

1949

PROCEDURE AND
CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING STUDIES IN
POLITICAL SCIENCE

- I. What is the general area of politics in which the Author(s) or Investigators are interested? Is the general area significant? Does the author show awareness and familiarity with past studies in the same general area?
- II. What is the character of the specific problem attacked? Is there a precise and clear statement of the problem (or hypothesis)? Is the author(s) aware of the potential use of his finding in the context of a larger body of propositions?
- III. Design and sampling: What is the general method used by the author(s) - or general methods, if more than one? Why does he believe this method is the one that can give him an answer to his problem? What facts, out of the mass of data available to him, does he select? Why does he select these (in terms of their substantive utility)? Why does he select these (in terms of methodological considerations)? Are the facts sufficient in scope to test his general problem hypotheses? (If the study is statistical, the evaluation of the foregoing ?s should be in statistical terms: what sample is taken, why is it taken, is it representative or not, what are the characteristics of the sample - random, stratified)
 - a. If an experiment: what are the controls. How are controls and isolation of the controls and experimental groups achieved? How is matching or pairing done? How are the motivations in both groups held constant/
- IV. Precision and measurement: Do the words mean the same thing continuously through the study? Are all parts of the study capable of symbolic representation so represented and when they can readily be abbreviated, and, conversely, are simple statements converted into complex statistical ones without achieving precision and saving space? What are the units of measure? Are they direct or indirect? Are they simple or converted mathematically?
- V. What are the special techniques used in the study - including all the foregoing? List them, step by step, from beginning to end. Are all the steps in the method of the study repeated so that the process of logic and proof can be viewed by the reader? If this is omitted, how can the study be evaluated for its scientific worth? Could you repeat this particular study yourself on the basis of this report? Could you repeat a similar study in other areas? If not reported because of lack of space, do the authors preserve the records somewhere else?
- VI. The Findings: what are the findings? Are they based exclusively on the evidence of the study or do they depend for their validity on findings of other studies? Are these other studies clearly pointed out or are they assumed to exist? Are the conclusions warranted by the data? Are they too limited in scope or do they overleap the data? Are significant implications overlooked? Could simpler methods have accomplished the same degree of proof and significance?

- a. If study is statistical: Are the statistical procedures sound? Are they adapted to the problem? Are all the necessary statistical procedures used and presented - number of cases, means, dispersions, percentages, measures of significance, correlation coefficients, etc.? Have there been consistent attempts to reduce the sources of error, given the difficulties of design and sampling? Is the tabular and statistical material well-presented?

VII. ~~Are~~ Values: Can the values of the author(s) or investigators be discovered in the selection of the general area of study? What are they? Can the values of the author(s) in the selection of the particular problem be ~~found~~ discovered? What are they? Do the values of the authors intrude in the procedures in the form of value-laden words, warped judgements of the evidence, obiter dicta, concealment of evidence or exaggeration of the place of data favoring the authors. Do the values of the author(s) distort the findings in any way - by minimizing, by exaggerating, by selecting certain consequences of the finding and neglecting others? Do the author(s) declare their findings prove their values? What is their logic in this connection? Do they state the meaning of the findings not only for people sharing their values, but for people holding contrary or different values?