Advice on Writing

Excerpted from *Social Science Methodology: A Primer*, by John Gerring and Dino Christenson, Cambridge University Press forthcoming.

Sometimes, the task of writing is regarded as separate and independent from the study of social science. In this view, writing is a skill taught in English, rhetoric, or composition courses while theorizing and analyzing are reserved for courses in social science.

People who hold this view may also regard writing as an art (and hence the province of the humanities) in contrast to the task of analysis, which they may regard as more scientific (and hence the province of the social sciences). They may even be a bit suspicious of eloquent prose, regarding it as a sign of sophistry (a subtle, superficially plausible, but generally fallacious method of reasoning). From this perspective, the cultivation of style is a substitute for sound analysis – "mere rhetoric," as the phrase goes.

We can all agree that substance should trump style, at least in the realm of social science. Yet, in order to communicate ideas those ideas must be put into words. If an author is unable to do so the reader must put the pieces of an argument together him- or herself, with much effort and possible misunderstanding. A poorly written study is one that is poorly executed. It will have less impact on the world, and – if it has any impact at all – may have an impact that is different from what the author intended. Communication skills thus matter a great deal to the progress of social science.

Moreover, the act of communicating is impossible to separate from the act of reasoning. We think through prose. This recalls E.M. Forster's question: "How can I tell what I think till I see what I say?"[1] In our own experience, writing out an argument usually leads to a reconceptualization of that argument. One cannot express an idea cogently without first understanding that idea, and one cannot understand an idea until one has effectively expressed it. Bad writing is usually a symptom of a deeper malaise.

Of course, everything depends upon how one chooses to define "good writing." Some purely stylistic components of writing such as spelling, grammar (norms of usage), and word-choice are indeed rather superficial in nature and do not necessarily reflect on the logic of an argument or the thoughtfulness of the writer. Non-native writers will always face difficulties in these areas, especially if their chosen language is English – arguably, the world's most idiomatic language.

We urge you to think about writing in a more holistic way, incorporating spelling, grammar, and word-choice along with argumentation and organization. In *this* sense, writing is inseparable from thinking. And in this sense, writing is not an isolated skill, like penmanship, that can be separated from one's overall expertise as a social scientist. Writing is a vital part of the skill-set that one expects all social scientists to possess.

The first section of the chapter identifies various writing genres that you may encounter, each of which follows somewhat different rules. The second section is about organization. The third section encompasses considerations of style, including grammar. The fourth section is about integrating sources clearly, honestly, and creatively. The fifth and final section is about editing.

---

[1] Forster (1927: ch 5).

Prior to reading this chapter, we shall assume that you have identified a topic for research – which may be assigned or may be of your own choosing (see Chapter 12). It is worth reiterating that the topic of a paper is the most consequential part of the resulting work; do not skip lightly over this crucial decision. Likewise, we shall assume you are familiar with the criteria pertaining to social science arguments and research designs, as discussed in Parts I and II of the book.

Genres

There are many kinds of written documents and hence many diverse – and occasionally conflicting – criteria for good writing. As an entrée to this chapter it may be helpful to identify some of these genres, and their distinctive aims.

Perhaps the most important distinction lies between fiction and non-fiction. Evidently, we are concerned with writing that aims to represent reality in a factual manner. Of course, fiction may contain valuable truths. A compelling novel, poem, or play may be more real than a non-fiction treatment of the same material, at least in certain respects. However, because the former is not intended to reproduce a factual reality its construction follows very different rules.

Within the vast category of non-fiction we can recognize a number of sub-genres based on the venue for which a work is produced. This includes (a) short papers or theses written in pursuit of a degree, (b) academic journal articles, (c) longer monographs (including dissertations and books) written for an academic audience, (d) books written for a general audience, (e) memos, reports, press releases, and web site content produced for a business, government agency, or nonprofit organization. What we have to say in this chapter is relevant to all of these genres. But it bears most directly upon (a) short papers or theses written in pursuit of a degree.

Another way to categorize non-fiction genres hinges on the *substance* of the writing rather than its venue. Here, one may distinguish the following genres: (a) general accounts, (b) book reviews, (c) literature reviews, (d) policy reports, and (e) monographs. Examples of each of these genres are included at the end of the chapter. Here, we briefly review their goals and usual formats.

A *general account* seeks to encompass all aspects of a topic, or at least all those that might be of interest to a lay audience (non-experts, who are presumed to know little about the topic). For example, a general account of democracy might encompass the following topics: (a) the definition and measurement of democracy, (b) the origins and spread of democracy since ancient times, (c) the process by which countries democratize, (d) the exogenous causes of democratization, and (e) the effects of democracy. This is a lot to deal with, evidently, and even a booklength treatise is likely to skim lightly over these topics. Encyclopedia articles must be even more concise. For this reason, general accounts are often employed for textbooks or for books and articles addressed to a popular (non-specialist) audience. A general account offers a point of departure for more focused work.

A *book review* offers a synoptic resume and discussion of a chosen book. Book reviews appear on all subjects and in many academic and non-academic venues. Typically, a review begins by summarizing the main theme or argument of the book under review, along with the evidence. The review will also seek to place the book within a larger context, i.e., as part of an intellectual current, identifying elements that are novel or held in common with that tradition. Finally, there is an attempt to identify the book's strengths and weaknesses. Laudatory reviews emphasize the former; critical reviews emphasize the latter. But generally one finds a mixture of both.

A *literature review* discusses work that has accumulated on a particular subject. For example,

one might review studies of democratization or of social capital. Where a large literature has developed – as on these topics – the author may seek to further limit the scope of the review, e.g., to recent work, work published in a particular subfield, or work with a narrower focus. For further discussion the reader is referred to Chapter 11.

A *policy report* is written to provide direction and guidance for citizens, policymakers, or members of an organization who require guidance on a topic. Prior to reaching this goal the report may contain a good deal of descriptive, causal, and/or predictive analysis. However, its primary goal is prescriptive, i.e., to suggest a concrete course of action. Thus, a report commissioned for a government office might begin by relating the history of a policy problem, including past attempts to deal with it and evaluations of their relative success, before concluding with a policy recommendation. Policy reports, unlike work in other genres, are meant to be acted upon.

A *monograph* encompasses studies with a highly focused topic and a concise argument or theory, which might be descriptive, causal, and/or predictive. This is the mainstay of academic work, as discussed in previous chapters. It also segues neatly into our discussion of essay organization.

Organization

Grammar (rules of usage), spelling, and other niceties of the English language should be observed, as discussed in a later section of this chapter. But this is the most obvious, and in some ways least essential part of an essay's style. More important is a clear argument (as discussed in Chapter 2) and a logical organization.

In order to facilitate this we suggest keeping an outline of how you think the paper will proceed. This outline might be extremely detailed – including, let us say, virtually every point that you wish to make – or it might be brief and schematic. You might experiment with both approaches to see what works best for you.

Of course, this outline will probably be revised as you work your thoughts out on paper (or on the computer). This is the thinking-through-writing-process that we have discussed. Nonetheless, at any given point in time you need to have a general idea of how all the pieces of your paper fit together. You may keep this outline in a separate document or on a separate screen (if you are working with two screens), and revise it continually as you go along. All your notes (including your ideas and your citations and quotations from the literature) should fit somewhere within this outline.

One way to move from a mass of notes towards a draft is to write headings and sub-headings for each idea. This will then translate into sections, or paragraphs, of the paper. In any case, it will help you keep track of the flow of your narrative.

Sometimes, one has difficulty putting together an entire outline. It isn't clear where the pieces fit, or even whether they all fit. Rather than spending hours and hours fiddling with the outline you might try another approach, based on the sections that you envision for the paper. Sometimes, you know that there will be a section on "apples" and a section on "oranges" but you don't know which will come first, and the appropriate ordering does not become apparent until the sections are written. In this instance, you should probably write the sections first (or at least some of them) and then return to the outline, in the hopes that these sections can be fit together into a coherent narrative. This is equivalent to working on various sections of a puzzle separately and then putting them together at a later stage.

One of the hardest tasks is discarding good ideas and juicy quotes. However, this process of

tossing things out is essential. It is often what distinguishes a focused, well-constructed essay from one that is disjointed and hard to follow. You should appreciate that any creative work will generate ideas that don't fit within the rubric of a single topic. This is inevitable. It is akin to the sketches that an artist produces prior to the final work, or the false leads that a detective pursues prior to finding the culprit. There is always some "waste product." Do not think of it as waste, however, for it is essential to the creative process. The point is that in order to create a well-crafted product you need to be able to recognize the parts that don't fit and have the discipline to toss them out, or file them away for a future project.

When constructing an outline, bear in mind that most social science papers follow a similar organizational prototype. The format looks like this:

I. *Introduction*
II. *Literature Review*
III. *Thesis*
IV. *Methods*
V. *Evidence and Supporting Arguments*
VI. *Conclusion*
VII. *End matter*

In a longer paper – say, over five pages – it is helpful to separate different sections of an argument by headings, as below. (Additional sub-headings may be added, as needed.)

Introduction

Introductions contain the body of an essay in a highly abbreviated form. Typically, introductions (a) explain the meaning and importance of the chosen topic, (b) review the literature on that topic, (c) state the main argument along with the method of analysis and the evidence that will be brought to bear, and (d) outline how the topic will be addressed.

Let us discuss each of these objectives, in turn.

Introducing a subject means, first of all, explaining that topic to your reader. Some topics are self-explanatory. Others require a long preamble and perhaps the definition of key terms. Naturally, much depends upon the audience one is writing for. In any case, one must build on common ground, i.e., features of the world – and terminology – that your readers are likely to understand and to agree with.

Typically, one says something about the significance of the chosen topic. Why should we care about your topic (and by extension, your paper)? Why does it matter? Some topics are intrinsically interesting, touching on themes that lots of people care about. Others need to be connected to things that your reader is likely to care about. For example, the topic of "party identification" seems at first glance to be a relatively obscure preoccupation of political scientists. However, you may be able to claim that the strength or weakness of party identification in a country has important consequences for politics and policy.

Even with topics that are intrinsically interesting it may be important to establish the present-day relevance of that topic. For example, if you are writing about genocide some readers may assume that this refers to events that lie firmly in the past. It may be important to remind readers that genocides have occurred as recently as 1994 (Rwanda) and – according to some observers – are occurring right now (e.g., in Syria).

The significance of a topic may derive from a particular problem that it addresses. If so, it is natural to begin with a statement of this problem. For example, one might launch an essay by making reference to the problem of polarization in contemporary American politics, perhaps citing

some authorities on the subject and making clear why you think it is a problem. Having set the context, and drawn your reader in, you can then state how your chosen topic addresses that problem, explains it, or perhaps suggests a solution to it.

At some point in an introduction you should outline briefly what others have written about your topic. This review of the literature might occupy several sentences or, at most, several paragraphs. If a longer review is required it must be postponed until a later section of the paper (see below).

Against this backdrop, tell the reader in a few sentences or a paragraph what your thesis is, and what sort of evidence and method of analysis will be employed to prove it. Recall that a good thesis usually contains some element of novelty. This might be the argument itself if it is at variance with what most authorities on a subject have been saying or with what most people believe. If the thesis is not entirely new – and of course no thesis is completely unique – the novelty of an argument may lie in the evidence. Perhaps a new terrain is being explored, or an especially strong test of an established theory is on display. Or perhaps material is being synthesized in a new way. In any case, a thesis is more interesting and useful insofar as it points out things that are not readily apparent. A paper should add something to the sum-total of human knowledge. You should make this clear in the introduction.

Finally, provide an outline of the paper. Don't shy away from straightforward sign-posting techniques: "First, I will address the question of *X*. Next, I will…"

Introductions generally occupy at least several paragraphs, perhaps as much as two pages. They should in any case consume no more than one-tenth the length of your paper. They are, after all, introductions. If your introduction stretches beyond that consider either cutting the excess or moving it to another section.

Literature Review

Every paper has a section in which the literature on a subject is reviewed. Sometimes, this is incorporated into the Introduction or the Thesis section (above and below). Sometimes, it stands alone.

In any case, it is vital to establish what sort of work has already been conducted on a subject before the author can introduce his/her own perspective on that subject. Literature reviews establish what *they* say and what *they* have done, thus situating the author's own work and the originality of that contribution.

The author must acknowledge his/her forbears graciously; there is nothing as discrediting as a crass and stingy review of the literature that pours ridicule on everyone who has worked on a subject. By the same token, the author must be careful to distinguish his/her work from those who came before. If one is meekly following in a well-established tradition, one cannot claim to be making much of a contribution. One should honor, but not worship, one's forbears. This is the delicate balance – between hubris and timidity – that every writer must strike.

There are at least two dimensions to every social science literature review. The first focuses on the argument, i.e., the theory. The second focuses on the analysis, i.e., the empirics. A contribution can be theoretical and/or empirical. Most reviews of the literature offer a little bit of both.

Thus, an author might begin by tracing the lineage of the chosen theory – to what extent is it original or derivative? To what extent is he/she agreeing or disagreeing with the standard view of a subject?

Next, an author might tackle the empirical elements of previous research. What sorts of

material have been examined by scholars, and with what methods? What are the strengths and weaknesses of these empirical efforts? In what ways are they limited or open to question?

The literature review may seem daunting, and it commonly occupies a good deal of time. However, it is usually the *least* important part of a paper. As such, you should take pains not to get too wrapped up in it. Try to summarize the extant literature as succinctly as you can. If the literature is substantial, this will require a good deal of bundling. Since you cannot afford to discuss each study individually you will need to group them according to some schema. "Group A focuses on Topic 1, Group B focuses on Topic 2,…" and so forth.

Another approach is to capture important characteristics of many studies in a table, with studies listed across each row and their characteristics listed across each column. An example is provided in Table 14.1. Here, salient features of recent studies focused on the relationship between development and democracy are summarized, including the outcomes employed to measure democracy, the research design, the period of analysis, and the main finding.

Table 14.1: Crossnational Studies of Development and Democracy

	Democracy indicator(s)	*Analysis*	*Period*	*Finding:* **Development affects…** *Democratiz*	*Consolidation*
Acemoglu et al. 2008	Polity2; PR	TSCS with country FE, IV	1500-2000	0	0
Boix, Stokes 2003	BMR	TSCS	1850-1990	+	+
Epstein et al. 2006	Based on Polity2	TSCS with Markov estimation; survival analysis	1960-2000	+	+
Przeworski, Limongi 1997	DD	TSCS	1950-1990	0	+

Finding
- *0* **No consistent relationship between development and democracy**
- *+* **Positive relationship between development and democracy**

Analysis
- *TSCS* **Time-series cross-section design**
- *FE* **Fixed effects model**
- *IV* **Instrumental variable analysis**

Democracy indicators
- *BMR* **Boix, Miller & Rosato (2013)**
- *DD* **Democracy-Dictatorship (Cheibub, Gandhi, Vreeland 2010)**
- *PR* **Political Rights (Freedom House 2007)**
- *Polity2* **Marshall, Jaggers (2007)**

Thesis

If the thesis (aka theory, main argument) of a paper is very simple it may be incorporated into the introduction. If it is more complex, it deserves a section of its own, or may be combined with the literature review. Here, you have space to lay out the theory in its entirety. Make sure to be clear about what you are arguing. Any ambiguity on this score will injure your cause. Recall that the purpose of a social science paper is not to leave the reader dangling, as one might in a work of rhetoric or fiction. Readers of social science have very little patience. If you wait until the middle or end of the paper to reveal the punchline you will lose some readers and annoy the rest.

Sometimes, one does not become fully aware of the thesis until one has already written a rough draft of a paper and put it aside for a few days. It is common to see thesis statements in concluding paragraphs. Once you realize this, a simple reorganization of the paper should be possible (swapping text from back to front).

If the thesis is complex, with many interacting parts, it may be helpful to construct a diagram, summarizing the key features, as suggested in Chapter 2. Regardless of how many moving parts it has, the argument should be summarizable in a few sentences. If it is longer than that, we suspect it is too long – which is to say it needs to be pared down, simplified, or presented in a more unified manner.

Although parsimony is important, you should not feel pressured to over-simplify the argument. Where caveats, clarifications, and scope-conditions are needed, make sure that they are fully articulated. It is important not to claim too much as this will make your case less persuasive. Sometimes it is helpful to distinguish between a "home turf" where you are pretty sure your argument is correct and a larger turf where its application is more speculative. (This distinction may conform to the distinction between sample and population, as discussed in Chapter 4.)

Method

If the method employed in a study is fairly straightforward it can be folded into the following section (Evidence and Supporting Arguments). If it is more complicated it should be accorded a section of its own. This is where you explain how you collected your data, how you analyze it, what methodological problems you face, and how you intend to overcome them.

Note that these methodological questions are equally important in quantitative and qualitative research. In a case study (see Chapter 9), you need to explain how you chose your case(s) and what method(s) you are employing for analyzing data drawn from that case(s).

Evidence and Supporting Arguments

The body of the paper is composed of your defense of the thesis. Here is where you present evidence and supporting arguments that that are intended to convince the reader that you are right. Evidence is broadly interpreted, including any species of "data" discussed in the previous chapter.

Each portion of the paper should address a different facet of the author's thesis. Generally, one saves the most important and/or the most complicated parts for last. But this is a matter of taste. Sometimes, a cumulative logic is at work, demanding that some issues be presented first and others later.

In arguing for your thesis imagine possible responses from those who might be inclined to skepticism. How might you convert this sort of reader to your argument? Remember that in order to convince the skeptics you will need to deal not only with the evidence and arguments that support your case but also those that do not. Omission of contrary evidence is generally damning to an

argument for it suggests that the writer is not aware, or has not fully considered, the facts of the case. Thus, you need to show why these points are wrong, overstated, or counterbalanced by opposing arguments or evidence. Since the thesis is your purpose for writing, if you do not argue your thesis effectively you have not achieved your stated objective.

Note, however, that a social science paper is not a legal brief, a debate, or an exercise in rhetoric. One wishes to convince, naturally, but not by misrepresenting the truth. One's purpose is to shed light on a subject, honestly and with as much completeness as you can muster (given time and space constraints). This is how science advances. There is no honor in convincing readers of a false thesis. The writer, therefore, has a strong professional obligation not to overstate the evidence in support of a thesis and to acknowledge arguments and evidence that contradict it.

Conclusion

One is obliged to sum things up in some manner. In a short paper, this summation should be brief. Remind the reader what you have argued and what you have proven. Clarify, as well, the limits of your thesis, its scope-conditions, if you have not already done so. If there are weaknesses in the argument that you have not already addressed, now is the time to acknowledge them.

Traditionally, the concluding section of a paper approaches the subject from a broader perspective, exploring possible implications of the thesis. What does your argument imply? If true, what predictions flow from it? What debates does it relate to? What additional topics might it be applied to?

Conclusions are often speculative, as you can see. They set forth ground for future research by pointing out various extensions of the subject. Here, it may be appropriate to discuss some of the thoughts and questions you had as you conducted your research – things that couldn't be proven or that didn't fit neatly into your paper but which are nonetheless connected to your subject and might be of interest to readers.

End Matter

At the end of a paper one generally finds a References section, providing full citations for all in-text references. (Naturally, if you choose to employ full references in the body of your paper – as footnotes or endnotes – you do not need a separate References section.) There may also be an Appendix, or even several appendices. An appendix is typically used to provide further detail on sources, descriptive statistics, robustness tests, or other information pertaining to the analysis. Sometimes, Tables and Figures are listed at the end of the document, rather than in the body of the paper. This is a matter of choice, though our personal preference is to integrate tables and figures into the body of the paper, where they are more accessible.

Variations

Having presented the prototypical organization of a social science paper it is important to note that these features can be aggregated or disaggregated in various ways. For example, one might merge the Literature review and/or Thesis sections into the Introduction. Alternatively, one might split the Evidence and Supporting Arguments section into several sections, each devoted to a separate analysis. Much depends upon how much you have to say about each of these topics. Sections should be roughly similar in length, though this is not a strict standard. It is much more important to carve up the paper into logically distinct parts than it is to create parts of equal length.

Style

Social science is similar to rhetoric insofar as its goal is to persuade. However, unlike other genres, the work of persuasion in social science is carried by the logic of the argument and the strength of the evidence. Fancy turns of phrase, evocative metaphors, a compelling narrative, provocative observations – these sorts of adornments are not essential, and may detract from the presentation of a theory and evidence to support that theory.

It follows that expository styles appropriate for popular journals, or even highbrow journals like the *New Yorker*, are not always appropriate for social science. The job of a social-scientific study is to contribute to the development of a body of knowledge, not to entertain. Our stylistic motto might be summarized as follows: To hell with beauty, let's try to communicate some truth.

Of course, there is no reason why the art of evocative writing must be sacrificed on the altar of clarity. One can be clear, organized, and also entertaining. However, wherever the two might conflict, intelligibility should take precedence.

The use of technical language – including mathematical symbols – also imposes a sacrifice of intelligibility, at least for those without the requisite technical knowledge to follow the argument. To remedy this problem, we suggest that everyday language be employed in works of social science wherever possible.

We recognize that a technical vocabulary is often essential insofar as it is clearer (less ambiguous) or more concise than the analogous term or phrase in everyday language. That said, it is important that writers summarize technical issues in everyday language at some point in a study – perhaps in the introduction or conclusion – so that the latter is accessible to lay readers.

Note that if social science is to have any effect at all on society we must be able to translate our wisdom into the vernacular. It is no use discovering the benefits and drawbacks of an electoral system if one cannot influence public debate on electoral reform. Knowledge about the effects of public and private investment do not bring any benefits at all if economists are the only holders of that knowledge.[2] Whatever sociologists may learn about the sources of racism will not help anyone overcome this condition if sociologists are the sole repositories of this truth.

More generally, whatever arguments are developed in specialized venues of social science must eventually filter down to a broader audience. In order to make sure that this occurs, or at least has some chance of occurring, social science must be intelligible to the lay reader. We must do our best to bring social science to the people.

Rules

Language, in common with math, chemistry, music, and any sporting event that you can imagine, has rules. Without rules, language is meaningless; indeed, it is no longer language at all but simply a random set of words without meaning (or with a wide range of possible meanings). When writing emails, tweets, texts, and in other contexts we may apply these rules loosely. However, in a formal

[2] "The economist who wants to influence actual policy choices must in the final resort convince ordinary people, not only his confreres among the economic scientists," notes Gunnar Myrdal (1970: 450–1).

setting it is important to abide by the formal rules of the English language, perhaps with an occasional change of pace to provide dramatic or comic relief.

Spelling, usage, word choice, and all the delicate mechanics of language are essential to effective communication. You will not convince your reader that you know what you are talking about and have thought seriously about the subject at-hand if there are careless mistakes of punctuation or spelling. This is a serious "image" problem, and you need to protect your credibility. Matters of form are also likely to affect the substance of the argument. But even if they are peripheral, stylistic mistakes will affect the rhetorical power of your paper – your ability to persuade.

As you think about grammatical rules bear in mind that writing is not a paint-by-numbers exercise. Regrettably, it is not possible to issue a set of rules that would tell you everything you need to know about proper sentence structure. Good writing is a matter of developing sensitivity to the English language, a process that develops over a lifetime. English is also a highly idiomatic language, so rules of grammar don't take one very far. In any case, good writing in any language involves much more than following correct rules of grammar. It involves choosing the best word from among several near-synonyms. It involves finding the right way to phrase an idea, the right organization for a set of related ideas, and the proper mix of general statements and supporting examples. This is what differentiates a persuasive and powerful essay from one that is merely grammatically correct.

While it is impossible to learn good writing by memorizing a set of rules, here are some bits of advice – drawn from a variety of sources – that are worth paying close attention to.

- Good writing is possible only if one has a good idea of the audience one is writing for. For most purposes, you may assume an audience of your peers. As you sit before the computer screen, imagine yourself writing to other members of your class.
- Don't assume knowledge of specialized topics. Do your best to explain things in a way that non-specialists can understand. Then, you may proceed to technical details that only specialists will be able to appreciate. (We have already discussed the rationale for this prescription.)
- Avoid jargon wherever possible. "Jargon" refers to technical or abstruse vocabulary for ideas that can be communicated just as accurately and parsimoniously with everyday words. If you wish to vary the vocabulary in an essay by introducing an unusual word, use this word only once or twice. *Chew* can be repeated; *masticate* should be used sparingly. Granted, some technical words have no ordinary-language counterpart. These are permitted, and indeed are often indispensable. Make sure that these technical terms are carefully defined at the outset of the paper, lest you lose your audience.
- Don't talk down to your reader. Fancy words and phrases often come out sounding pretentious. Likewise, explaining the obvious suggests that you have a low opinion of the reader. Find an appropriate voice, one that conveys respect.
- Don't let your prose get in the way of the logic of the argument. Overly long sentences with multiple clauses are hard for the reader to follow. Try to write as simply as possible – without sacrificing the complexities of your topic.
- Colloquial phrases are sometimes funny (dammit). But they should be kept to a minimum.
- Use adverbs like "very," "extremely," or "unbelievably" sparingly. They sound shrill and don't add much to a sentence.
- Avoid a polemical or conversational style. The tone should be even, measured, and scholarly.
- Use examples wherever a statement might not be entirely clear, or simply to avoid the arid effect of an unrelieved series of generalizations.
- Avoid deterministic language, unless it is clearly justified. Most things in the social-science

universe are probabilistic, rather than invariant.

- Don't overstate your argument. In debates and in courtroom arguments one is enjoined to give no quarter, to contest every point. Academic writing is different. Here, you are enjoined to acknowledge the limitations of your own position and the possible utility of arguments offered by others. Your purpose is to reach the truth, not vanquish opponents. And reaching the truth is usually a communal endeavor. This does not mean that compromise is always warranted, or that the truth always lies in the middle. It means, very simply, that you should worry about getting things right, not about settling scores. It means that you should indicate uncertainty wherever uncertainty is indicated, using appropriate qualifiers and caveats.
- Turn on, and pay attention to, the grammar promptings that your word processor provides. Also, take a look at this page, which clarifies a basket of words that are often confused with each other (such as *there*, *their*, and *they're*): www.englishchick.com/grammar/grconf.htm
- Thesauruses are now available on-line or as part of word-processing programs. Don't hesitate to use them. But don't use them too often as it will slow down your writing and, worse, may encourage you to write in an ungainly manner. Words drawn from a thesaurus tend to be poorly chosen and stick out inappropriately in a paper. In order to use a word correctly you need to be familiar with it, which is to say you need to have seen that word in a natural context several times. In this way, you maintain control over the medium.
- Avoid brackets ("") wherever possible. Irony is not well-conveyed by the use of a scare-quote. A new term, if questionable in some way or if under definition, may be placed in brackets when it is first introduced. (Note the use of "jargon" above.) Afterwards, it should be used without the brackets.
- Each paragraph should contain a single idea. Typically, this idea is expressed in the first sentence of the paragraph. This allows your reader to skim your paper by reading the first sentences of each paragraph, which function as headings in an outline. Of course, no one follows this format slavishly, and to do so would probably end up sounding rather stilted. However, as a rule topic sentences should not be hidden in the middle of paragraphs. They should be placed at the beginning, or (occasionally) at the end.
- The length of a paragraph is less important than its logical coherence. Some will be long and others will be short, depending upon how much verbiage needs to be packaged within that container.
- You may think of paragraphs as separate slides within a Powerpoint presentation; each should address a different facet of the argument. Establish breaks between paragraphs when you move to a new idea.
- Work hard on your transitions from one paragraph to the next and from one section of the paper to the next. If there are no transitions, your reader will have difficulty following the narrative.
- State your points as concisely as possible and avoid redundancy. Delete words that are not needed, perhaps because they are implied by other words. Replace phrases with words, where possible. Alter sentences so that they are stated positively rather than negatively (eliminate *not*).[3]
- The main point of an essay should appear in the introduction, in the conclusion, and – in varying ways – within the body of a paper. This is justifiable redundancy – although each appearance should be phrased somewhat differently. Other points should appear only once

[3] Williams, Bizup (2014: 186).

in the course of your essay. If you find that a given issue is treated on several occasions, you should think about reorganizing the essay to eliminate this redundancy. Another way to deal with this problem is to refer back to earlier points ("as stated above"). This relieves you of the necessity of repeating a point ad nauseum while allowing you to point out continuities and connections.

- Differentiate clearly between (a) what others say, or what is generally understood to be true about a subject (background knowledge), and (b) what you – the author – say about that subject (the argument). The first is established in the introduction or the literature review section of a paper; it provides the point of departure. The second is the author's contribution to that subject – where s/he extends or contests established wisdom. If you confuse (a) and (b) your readers will be confused and perhaps also annoyed. Consider the difference between "Alcoholism is a principal cause of unemployment," and "I argue that alcoholism is a principal cause of unemployment." The first statement suggests that this is a truth that most people – or at least most knowledgeable experts on the subject – accept. The second statement suggests that this is the author's perspective, which knowledgeable observers may contest, and which the author will try to prove in the course of the essay.
- Length is probably the least important element of any paper. Granted, one is often constrained to work within arbitrary page or word limits set by a journal or by an instructor. However, bear in mind that this is an entirely arbitrary matter, established for convenience. Above all, do not confuse length with quality. Longer is not necessarily better; indeed, it may be worse. Pascal once apologized to a correspondent, saying "The present letter is long, as I had no time to make it shorter." Writing concisely usually requires more care and attention than writing at length about a subject. One must pick and choose.

To summarize, the object of your paper is to persuade the reader, to communicate. So try to be as clear and straightforward as you can, without trivializing your ideas or patronizing your reader. The secret to what is generally regarded as good nonfiction writing probably has less to do with prose style than with clear thinking.

Sources

Ideas come from somewhere; they are not invented out of whole cloth. (If they were, they would probably be pretty absurd, and wouldn't constitute good social science.) So don't be ashamed of taking ideas from other places. Everyone does it. Social science is theft.

The point is to give full attribution wherever borrowing occurs if the piece of information is not already common knowledge. (You don't need to footnote that the sun rises in the East and sets in the West.) This is a matter of honesty, as well as a matter of scholarly cumulation. Recall that your paper builds on a skein of existing knowledge. Only through accurate documentation can the reader distinguish the writer's original contribution from those of others. Likewise, your arguments build on evidence, and in order to establish the veracity of the evidence you present readers must be able to trace it back to a source. Correct use and acknowledgment of source materials is therefore vital to any research project.

Thus, if you use material drawn from something aside from your own first-hand experience, and the material is not common knowledge, give credit to your source. If you quote directly, even a

word or phrase, use quotation marks and a citation. If you paraphrase (i.e., take the ideas and put them into your own words), cite the source.

If you take ideas or words from sources without attribution you may face disciplinary action – including expulsion – from a college or university, or you may lose your job. You should also bear in mind that the current state of information technology assures that a paper that you write today may remain in the public domain for the rest of your life. This means that decades from now someone may discover an episode of plagiarism, committed in your youth, which jeopardizes your position, not to mention your standing in the community. There is a lot at stake. So, if you are in doubt about whether a citation is necessary, play it safe by citing the source or consult your instructor for further guidance. Once your paper is turned in, the reader has the right to assume that whatever appears in the paper, unless otherwise indicated, is your own work or is common knowledge.[4]

Naturally, even with appropriate citation you do not want to take your entire argument from someone else. What you should be taking from your sources are bits-and-pieces: a fact here, a point there – whatever bears upon *your* argument. You will need to refer to multiple sources; otherwise, you can hardly avoid relying excessively on one person's work. Creativity, in this context, means putting together the material presented in the text in a new way in order to answer a question that is at least slightly different from the authors' point of view.

In citing evidence, don't simply cite an author's view that such-and-such is true. Research is not a polling of authors. If four out of five authors say something is true it still may be false. Of course, it may be helpful to establish what the prevailing wisdom on a topic is. However, in bringing evidence to bear you must be sensitive to whether a particular source is authoritative. An authoritative source is a source that is, for one reason or another, well-suited to weigh in on a given topic – an eye-witness, an expert, and so forth. For these sources, direct quotations may be appropriate.

Even so, such authorities must often be viewed with suspicion. In general, you should avoid quotations, especially long ones. Try to paraphrase instead (put things in your own words). This, of course, still requires a citation.

Note that the purpose for which a source is being cited determines what sort of source is most useful or most authoritative. If you are attempting to demonstrate that a certain mood pervades a society, or that a certain event received a great deal of attention then citing popular media (newspaper, wide-circulation magazine, best-selling novel, television report) may be the best source. You might also cite an academic study that studied these popular media in a systematic fashion. If, on the other hand, you are trying to demonstrate a non-obvious point about the world – a descriptive, predictive, or causal inference – then an academic source is probably more authoritative than a popular source.

Although most sources are in written form they may also be in the form of personal communication with the author (interviews, discussions, and so forth). This raises a final, but extremely important, point: if you talk with friends and classmates about your paper and this discussion leads to an exchange of ideas (substantive ideas, not just stylistic/organizational ones) you need to cite these sources just as you would a book or article. If you got the idea for an argument from Cindy Walker, Cindy Walker should appear in a citation where this argument is presented. Otherwise, you are plagiarizing.

How many sources/citations are necessary? This is an oft-repeated question, to which our oft-repeated response is: it depends. It depends on what it is you are trying to prove, on what

---

[4] This statement is adapted from a document entitled "Use of Source Materials," Pomona College Department of Government, Claremont, CA.

sources are out there, and on whether it is possible to cite one or two sources as examples of what is out there. Citations, like pages of text, are not to be judged by their quantity. More is not necessarily better. There are over-referenced papers and under-referenced papers. However, you are more likely to be sanctioned for the latter than for the former. So, if you must err, err on the side of over-referencing.

Note that if you find a well-referenced article or book that reviews the academic literature on a subject it may be sufficient to cite this one source, rather than all the additional sources that are cited therein. You may indicate in your citation that this particular source offers a good review of the literature ("for a comprehensive review of the literature see Smith 1989").

Quotation formats

If a direct quotation exceeds a sentence or two you should set it off in the text in a block quotation, such as the following:

> This is a block quotation, with larger margins than the rest of the text. Sometimes, a smaller font is also employed, as it is here. In any case, no quotation marks are necessary. Simply type the quotation into the block, and include the citation as you normally would (Smith 1989: 45).

In adapting a quotation for use in a paper you may need to alter it in small ways. If you drop words from the quoted passage, indicate the missing text with ellipses. For example, Smith (1989: 45) writes, "Ellipses are important…but sometimes ignored." The deleted words are situated in between 'important' and 'but.'

If you insert words into a quotation, this is signaled by square brackets. For example, Smith (1989: 45) writes, "Ellipses [in a published paper] are important…but sometimes ignored." The added words are in brackets.

If a quotation includes a misspelled word or grammatical error you should indicate this by inserting (*sic*) after the error. For example, Smith (1989: 45) writes, "Ellipses are important…but sometimes ignord (*sic*)." This indicates to the reader that the error is in the original.

Occasionally, you may need to employ quotations marks within a quotation. This is handled with single quotes. For example, Smith (1989: 45) writes, "You should remain financially independent. Following the words of Shakespeare, 'Neither a borrower nor a lender be.'"

Citation formats

There are many citation formats. You should learn the format that is most common in your field, or that which your instructor advises. As a default, you may follow the formatting style used in this book – described below – which is similar to most formats used in the social sciences today.

In the text, or in a footnote, list the author's name in parentheses, followed by the year your edition of the work was published, followed by the page number of the quotation or idea you are citing (Smith 1989: 45). If you are citing a whole book, which is to say an idea or argument that consumes an entire book, then you may omit the pagination (Smith 1989). Information from several sources may be combined in a single parenthetical note (Smith 1898; Washington 1945). Within a parenthetical citation, author last names are alphabetized (Smith comes before Washington). A work with multiple authors should cite each author (Smith, Wilson, and Crane 1989) unless the number of authors is greater than three, in which case cite only the first author followed by *et al.* (Smith et al. 1989). A citation drawn from a source without an author may be cited by the name of the organization or journal that published the work (*The Economist* 1989: 45). Information obtained from

a personal communications should be cited in a footnote and needn't appear in your bibliography. For example, *Footnote:* Roger Smith, personal communication (5/31/1989). When a person has authored several pieces in the same year these may be distinguished by letters (Smith 1989a, 1989b, 1989c). Very long lists of citations, or extensive substantive comments of a parenthetical nature, should go into footnotes. Do not use endnotes, unless instructed to do so (they are hard to follow).

At the end of your paper include a References section including all works cited, with complete citations, as follows.

Books:

Smith, Arthur. 1989. *My Great Idea*. New York: Random House.

The same author with several works published in the same year:

Smith, Arthur. 1989a. *My First Great Idea*. New York: Farrar Straus.
Smith, Arthur. 1989b. *My Second Great Idea*. New York: Random House.
Smith, Arthur. 1989c. *My Third Great Idea*. New York: Farrar Straus.

Edited books:

Smith, Arthur (ed). 1989. *A Series of Chapters about My Great Idea.* Washington: Crane Russak.

Book chapter in edited volume:

Smith, Arthur. 1989. "His Great Idea Stinks." In Arthur Smith (ed), *A Series of Chapters about My Great Idea* (Washington: Crane Russak), 55-66.

Works with multiple authors:

Smith, Arthur, Philip Smith, Rose Smith. 1989. *Our Great Ideas*. New York: Farrar Straus.

Works without authors (collective authorship):

"Great Ideas that Aren't Really so Great." 2004. *The Economist* (August 15), 44-46.

Translated works:

Smith, Arthur. 1989. *My Great Idea*, trans. Hugh Smith. New York: Farrar Straus.

Newspaper articles:

Smith, Arthur. 1989. "My Great Idea, in Brief." *New York Times* (May 31), 44-55.

Journal articles:

Smith, Arthur. 1989. "My Great Idea Dressed Up as Social Science." *American Political Science Review* 11:1 (June), 44-55. [*11* refers to the volume#; *1* refers to the issue#; *44-55* is the pagination.]

For the web:

Work that has appeared, or will appear, in printed form (e.g., the *New York Times* on the web), can be cited as if it were printed material (as above). If there is no printed version, or the printed version has different pagination or is otherwise altered from the web version, construct a bibliographic entry that approximates your entry for books and articles. At the end of the entry, give the exact web address from which you downloaded the material and the date that you downloaded it.

In handling citations you may wish to employ software that is either incorporated in your word processing program or can be imported to it. Popular citation software (aka bibliographic software, citation managers, or reference managers) includes *BiblioExpress/Biblioscape*, *Endnote*, *Mendelay*, *ProCite*, *RefWorks*, *Reference Manager*, and *Zotero*. These programs import citations from databases and websites, build and organize bibliographies, format citations (according to your choice of format). They may also allow you to take notes on articles and to save other files (e.g., PDFs). Note that most of these programs are proprietary, so you will need to purchase the software or

employ a site license.

Editing

The skill of writing is learned primarily by writing, not by reading about writing. That is why this is a short chapter rather than a long one (though there is no harm in reading longer treatises such as those listed at the end of this chapter).

However, the act of writing, by itself, is unlikely to advance your skills. You also need feedback. You should look closely at the comments you receive from your teachers. Request that they comment on the *form* of your essay, not simply its content.

Be aware that very few writers – even professional writers – get it right the first time. Good writing depends upon *re-writing*. Usually it is better to write quickly, in a stream of consciousness, rather than to slave over sentence structure the first time a sentence is formed. Editing, in any case, is essential. Careful proofreading can tell you where things work and where they're not so clear or convincing. Reading the paper aloud to yourself may also alert you to stylistic problems that look innocent enough on the written page but sound awkward or confusing when spoken.

If you can enlist a friend to read the paper – one who will give honest feedback without sparing your feelings – this is often extremely helpful. By the time you have written a paper you are perhaps *too* familiar with the subject matter to be an objective judge of your communication skills. Someone with no knowledge of the topic is in a better position to tell whether you have done a good job of getting your point across. If he or she doesn't get it, or has to struggle to understand it, then you have done a poor job.

As you proofread, make sure that you are actually addressing your thesis in some way in every paragraph. You may wish to keep a sentence-long copy of your thesis taped to a wall next to you as you write so that you can remind yourself of your argument. This is a good way to identify and eliminate dilatory points.

Conclusions

By way of conclusion, let us review the most important criteria of all social science papers, whether written for a classroom assignment, for the completion of an advanced degree, or for publication. These may be summarized in the following questions.

1. Is there a thesis and is it clearly stated?
2. Is the thesis significant? Does it matter?
3. Is the thesis adequately argued or proven (within the constraints imposed by time, resources, and available sources)?
4. Is the study innovative with respect to theory, method, or findings? Does it expand our knowledge of the chosen subject?
5. Is the essay well-written, i.e., cogently organized, grammatically correct, stylistically elegant, and citing all appropriate sources?

Flaws in one of these categories may be compensated by virtues in others, but generally speaking an

essay must satisfy all five in order to qualify as excellent. This chapter has focused primarily on the fifth, though we have stressed repeatedly that matters of form can never be neatly separated from matters of substance.

Writing is the perhaps most important basic skill that the social sciences and humanities impart, and the skill upon which the liberal professions (law, medicine, academics) and business still depend. Getting good grades, getting into the graduate or professional school of your choice, getting a job, and succeeding in that line of work will rest, in part, on your ability to put your thoughts on paper (read: computer) clearly and persuasively.

Freshman English classes give you a start on the road to good writing. However, writing must be practiced continually or the skill atrophies. It is in your interest to pay attention to writing as a craft, and to practice that craft as frequently as possible.

Whatever its role in enhancing your career, good writing is also inherently rewarding. If you wish to influence the world – to change the way people think about something, to offer a new idea or solution – you will need to find a way to communicate that idea to the public, or to some portion of the public with a special interest in what you have to say. Doing so will probably require you to put your words into a coherent, organized format, e.g., a memo, article, essay, or book. If you think that your argument matters then you should be convinced that the communication of that argument matters. One without the other will not go very far.

Key Terms

Inquiries

1. Exchange papers with a friend and comment on each other's work. Or, as a class, exchange papers with each other (perhaps with names removed, so that the review process is anonymous) and comment on each other's work, following the guidelines set out in this chapter.

2. Find an unpublished paper on the web on a topic of interest to you. Make sure it's a paper that's written in a manner that is understandable to you (not too technical or requiring a great deal of background information). It may be written by an established scholar or a lay scholar. Comment on the paper following the guidelines set out in this chapter.

3. Find a paper that you have written recently and that you feel represents your best work, or best work to-date. Grade your paper, that is write comments (both positive and negative) and assign a grade, relying on the criteria laid out in this chapter. (Your comments may repeat, or depart from, those you may have received from an instructor or a reviewer.) Now rewrite the paper, making improvements as suggested by your comments. In this exercise, we are primarily concerned with stylistic issues, though you should try to address substantive issues as well (so long as it doesn't require a lot of additional research).

Resources

Research and writing

- Baglione, Lisa A. 2011. *Writing a Research Paper in Political Science: A Practical Guide to Inquiry, Structure, and Methods, 2d ed.* Washington, DC: CQ press.
- Becker, Howard S. 1986. *Writing for Social Scientists: How to Start and Finish Your Thesis, Book, or Article.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press. [primarily for graduate students]
- Booth, Wayne C.; Gregory G. Colomb; Joseph M. Williams. 2008. *The Craft of Research.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cuba, Lee. 2001. *A Short Guide to Writing about Social Science, 4th ed.* Longman.
- Elbow, Peter. 1981. *Writing with Power: Techniques for Mastering the Writing Process*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hacker, Diana; Nancy Sommers. 2011. *Rules for Writers, 7th ed.* Bedford/St Martin's.
- Lipson, Charles. 2005. *How to Write a BA Thesis: A Practical Guide from Your First Ideas to Your Finished Paper.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press. [A lengthy, detailed guide.]

- McDonald, Susan Peck. 1994. *Professional Academic Writing in the Humanities and Social Sciences*. Southern Illinois University Press. [Advanced]
- Northey, Margot; Lorne Tepperman; Patrizia Albanese. 2012. *Making Sense: A Student's Guide to Research and Writing, 5th ed.* Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press.
- *Norton On-line Handbook*. http://www.wwnorton.com/college/english/write/writesite/
- Scott, Gregory M. and Stephen M. Garrison. [various editions]. *The Political Science Student Writer's Manual*. Prentice-Hall.
- **Williams, Joseph M., rev. by Joseph Bizup. 2014. *Style: Lessons in Clarity and Grace, 11th ed*. New York: Pearson.**
- Zinsser, William. 1980. *On Writing Well: An Informal Guide to Writing Nonfiction*. New York: Harper and Row.

Web sites:

- *Harvard Writing Center:* fas.harvard.edu/~wricntr/html/tools.htm
- *Bartleby.com* (various resources)
- *Dictionary.com* (on-line dictionary and thesaurus)

Citation standards for datasets

- Altman, Micah and Gary King. 2007. "A Proposed Standard for the Scholarly Citation of Quantitative Data." *D-lib Magazine* 13:3-4, 1082-9873.

Reflections on writing

- Billig, Michael. 2013. *Learn to Write Badly: How to Succeed in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Emerson, Robert M.; Rachel I. Fretz; Linda L. Shaw. 2011. *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes, 2d ed*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- McCloskey, Donald N. 1983. "The Rhetoric of Economics." *Journal of Economic Literature* 21 (June) 481-517.
- Mills, C. Wright. 1959. "On Intellectual Craftsmanship." In *The Sociological Imagination* (New York: Oxford University Press), 195-226.
- Orwell, George. 1954. "Politics and the English Language." In *A Collection of Essays* (Garden, City, NY: Doubleday & Co) 162-77.

Writing centers

- Most colleges have a writing center, devoted to improving students writing. Do not think of this as a place only for "remedial" cases. If the staff is good, they should be able to offer assistance at all levels. Likewise, do not wait for an instructor to advise you to go there. If you are interested in improving your writing, go there for yourself and check it out. See what they have to offer (and bring a paper that you have written).

Examples of Work in Various Genres

The following examples are drawn mostly – though not exclusively – from the three topics we have followed throughout this book: worker-training programs, democracy, and social capital (see Chapter 1).

General accounts

- Ashton, David, and Francis Green. 1996. *Education, Training, and the Global Economy*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Dahl, Robert A. 2000. *On Democracy*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Hall, John A. 1995. *Civil Society: Theory, History, Comparison*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- See also Wikipedia articles on various subjects.

Book reviews

- Finegold, David. 2005. " Review of *How Institutions Evolve: The Political Economy of Skills in Germany, Britain, the United States, and Japan*." *Perspectives on Politics* 3(4): 930–31.
- Levi, Margaret. 1996. "Social and Unsocial Capital: A Review Essay of Robert Putnam's *Making Democracy Work*." *Politics & Society* 24:1 (March) 45-55.
- Tarrow, Sidney. 1996. "Making Social Science Work across Time and Space: Critical Reflections on Robert Putnam's *Making Democracy Work*." *American Political Science Review* 90:2, 389–97.

Literature reviews

- Carbone, Giovanni. 2009. "The Consequences of Democratization." *Journal of Democracy* 20:2 (April) 123-37.
- Geddes, Barbara. 1999. "What Do We Know about Democratization after Twenty Years?" *Annual Review of Political Science* 2, 115-44.
- Thelen, Kathleen. 2007. "Skill Formation and Training." In *The Oxford Handbook of Business History*, eds. Geoffrey Jones and Jonathan Zeitlin. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 558–80.
- Woolcock, Michael. 2010. "The Rise and Routinization of Social Capital, 1988-2008." *Annual Review of Political Science* 13 (May).

Policy reports

- Almeida, Rita; Jere Behrman; David Robalino (eds). 2012. *The Right Skills for the Job?: Rethinking Training Policies for Workers*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Committee on Evaluation of USAID Democracy Assistance Programs (CEUDAP). 2008. *Improving Democracy Assistance: Building Knowledge through Evaluations and Research*. National Research Council.
- *Worker Training in a New Era; Responding to New Threats*. Report of a Conference in Baltimore, Maryland, October 26-27, 2002. Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health and the

National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health.
http://www.cdc.gov/niosh/docs/2004-173/pdfs/2004-173.pdf

Monographs

- Berman, Sheri. 1997. "Civil Society and the Collapse of the Weimar Republic." *World Politics* 49:3, 401-29.
- Bourgois, Phillippe. 2002. *In Search of Respect: Selling Crack in El Barrio*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Estevez-Abe, Margarita, Torben Iversen, and David Soskice. 2001. "Social Protection and the Formation of Skills." In *Varieties of Capitalism: The Institutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage*, eds. Peter A. Hall and David Soskice. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gerring, John; Philip Bond; William Barndt; Carola Moreno. 2005. "Democracy and Growth: A Historical Perspective." *World Politics* 57:3 (April) 323-64.
- Huntington, Samuel P. 1991. *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Myerhoff, Barbara. 1980. *Number Our Days*. Touchstone.
- Paxton, Pamela. 2000. "Women's Suffrage in the Measurement of Democracy: Problems of Operationalization." *Studies in Comparative International Development* 35:3, 92-111.
- Paxton, Pamela. 2002. "Social Capital and Democracy: An Interdependent Relationship." *American Sociological Review* 67:2 (April) 254-77.
- Putnam, Robert D. 1993. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Putnam, Robert D. 1995. "Tuning In, Tuning Out: The Strange Disappearance of Social Capital in America." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 28:4 (December) 664-83.
- Snyder, Jack L. 2000. *From Voting to Violence: Democratization and Nationalist Conflict*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Thelen, Kathleen. 2004. *How Institutions Evolve: The Political Economy of Skills in Germany, Britain, the United States and Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.