx's work in light of the methodological issues that concern Lieberson and Goldthorpe. Since you are pretending to be Lieberson and Goldthorpe, you'll want to state your case as strongly as possible.
4. Now pretend that you are Dietrich Rueschemeyer and John Stephens. Write a rejoinder to your previous essay in which you try to rebut the arguments of Lieberson and Goldthorpe. Again, your rebuttal should focus on the substance of Marx's book (pp. xi – 190), including specific examples. The rejoinder should be no more than 700 words.
5. Finally, pretend that you are yourself. Write another rejoinder in which you weigh in with your own views regarding the debate between Lieberson/Goldthorpe and Rueschemeyer/Stephens. This rejoinder should again draw on the material from Marx's book (pp. xi – 190), and it may be up to 400 words in length.
6. This assignment is due in class on Feb. 28.

Assignment #4:
Sorting Out the Debate over General Theory in Historical Sociology

Read the articles by Kiser and Hechter, Quadagno and Knapp, Somers, and Mahoney. Then write an essay on **one** of the topics below. Your essay should be double spaced and no more than 1,500 words in length.

1. Kiser and Hechter as well as Mahoney believe that there is a place for general theory in historical sociology. However, these authors disagree about many issues. Compare and contrast the authors with respect to several of the following issues: a) the definition/understanding of general theory; b) the relationship between general theory and non-general theory; c) the relationship between general theory and methodology; d) the role of induction and deduction in general theory; e) the benefits of general theory; f) the relationship between rational choice theory and general theory; and g) the extent of the use of general theory by Skocpol and other comparative-historical researchers.

2. Quadagno and Knapp as well as Somers are quite critical of Kiser and Hechter's argument. But these critics employ different strategies for rebutting Kiser and Hechter, and they end up advocating different visions of the theoretical strengths of historical sociology. Write an essay that offers: a) a summary of the main criticisms of Kiser and Hechter emphasized by these two sets of critics; b) an overview of the similarities and differences in the critics' understandings of the real strengths of historical sociology; and c) a discussion of the different epistemological assumptions (e.g., assumptions about how we can best learn about the social world) and/or ontological assumptions (e.g., assumptions about what entities make up the world) of Somers versus Quadagno and Knapp.

**Assignment #5:
Method, Theory, and Argument in Gorski**

Read the Gorski book, *The Disciplinary Revolution*, and then answer at least three of the following questions. Most questions will require an answer a few paragraphs in length and/or the creation of a table or figure.

1. Why does Gorski reject (in part) the theories of state formation proposed by Anderson, Wallerstein, and Ertman? Does Gorski use the logic of the method of agreement and/or method of difference to reject these theories? Or does he use some other method? How convincing is Gorski's critique of these theories?
2. Can Gorski's argument be stated in terms of postulates and propositions (using the formula from Mahoney 2004)? If so, try to list his major postulates and proposition/s. If not, try to explain why his work cannot be made to fit this kind of model.
3. On page 32 and on page 35, Gorski could have created two-by-two tables that illustrate a typology with four categories. Create the two-by-two tables that correspond with these typologies.
4. In chapter 2, Gorski argues that a Calvinist disciplinary revolution partially caused a strong Dutch state. In making this argument, does Gorski overcome the black box problem? What are the intervening processes through which Calvinism shaped the Dutch state? If you like, make a figure that includes these intervening processes.
5. According to Gorski in chapter 3, why was the Prussian state so autonomous? Why was it so strong? In answering, try to list the main causal variables and key intervening processes that are emphasized by Gorski. If you like, make a figure to illustrate your view.
6. Conclusions to books can do many different things. Discuss what Gorski does in his conclusion. You should not simply summarize his conclusion, but rather attempt to generalize about the kinds of more generic issues and topics he pursues in this last chapter.

**Assignment #6:
Problems and Solutions in Social Science Analysis**

Read the articles by Abbott, Griffin, Isaac and Griffin, and Haydu. Then answer at least three of questions listed below.

1. To what extent does Abbott's critique of the "general linear model" apply to leading works in historical sociology (e.g., Skocpol, A. Marx, Gorski)? Do historical sociologists avoid these problems? If so, how?

2. Isaac and Griffin suggest various ways in which quantitative analysis might be made more historical. Does their analysis also give us any clues for making historical work more quantitative? Do you think any of the books that we have read so far could usefully have been made more quantitative?

3. In what ways is Griffin's "event-structure analysis" similar to the narrative diagram that you made for part of Skocpol's book? Were you implicitly using event-structure analysis? Or did your diagram rely on a different set of principles? Explain.

4. What does Haydu mean by a "problem solving" approach for connecting events? Do you think this approach successfully combines interpretive analysis with causal analysis? What are some of the problems with this approach?

5. Pierson's table 5.3 provides categories for situating different studies of comparative-historical analysis. What category or categories would apply best to the books by Marx and Gorski? Explain your decision by drawing on concrete examples from the books.

Assignment #7:
Analytically Breaking Down Charrad's *States and Women's Rights*

Read the Charrad book and then answer at least three of the questions below.

1. Can Charrad's argument be stated in terms of postulates and propositions (using the formula from Mahoney 2004 on general theory)? If so, try to list her major postulates and proposition/s. If not, try to explain why her work cannot be made to fit this kind of model. Finally, explore whether any of the causal mechanisms listed in Mahoney 2004 could be applied to this work.

2. What are Charrad's main cases? What is her main dependent variable? How do the cases score on this variable? What are her main independent variables? How do the cases score on these variables? Any key intervening variables? Make a diagram that summarizes the causal logic of her argument. Explain your diagram in words.

3. Does Charrad consider alternative explanations? If so, what method does she use to eliminate these alternatives? Explain. If not, try to think up one or more alternative explanations not considered by Charrad that might help explain her major outcomes.

4. Charrad's book won the Distinguished Contribution Prize of the ASA (best book award). What do you believe are the greatest strengths of this important book? For example: convincing argument, clear description, powerful narrative, important topic, compelling comparisons, theoretical insight, and so on. Are the strengths of this book the same as the strengths of other books that we have read so far (e.g., Skocpol, Marx, Gorski)?

Assignment #8:
Understanding Part I of Ragin's *Fuzzy-Set Social Science*

Read the first half (pp. 3-145) of Charles Ragin's book, *Fuzzy-Set Social Science*, and then answer the following questions as directed.

Chapter 1 (answer **one** of the following two)

- A. According to Ragin, how is the study of "diversity" similar to and different from the study of "complexity" and the study of "generality"? How would you define his diversity-oriented approach?
- B. "Ragin's distinction between complexity and generality is a false dichotomy. All good social science research shows sensitivity to both complexity and generality." Assess the validity of this quotation.

Chapter 2 (answer **one** of the following two)

- A. What does Ragin mean when he says that, "Most populations contain unknown amounts of unrecognized heterogeneity" (p. 62)? How is Ragin's concern with causal homogeneity/heterogeneity related to the use of scope conditions in comparative-historical research?
- B. Skocpol and Charrad both limit the scope of their arguments. Explain why they limit their scope by drawing on the idea of causal homogeneity/heterogeneity. Are they justified in limiting their scope?

Chapter 3 (answer the following question)

- A. What does Ragin mean when he says that qualitative researchers treat cases as "configurations"? What does it mean to study variables as "packages"? How is this different from most quantitative research?

Chapter 4 (answer **all** of the following questions)

- A. State whether the following causal relationships are better characterized as necessary or sufficient:

- i. Air => Revolution
- ii. Not Taking Exams => Grade of F
- iii. Female => Pregnancy
- iv. Tenure => Job Security
- v. Being President => Having Power
- vi. Winning the Lottery => Feeling Good

- B. Complete the following sentences by picking the correct word from the three choices. Assume that necessary cause means "necessary but not sufficient" and that sufficient cause means "sufficient but not necessary."

- i. When a necessary cause is present, the outcome is (always, never, can't tell) present.
- ii. When a necessary cause is absent, the outcome is (always, never, can't tell) present.
- iii. When a necessary cause is present, the outcome is (always, never, can't tell) absent.
- iv. When a necessary cause is absent, the outcome is (always, never, can't tell) absent.
- v. When a sufficient cause is present, the outcome is (always, never, can't tell) present.
- vi. When a sufficient cause is absent, the outcome is (always, never, can't tell) present.

- vii. When a sufficient cause is present, the outcome is (always, never, can't tell) absent.
- viii. When a sufficient cause is absent, the outcome is (always, never, can't tell) absent.

C. How many cases are needed to confirm a hypothesis at a .05 level of significance for a cause that is necessary at least 65 percent of the time? How many cases are needed to confirm a hypothesis at a .01 level of significance for a cause that is sufficient at least 80 percent of the time?

D. What does Ragin mean when he says that combinations of causes could be sufficient for an outcome even though no single cause is necessary or sufficient? What does he mean when he says different combinations of factors could each be sufficient for an outcome? How is this possible?

Chapter 5 (answer the following question)

A. On page 138, Ragin reaches the following conclusion:

[large * growing] + [fluent * wealthy] => ethnic political mobilization

How would you state this finding in regular words while still being precise? How did Ragin arrive at this finding? Summarize the steps he took to draw this conclusion.

**Assignment #9:
Questions on Path Dependence**

Read the articles on sequences and path dependence for this week and then answer at least four of the questions below.

1. Aminzade offers a number of concepts for temporal analysis. Do any of these concepts apply to the studies that we have read so far? How?

2. Compare and contrast the definitions of path dependence offered by Pierson and Mahoney. How common does Pierson think path dependence is? How about Mahoney? Would any of the studies we have read so far meet the definition of path dependence proposed by either of these authors?

3. Why does Thelen believe that the concept of path dependence has significant limitations for social science analysis? What alternative concepts does she propose? Do any of the studies we have read so far implicitly use these concepts?

4. What is the relationship between Collier and Collier's critical juncture framework and the idea of path dependence (as defined by Pierson and Mahoney). Can you fit any of the studies that we have read so far into the Colliers' critical juncture framework? Explain.

5. Discuss the role of agency, contingency, and/or small events in the study of path dependence and critical junctures. How do the different authors for this week address these issues?

**Assignment #10:
Book Review of Kimeldorf's *Reds or Rackets***

For this exercise, you are asked to write a short book review of Howard Kimeldorf's *Reds or Rackets*. Pretend as if you were publishing the review in a scholarly journal (e.g., the *American Journal of Sociology*).

Your review should be about 800 words in length, double-spaced. It is due in class on Monday, April 25.

Normally, book reviews include both a summary of a book's argument and a discussion of the book's contributions and shortcomings. In some cases, these parts are clearly bracketed from one another; in other cases, the parts are intermingled throughout the essay.

In your summary of Kimeldorf's argument, you may wish to draw on (informally) the framework of "cases, outcome, and explanation" that we have used in this course. It is one good way to summarize an argument.

The critique and evaluation of the argument can take a number of different forms. You can focus on methodological points (e.g., the logical structure of the argument, the use of negative cases, the utility of the comparison), theoretical points (the use of path dependence and sequence analysis, agency-structure issues, inductive vs. deductive analysis), and/or historical/empirical points (e.g., the use of historical sources, evidence that is excluded, implications for other cases).

You may find it helpful to look at several examples of previously published book reviews as you complete this assignment. Good luck!

**Assignment #11:
The Debate over Secondary Sources in Historical Sociology**

For this assignment, read the articles by Goldthorpe and Lustick on the use historical sources in social science research. Then answer the questions listed below. The assignment is due in class on Monday, May 2.

1. Summarize the concerns of Goldthorpe and Lustick regarding the use of “secondary sources” in historical research in sociology and political science.
2. Consider the extent to which the problems they identify might apply to at least two of the substantive books we have read in this class (more than two is also fine).
3. Explain how the authors of the books you address might respond to Goldthorpe and Lustick. More generally, consider rebuttals to the Goldthorpe/Lustick critique based on your reading of works in historical sociology.
4. Do the authors you address use primary sources? If so, does this allow them to avoid the problems raised by Goldthorpe and Lustick? If not, could they have used primary sources in a way that would have enabled them to improve their research? Explain.

**Assignment #12:
Uses of Secondary Sources in the Study of English Development**

This assignment asks you to write a short essay of about 800 words in length in which you critically assess the use of secondary sources in at least three of the major works on English development that are listed in the syllabus. The essay is due in class on May 9.

Your essay should compare and contrast the use of secondary sources in these works. You should pay attention to both similarities and differences in the way in which scholars handle their data sources. You may want to address some or all of the following issues: What are the authors' general approaches to using secondary sources? For example, do the authors rely on many sources or just a few basic sources? Do the authors engage debates in the historiography by considering opposing sources? To what degree do the sources used by different authors overlap? If the sources overlap, do the authors reach similar or different conclusions? Does your inventory of different works provide evidence in favor of Goldthorpe's and Lustick's arguments about secondary sources? Do you think some authors do a better job of using secondary source information than other authors? Why?