POLS 205 Political Science as a Social Science

Examples of Theory-Building in Political Science

Christopher Adolph

University of Washington, Seattle

April 7, 2010

Red State, Blue State, Rich State, Poor State, Gelman et al (2007)

What is the research question?

What is the dependent variable?

What is the unit of analysis?

What are the key independent variables?

What are the hypotheses and alternatives?

Correlations among aggregates do not imply the same correlations among individuals

Correlations among aggregates do not imply the same correlations among individuals

Example:

Aggregate correlation: In the early 20th century, US states with many immigrants also had more college educated residents. In symbols, $corr(Immigants_{State}, CollegeEdu_{State}) > 0$

Correlations among aggregates do not imply the same correlations among individuals

Example:

Aggregate correlation: In the early 20th century, US states with many immigrants also had more college educated residents. In symbols, $corr(Immigants_{State}, CollegeEdu_{State}) > 0$

But

Individual correlation: Did immigrants have more years of education than natives? *No*. They had less: $corr(Immigant_i, CollegeEdu_i) < 0$

Correlations among aggregates do not imply the same correlations among individuals

Example:

Aggregate correlation: In the early 20th century, US states with many immigrants also had more college educated residents. In symbols, $corr(Immigants_{State}, CollegeEdu_{State}) > 0$

But

Individual correlation: Did immigrants have more years of education than natives? *No*. They had less: $corr(Immigant_i, CollegeEdu_i) < 0$

What is going on?

Assuming aggregate correlations tell us about individual correlations is a *fallacy*, or frequently misleading practice

Individual level correlations can be very different from the aggregate ("ecological") correlations

Note: this is the original meaning of ecology, a collection of individuals, not the modern environmental usage

Recognition of the ecological fallacy in the early 1950s changed course of social science towards individual level surveys

Republican Party advocates & implements policies which benefit high income: low marginal tax rates, low taxes on capital, a small welfare state

Republican Party advocates & implements policies which benefit high income: low marginal tax rates, low taxes on capital, a small welfare state

So rational, materialist voters should split on income: high income voters \rightarrow Republicans; low income voters \rightarrow Democrats

Republican Party advocates & implements policies which benefit high income: low marginal tax rates, low taxes on capital, a small welfare state

So rational, materialist voters should split on income: high income voters \rightarrow Republicans; low income voters \rightarrow Democrats

Thomas Frank and others note that Kansas has a lower average income than most US states, but a higher Republican vote

Republican Party advocates & implements policies which benefit high income: low marginal tax rates, low taxes on capital, a small welfare state

So rational, materialist voters should split on income: high income voters \rightarrow Republicans; low income voters \rightarrow Democrats

Thomas Frank and others note that Kansas has a lower average income than most US states, but a higher Republican vote

Does this finding contradict rational materialist voting?

What's the matter with Kansas? Nothing!

Frank has committed the ecological fallacy.

To show that Kansans vote irrationally, we need individual level data.



























Keynesian Politics: The Political Sources of Economic Policy Choices, Peter Gourevitch (1989) (2007)

What is the research question?

What is the dependent variable?

What is the unit of analysis?

What are the key independent variables?

What are the hypotheses and alternatives?