

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS
POLSCI 796
Term 1, Fall 2018

Instructor: Karen Bird
Email: kbird@mcmaster.ca
Seminar: Wednesdays, 8:30-11:20 am,
Classroom: KTH-709

Office: KTH-527
Office Hours: Tuesdays, 9-11am

Contents

Course Description..... 3
Course Objectives..... 3
Required Materials and Texts 4
Course Evaluation – Overview 4
Course Evaluation – Details..... 4
 Weekly memos (40%), due in class..... 4
 Participation (20%), ongoing..... 4
 Dissertation Research Proposal (40%), due Dec 12th..... 4
Weekly Course Schedule and Required Readings 5
 Week 1 (Sept 5) Introduction 5
 Week 2 (Sept 12) What is science?..... 6
 Week 3 (Sept 19) What/where are we as a discipline?..... 6
 Week 4 (Sept 26) Research questions 7
 Week 5 (Oct 3) Just exactly what do you mean?..... 7
 Week 6 (Oct 10) Fall mid-term recess, NO CLASS 8
 Week 7 (Oct 17) Causation and explanation 8
 Week 8 (Oct 24) Comparative methods & case study 9
 Week 9 (Oct 31) Experimental methods 10
 Week 10 (Nov 7) Qualitative research techniques..... 10
 Week 11 (Nov 14) Ethics and relevance..... 11
 Week 12 (Nov 21) Methods and resources @ Mac 12
 Weeks 13 (Nov 28) Research proposal presentations..... 12
 Week 14 (Dec 5) Research proposal presentations 12
Course Policies 13
 Submission of Assignments..... 13

| | |
|--|----|
| Grades..... | 13 |
| Late Assignments | 13 |
| Absences, Missed Work, Illness | 13 |
| Avenue to Learn | 13 |
| University Policies | 14 |
| Academic Integrity Statement..... | 14 |
| Academic Accommodation of Students with Disabilities..... | 14 |
| Faculty of Social Sciences E-mail Communication Policy | 14 |
| Course Modification | 14 |
| Appendix I: Supplementary Readings | 15 |

Course Description

Designed to explore philosophical assumptions in political science, theory, and matters of evidence and judgment, this course presents an introduction to research design, empirical methods, and the execution of research. The primary aims are to make you a more sophisticated consumer of diverse empirical research, to heighten your attention to the need for methodological rigour, and expose you to a variety of strategies and methods for conducting good research. The course will not cover every method or every approach. There is simply not time. However, it is expected that by the end of the course, you will be a better reader of empirical research, and will have a better understanding of how to design and conduct your own original, independent research. This is not a course in data analysis. Students looking for coverage of quantitative research methods should consider taking POL 784 as a complement to this course.

Note: There is an undeniable plurality of approaches and methods within the discipline of political science. And while there is public acceptance of this fact, in private there is a quiet war going on, in which supporters of specific methods can be highly dismissive and unsympathetic to others. My hope for this course is that we can move from at best grudging acceptance to something closer to a celebration of this diversity. Students are expected to come with an open mind and be prepared to critically analyze and challenge their own preconceptions about how political science research should be conducted and what makes for good research. As one aim of this course is to help students to advance their own research projects, it is expected that you will approach discussions in the spirit of genuine respect and mutual support for each other and our various projects.

Course Objectives

The primary goal of this course is to assist students in preparing their (Masters and PhD) dissertation proposals. In particular, the course aims to:

- make students aware of the ways in which methodological choices are closely linked to broader theoretical and conceptual issues;
- provide students with a critical understanding of the philosophical commitments and assumptions in political science research;
- enable students to consider the appropriateness of different methodologies and types of evidence to test alternative hypotheses and to construct various arguments;
- familiarize students with a variety of research methods, including participant observation, case studies, comparative analysis, and the use of documentary/primary sources;
- show students how to evaluate published studies in various social science fields, focusing on the logic of their argument, their methodologies, and the relationship between the evidence presented and their argument;
- sensitize students to the ethical issues in social science research.

Required Materials and Texts

- F. Chalmers. 2103. *What is this thing called science?* Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Co. Available at Campus Bookstore (3rd or 4th edition is acceptable).
- Donatella della Porta and Michael Keating (eds.). 2008. *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences: A Pluralist Perspective*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Online:
[https://www.hse.ru/data/2012/11/03/1249193115/Donatella Della Porta Michael Keating Approa.pdf](https://www.hse.ru/data/2012/11/03/1249193115/Donatella_Della_Porta_Michael_Keating_Approa.pdf)

Readings not drawn from these books can be accessed via Scholars Portal, or will be made available on the [Avenue To Learn](#) course website.

Course Evaluation – Overview

1. **Weekly memos: 40%**
2. **Participation: 20%**
3. **Dissertation research proposal: 40%**
 - a. Summary proposal Wks 12 & 13: 5% for proposal; 5% for peer review
 - b. Final paper due Dec. 12: 30%

Course Evaluation – Details

Weekly memos (40%), due in class (unless otherwise noted)

In addition to regular class attendance, students are required to write weekly memo assignments. **PhD students are to complete 8 memos (worth 5 pts each), while MA students may choose any 5 (worth 8 pts each).** The guiding questions for each memo are explained with each week's readings. They are due at the beginning of the appropriate seminar session. They will not be accepted after the due date and there are no substitute assignments. Memos are to be brief: maximum 2.5 pages (no more than 1,000 wds) unless otherwise specified. I am looking for analytically sharp, well-reasoned think-pieces, demonstrating a solid grasp of key concepts and arguments developed in the readings. Students should be prepared to summarize their main points in class.

Participation (20%), ongoing

Attendance and active participation in seminar are central to succeeding in this course. You are expected to complete all reading assignments, and should have at least 1-2 questions or reflections ready to advance the discussion each week.

Dissertation Research Proposal (40%), due Dec 12th

The major assignment for the course is a research proposal suitable for a PhD or Masters thesis. Your paper should be approximately 12-15 pages (5,000–6,000 words) and should apply relevant knowledge you have gained throughout the course. The proposal must clearly state the research problem and objectives, including the broad purpose of the analysis (e.g., causal inference, theory building and/or testing,

explanatory description). Specify these objectives in relation to the current development and needs of the relevant research program, related literatures, contested concepts and rival explanations or understandings. It must then clearly state the research question and provide an analytically appropriate specification of the phenomenon to be investigated. For example, if you are seeking to make causal inferences, this can be a discussion of the outcome to be explained, the likely causal factors or intervening mechanisms, and the variance you expect to find in the variables you are focusing on. If you are seeking to develop explanatory descriptions, you should discuss the spatial and temporal context(s) of the phenomenon of interest (what geographic locations are you studying, what time periods are you focusing on?) In the context of a small-n comparative, interpretive and/or process-tracing research design, this would include selection of case(s) to be studied and explicit justification of this selection. Next, the paper must specify the empirical basis for your project – i.e., on what data sources and information it will rest. What kind(s) of data do you need, and where will you find it? If you will generate the data yourself, describe the techniques you will use. This may include, for example, survey research, experiments, structured, semi-structured or unstructured interviews, ethnography or participant observation of daily life, archival research, collection of pre-existing materials (government or international organization data, newspaper articles, cartoons, graffiti, etc.), and so on. At the more concrete level, specify some of the specific steps you will take in gathering and analysing data. For example, how will you recruit research participants, and what kind of questions will you ask? What are the tools of data analysis you expect to employ (e.g., regression analysis, content analysis, discourse analysis, small n-comparative analysis, process-tracing, counterfactual analysis, etc.)? You should also demonstrate some awareness of opportunities and/or challenges regarding data collection and overall project feasibility. Consider cost, ethical, language, trust or safety problems you may have to confront; assess the availability of existing data, expert reports, or access to key actors/informants related to your specific topic. Finally, as with any grant proposal, aim for clarity, avoid jargon, and do not assume that your reader knows the idiosyncracies of your particular sub-field. Show why your research question is an important one, and why your design is capable of yielding valid answers and explanations.

You are to prepare a 1-2 page single-spaced summary of your research proposal for presentation to the class during Wks 12 and 13. Your summary must be uploaded to ATL on the Monday prior to your assigned week. Each student will make a 10-minute oral presentation of their proposal, which will be followed by 10 minutes of general discussion led by an assigned peer reviewer.

Final paper is due Dec. 12, to be submitted via ATL.

Weekly Course Schedule and Required Readings

Week 1 (Sept 5) Introduction

Topic: Introductory meeting and course overview

Come to class prepared to discuss your own research interests. What are you interested in studying? Why? How? Where? What kinds of methods were you thinking of using?

Week 2 (Sept 12) What is science?

Topic: What is science? Is political science a science? Positivist, interpretivist and poststructuralist approaches.

Write a brief memo about how one's assumptions about human behavior, and various social, economic and political processes, shape one's approach to research. What questions you ask, what kinds of data you collect, what "findings" you find interesting are all shaped by these assumptions. What are your own underlying assumptions? Can politics and other decisional aspects of human behavior be studied scientifically? Where do you stand on the positivist – interpretivist – poststructuralist divide? Why?

- Chalmers, ch. 1, 5-9.
- Dryzek, John S. (1986). "The Progress of Political Science." *Journal of Politics*, 48(2): 301-320.
- Shreeve, Jamie (2015). "This Face Changes the Human Story. But How?" *National Geographic* (10 Sept.)
<http://news.nationalgeographic.com/2015/09/150910-human-evolution-change/>

Week 3 (Sept 19) What/where are we as a discipline?

Topic: Unity, plurality of methodology, and relevance of political science research. Perestroika and other developments in the discipline of political science in the US and Canada.

We all want in some way to be "engaged scholars" and to make our research relevant to those outside of the academy. Why and how is this important in thinking about your own research agenda? What specific forms of engagement do you see as important? What opportunities or barriers to engagement do you anticipate, whether from the university and scientific community, or from the communities that might benefit from your research? What real costs, benefits and risks do you see with respect to being an engaged scholar in your line of research?

- Various (2010). Symposium: Perestroika in Political Science. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 43(4): 725-754. Luke & McGovern, Yanow & Schwartz-Shea, Sadiq & Monroe, and Caterino pieces.
- Gerring, John (2012). "Postscript: Justifications." In *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press, pp 394-401. (ATL)
- Achen, Christopher H. (2014). "Why do we need Diversity in the Political Methodology Society?" *The Political Methodologist*, 22(2): 25-28.

- Kovach, Margaret (2009). "Situating Indigenous Research within the Academy." *Indigenous Methodologies*. University of Toronto Press. (ATL)
- Goodman, Nicole, Karen Bird, and Chelsea Gabel (2017). "Towards a More Collaborative Political Science: A Partnership Approach." *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 50(1): 201-218.
- Alcantara, Christopher, Dianne Lalonde, and Gary N. Wilson (2017). "Indigenous Research and Academic Freedom: A View from Political Scientists." *The International Indigenous Policy Journal*, 8(2), <http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/iipj/vol8/iss2/3/>

Week 4 (Sept 26) Research questions

Topic: Coming up with a good research question

Write a brief memo describing your own research question. How did you "discover" this question? Describe the process. How do you propose to design a research project around this question? What personal and/or practical (as well as intellectual) goals do bring to your proposed study, and to your preferred methods of data collection? What potential benefits or liabilities do these more personal interests have for your research?

- Schmitter, Philippe (2008). "The Design of Social and Political Research." Ch. 14 in Donatella della Porta and Michael Keating (eds.), *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences: A Pluralist Perspective*. Cambridge University Press, pp 263-295.
- John Gerring (2012). "Beginnings." Ch. 2 in *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. (ATL)
- Gustafsson, Karl, and Linus Hagström (2017). "What is the Point? Teaching Graduate Students how to Construct Political Science Research Puzzles." *European Political Science*, <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41304-017-0130-y>
- Bloemraad, Irene (2007). "Of Puzzles and Serendipity: Doing Cross-national, Mixed Method Immigration Research." Pp 34-49, in Louis DeSipio (ed.), *Researching Migration: Stories from the Field*. New York: SSRC. Online at http://www.ssrc.org/workspace/images/crm/new_publication_3/%7B42451838-264a-de11-afac-001cc477ec70%7D.pdf
- Smith, Rogers M. (2007). "Systematizing the Ineffable: A Perestroikan's Methods for Finding a Good Research Topic." *Qualitative Methods: Newsletter of the American Political Science Association Organized Section on Qualitative Methods*, 5, 1 (Spring): 6-8. <http://www.maxwell.syr.edu/uploadedFiles/moynihan/cqrm/Newsletter5.1.pdf>

Week 5 (Oct 3) Just exactly what do you mean?

Topic: Conceptualization, operationalization and measurement

For this memo, you are to develop a concept map that can inform and guide your research. The main idea here is to lay out, interrogate and problematize important concepts, assumptions, expectations and theories with respect to the phenomena of interest to you. Where possible, use arrows to show how elements are related. You cannot map a theory of everything, so this exercise should also help you to narrow and refine your research focus. And don't worry about perfection. At this stage, your concept map is not intended to be definitive, but rather is an early stage in reflection, making hunches or implicit ideas more explicit, and beginning to theorize about causes, effects, processes, mechanisms, etc. The memo you submit must have two parts: a visual map, and a brief narrative of what this concept map says about the phenomena you are studying, how elements are linked, and what parts of the map you need to read/think/work on improve your conceptual and theoretical framework.

- Maxwell, Joseph A. (2013). "Conceptual Framework: What Do You Think is Going On?" Ch. 3 in *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach*. Thousand Oaks: Sage. (ATL)
- Gerring, John (1999). "What Makes a Good Concept? A Criterial Framework for Understanding Concept Formation in the Social Sciences." *Polity* 31(3): 357-393.
- Mair, Peter (2008). "Concepts and Concept Formation." Ch. 10 in Donatella della Porta and Michael Keating (eds.), *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences: A Pluralist Perspective*. Cambridge University Press, pp 177-197.
- Jones, Charles O. (1974). "Doing Before Knowing: Concept Development in Political Research." *American Journal of Political Science*, 18, 1: 215-228.
- Coppedge, Michael, and John Gerring (2011). "Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy: A New Approach." *Perspectives on Politics*, 9, 2 (June): 247-67.

Week 6 (Oct 10) Fall mid-term recess, NO CLASS

Week 7 (Oct 17) Causation and explanation

Topic: What is causal explanation? Can qualitative research establish causality?

Write a short memo on any research article or book that you believe provides a convincing explanation: what questions did the author pose, what alternative explanations were considered, what method was employed, and why in your opinion do you think the proposed explanation is convincing?

- Gerring, John (2012). "Causal Arguments." In *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press, pp 197-217. (ATL)
- King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane and Sidney Verba (1994). "Causality and Causal Inference." Ch. 3 (esp. pp 99-114) in *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. (ATL)

- Mahoney, James, and Gary Goertz. 2006. "A tale of two cultures: Contrasting quantitative and qualitative research." *Political Analysis* 14(3): 227–249.
- Elster, Jon (1988). "A Plea for Mechanisms." In Peter Hedstrom and Richard Swedberg (eds.), *Social Mechanisms: An Analytical Approach to Social Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (ATL)
- George, Alexander L. and Andrew Bennett (2005). "Process-Tracing and Historical Explanation." Ch. 10 in *Case Studies and Theoretical Development*. Boston: MIT Press. (ATL)
- Brady, Henry E. (2004). "Data-set Observations vs. Causal-Process Observations: The 2000 US Presidential Election." Appendix in Henry E. Brady and David Collier (eds.) *Rethinking Social Inquiry* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield. (ATL)

Week 8 (Oct 24) Comparative methods & case study

Topic: What is the logic and purpose of comparison? How should cases be chosen for comparison?

Choose a major article or book that employs a small-n comparison or a case study for testing or developing a theory. How did the author justify the case selection strategy, or decide what country, village, town, factory, or institution should be selected for the study? Do you think the criteria were appropriate? Does the study present a "crucial" case for the theory? Can any generalizations be drawn from the study? How does the author define and limit the unit for study? Might the choice of other units lead to different results?

- Lijphart, Arend (1971). "Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method." *American Political Science Review*, 65(3): 682-93.
- della Porta, Donatella (2008). "Comparative Analysis: Case-oriented versus Variable-oriented Research. Ch. 11 in Donatella della Porta and Michael Keating (eds.), *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences: A Pluralist Perspective*. Cambridge University Press, pp 198-222.
- Van Evera, Stephen (1997). "What Are Case Studies? How Should They Be Performed?" In *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. (ATL)
- Levy, Jack S. (2008). "Case Studies: Types, Designs and Logics of Inference." *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, 25: 1-18.
- Alexander L. George, and Andrew Bennett (2005). "Case Studies and Theory Development." Ch. 1 in *Case Studies and Theoretical Development*. Boston: MIT Press, pp 3-36. (ATL)

Studies that illustrate research method:

- Varshney, Ashutosh (2001). "Ethnic Conflict and Civil Society: India and Beyond." *World Politics*, 53: 362-398.

- Posner, D. 2004. The political salience of cultural difference: why Chewas and Tumbukas are allies in Zambia and adversaries in Malawi. *American Political Science Review*, 98 (4): 529–46.

Week 9 (Oct 31) Experimental methods

Topic: Defining characteristics and pitfalls. Lab, survey, field and natural experiments.

The experimental method is often referred to as the gold standard for causal inference. In this memo, consider the Ontario Basic Income Pilot Project that was cancelled by the newly elected PC government. Based on what you can find out about that study, were its design elements up to the gold standard? What are some of the key challenges for ensuring that such an experiment produces valid results, which can in turn be translated into good public policy?

- John, Peter (2017). “Field Experimentation: Opportunities and Constraints.” *Field Experiments in Political Science and Public Policy: Practical Lessons in Design and Delivery*. New York: Routledge, ch. 1. (ATL)
- Dunning, Thad (2012). “Introduction: Why Natural Experiments?” *Natural Experiments in the Social Sciences: A Design-Based Approach*. New York: Cambridge University Press, ch. 1. (ATL)
- Hyde, Susan D. (2015). “Experiments in International Relations: Lab, Survey, and Field.” *Annual Review of Political Science*, 18: 403–24.
- Stoker, Gerry (2010). “Translating Experiments into Policy.” *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 628(1): 47-58.

Studies that illustrate research method:

- Broockman, David E. (2013). “Black Politicians are More Intrinsically Motivated to Advance Blacks’ Interests: A Field Experiment Manipulating Political Incentives.” *American Journal of Political Science*, 57(3): 521-36.
- Habyarimana, James, Humphreys, M., Posner, D., & Weinstein, J. (2007). Why Does Ethnic Diversity Undermine Public Goods Provision? *The American Political Science Review*, 101(4), 709-725
- Beaman, Lori, Esther Duflo, Rohini Pande, and Petia Topalova (2006). “Women Politicians, Gender Bias, and Policy-making in Rural India.” UNICEF. https://www.unicef.org/french/sowc07/docs/beaman_duflo_pande_topalova.pdf

Week 10 (Nov 7) Qualitative research techniques

Topic: Interviews, group discussion, ethnography and text/document-based techniques

Attend an open public meeting and write a brief report on what you observe. (Examples: a protest rally, an all-candidates meeting, a city council meeting, a police services board meeting, etc.). Your task is to come up with observations and insights not ordinarily offered by journalists. You might, for example, devise a method for ascertaining the

social composition of the audience; a measure of audience response to the speakers; tell us why people came to the meeting; give a content analysis of themes or metaphors presented by the speakers; tell us something about the symbols employed in the event; provide a kind of ethnographic description of the event (à la Geertz and the Balinese cockfight); provide a "discourse analysis"; analyze the event as a "play," a "fight," a "religious" revival, or whatever else appears to be an appropriate metaphor. Use your imagination and ingenuity.

- Bray, Zoe (2008). "Ethnographic Approaches." Ch. 15 in Donatella della Porta and Michael Keating (eds.), *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences: A Pluralist Perspective*. Cambridge University Press, pp 296-315.
- Hammersley, Martyn, and Paul Atkinson (2007). *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*. London, UK: Routledge, ch. 1 and 2. (ATL)
- Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York, NY: Basic Books, chapters 1 and 15. (ATL)
- Richard F. Fenno (1986). "Observation, context, and sequence in the study of politics." *American Political Science Review* 80:1, pp 3-15.

Studies that illustrate research method:

- Richard F. Fenno. 1978. "Appendix. Notes on method: Participant observation." In *Home-Style: House Members and their Districts*. Toronto: Little Brown & Co. (pp 249-295). (ATL)
- Scott, James C. (1987). *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, ch. 6. (ATL)
- Bird, Karen (2015). "'We are Not an Ethnic Vote!' Representational Perspectives of Minorities in the Greater Toronto Area." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 48(2): 249-279.

Week 11 (Nov 14) Ethics and relevance

Topic: Ethnics and Relevance of political science research

Write a brief essay discussing the potential ethical issues raised by your proposed research project. What are the issues? How do you propose to resolve them?

- McMaster Research Ethics: http://reo.mcmaster.ca/policies/copy_of_guidelines
- Porter, Tony (2008). "Research Ethics Governance and Political Science in Canada," *PS: Political Science and Politics*, (July): 495-99.
- Humphrey, Macartan (2014). "How to Make Field Experiments More Ethical," *Monkey Cage / Washington Post*, 2 Nov., https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2014/11/02/how-to-make-field-experiments-more-ethical/?utm_term=.fc848758ee9c
- Aschwandene, Christie (2015). "Science Isn't Broken. It's just a hell of a lot harder than we give it credit for." *Five-thirty-eight*, 19 Aug., <http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/science-isnt-broken/#part1>

- Nilan, Pamela (2002). 'Dangerous Fieldwork' Re-examined: The Question of Researcher Subject Position." *Qualitative Research*, 2, 3: 363-86.
- Siplon, Patricia (1999). "Scholar, Witness, or Activist? The Lessons and Dilemmas of an AIDS Research Agenda," *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 32, 3: 576-78.

Week 12 (Nov 21) Methods and resources @ Mac

Topic: Guest speakers and tour of resources for social science research. Class will begin at the William Ready Division of Archives & Research Collections, basement level of Mills: LB101. **Please arrive promptly at 8:30.**

This week, students will get some hands-on experience in using archival resources and freedom of information requests. For your weekly memo, you are to write up your experience and assessment of the resources reviewed. What did you learn? How did you find the space and/or research resources that were explained? What surprised you? What did you like or dislike? If you think you may use either archives or FOI mechanisms in your own research, say a bit about that. **This memo is to be submitted via ATL on the Friday following class.**

Weeks 13 (Nov 28) Research proposal presentations

Prepare a 1-2 page single-spaced summary of your research proposal. The summary should briefly indicate the research question, the hypotheses, the methods to be employed, and what the expected contribution of the research would be to the body of literature related to your topic. A total of 20 minutes of class time will be devoted to each proposal. You must limit your presentation to 10 minutes, at which time the instructor will stop you. Ten additional minutes will be reserved for class discussion. Each student will be assigned one peer reviewer, however everyone is expected to read the proposed summaries and come to class prepared to offer constructive comments to their classmates. To ensure adequate time for everyone to present their proposals, we will organize this over two seminar meetings. **Your memo is due via ATL on the Monday immediately prior to your presentation.**

- Przeworski, Adam, and Frank Salomon (1988). "On the Art of Writing Proposals: Some Candid Suggestions for Applicants to Social Science Research Council Competitions." <https://www.ssrc.org/publications/view/7A9CB4F4-815F-DE11-BD80-001CC477EC70/>

Week 14 (Dec 5) Research proposal presentations

Topic: Research Proposal Presentations continued

Note: final paper due, December 12th

Course Policies

Submission of Assignments

Weekly memos are to be submitted in hard copy at the beginning of seminar. The 1-2 page summary of research proposal, and the final research proposal paper, are to be submitted via ATL.

Grades

Grades will be based on the McMaster University grading scale:

| MARK | GRADE |
|-------------|--------------|
| 90-100 | A+ |
| 85-90 | A |
| 80-84 | A- |
| 77-79 | B+ |
| 73-76 | B |
| 70-72 | B- |
| 69-0 | F |

Late Assignments

Memos will not be accepted after the due date.

With respect to the final paper, I will apply the following rule strictly in the interest of fairness to all students: 5% per day deduction (i.e., 1.5 points/day on a 30-point assignment), including weekend days.

Absences, Missed Work, Illness

Regular attendance is expected of all graduate students. In cases of illness, students may post their memos to ATL. No 'make-up' assignments will be provided in the event of missed classes and participation opportunities; rather students should double their effort in subsequent classes. Finally, I reserve the right to use my judgement in calculating the final grade. If you choose especially challenging assignments for yourself, or tend to go the easy route, I will take that into account

Avenue to Learn

In this course we will be using Avenue to Learn. Students should be aware that, when they access the electronic components of this course, private information such as first and last names, user names for the McMaster e-mail accounts, and program affiliation may become apparent to all other students in the same course. The available information is dependent on the technology used. Continuation in this course will be deemed consent to this disclosure. If you have any questions or concerns about such disclosure please discuss this with the course instructor.

University Policies

Academic Integrity Statement

You are expected to exhibit honesty and use ethical behavior in all aspects of the learning process. Academic credentials you earn are rooted in principles of honesty and academic integrity.

Academic dishonesty is to knowingly act or fail to act in a way that results or could result in unearned academic credit or advantage. This behavior can result in serious consequences, e.g. the grade of zero on an assignment, loss of credit with a notation on the transcript (notation reads: "Grade of F assigned for academic dishonesty"), and/or suspension or expulsion from the university.

It is your responsibility to understand what constitutes academic dishonesty. For information on the various types of academic dishonesty please refer to the Academic Integrity Policy, located at www.mcmaster.ca/academicintegrity.

The following illustrates only three forms of academic dishonesty:

1. Plagiarism, e.g. the submission of work that is not one's own or for which credit has been obtained.
2. Improper collaboration in group work.
3. Copying or using unauthorized aids in tests and examinations.

Academic Accommodation of Students with Disabilities

Students who require academic accommodation must contact Student Accessibility Services (SAS) to make arrangements with a Program Coordinator. Academic accommodations must be arranged for each term of study. Student Accessibility Services can be contacted by phone 905-525-9140 ext. 28652 or e-mail sas@mcmaster.ca. For further information, consult McMaster University's Policy for [Academic Accommodation of Students with Disabilities](#).

Faculty of Social Sciences E-mail Communication Policy

Effective September 1, 2010, it is the policy of the Faculty of Social Sciences that all e-mail communication sent from students to instructors (including TAs), and from students to staff, must originate from the student's own McMaster University e-mail account. This policy protects confidentiality and confirms the identity of the student. It is the student's responsibility to ensure that communication is sent to the university from a McMaster account. If an instructor becomes aware that a communication has come from an alternate address, the instructor may not reply at his or her discretion.

Course Modification

The instructor and university reserve the right to modify elements of the course during the term. The university may change the dates and deadlines for any or all courses in extreme circumstances. If either type of modification becomes necessary, reasonable

notice and communication with the students will be given with explanation and the opportunity to comment on changes. It is the responsibility of the student to check his/her McMaster email and course websites weekly during the term and to note any changes.

Appendix I: Supplementary Readings

Week 2: What is science?

- Grofman, Bernard (2007). "Toward a Science of Politics?" *European Political Science*, 6: 143-155.
- Yanow, Dvora (2006). "Thinking Interpretively: Philosophical Presuppositions and the Human Sciences." Pp 5-26 in Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea (eds.), *Interpretation and Method" Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Riker, William H. (1982). "The Two-Party System and Duverger's Law: An Essay on the History of Political Science." *American Political Science Review*, 76(4): 753-766.
- Walker, Thomas C. (2010). "The Perils of Paradigm Mentalities: Revisiting Kuhn, Lakatos, and Popper." *Perspectives on Politics*, 8(2): 433-451.
- Grant, Ruth (2002). "Political Theory, Political Science, and Politics." *Political Theory* 30(4): 577-595.
- Fay, Brian (1975). "Positivist Social Science and Technological Politics." Pp 18-48, in *Social Theory and Political Practice*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Sil, Rudra (2004). "Problems Chasing Methods or Methods Chasing Problems? Research Communities, Constrained Pluralism, and the Role of Eclecticism." Pp 307-331 in Ian Shapiro, Rogers M. Smith, and Tarek Masoud (eds.), *Problems and Methods in the Study of Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Delanty, Gerard (1997). *Social Science: Beyond Constructivism and Realism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Ball, Terence (1976). "From Paradigms to Research Programs: Toward a Post-Kuhnian Political Science." *American Journal of Political Science*, 20: 151-77.
- Ball, Terence (1987). "Is There Progress in Political Science?" Pp 13-35 in Ball (ed.) *Idioms of Inquiry: Critique and Renewal in Political Science*. Albany: SUNY Press.

Week 3: What/where are we as a discipline?

- Cairns, Alan C. (1975). "Political Science in Canada and the Americanization Issue." *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 8(2): 191-234.
- Trent, John E. (1987). "Factors Influencing the Development of Political Science in Canada: A Case and a Model." *International Political Science Review*, 8(1): 9-24.
- Nossal, Kim Richard (2000). "Home Grown IR: The Canadianization of International Relations." *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 35, 1 (Spring): 95-114.
- Cairns, Alan C. (2008). "Conclusion: Are We on the Right Track?" Pp 238-51 in Linda White et. al (eds.) *The Comparative Turn in Canadian Political Science*. Vancouver/Toronto: UBC Press.
- Anonymous (2014). "No Shortcuts to Gender Equality: The Structures of Women's Exclusion in Political Science." *Politics & Gender* 10(3): 437-447.
- Grant, J. Tobin (2005). "What Divides Us? The Image and Organization of Political Science." *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 38, 3 (July): 379-86.
- Various (2002). Symposium on Perestroika movement. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 35, 2: 177-205.
- Hawkesworth, Mary (2006). "Contending Conceptions of Science and Politics." Ch. 2 in Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea (eds.), *Interpretation and Method" Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine (2003). "Is This the Curriculum We Want? Doctoral Requirements and Offerings in Methods and Methodology." *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 36, 3 (July): 379-86.
- Tuhiwai Smith, Linda (1999). "The Indigenous Peoples' Project: Setting a new Agenda." Ch. 5 in *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London: Zed Books.
- Fox Piven, Frances (2010). "Reflections on Scholarship and Activism." *Antipode*, 42, 4: 806-10.

Week 4: Research questions

- Mills, C. Wright (1959). "Appendix: On Intellectual Craftsmanship." *The Sociological Imagination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (pp 195-226).
- Wildavsky, Aaron (1989). "Reading with a Purpose." Ch. 3 in *Craftways: On the Organization of Scholarly Work*. New York: Transaction Press.
- Most, Benjamin A. (1990). "Getting Started on Political Research." *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 23, 4: (December): 592-6.
- Useem, Bert (1997). "Choosing a Dissertation Topic." *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 30, 2 (June): 213-6.
- Various (2001). Symposium on Advisors and the Dissertation Proposal. *PSOnline* (December). www.apsanet.org
- King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane and Sidney Verba (1994). "Major Components of Research Design." Pp 7-28 in *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Week 5: Concepts, operationalization & measurement

- Adcock, Robert and David Collier (2001). "Measurement Validity: A Shared Standard for Qualitative and Quantitative Research." *American Political Science Review*, 95 (September): 529-546.
- Bittner, Amanda, and Elizabeth Goodyear-Grant. 2015 "What's Better than Sex? Rethinking Gender in Election Studies." Manuscript. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281592081_Rethinking_Gender_in_Election_Studies
- Brady, Henry and Cynthia Kaplan (2000). "Categorically Wrong? Nominal Versus Graded Measures of Ethnic Identity." *Studies in Comparative International Development* 35(3): 56-91
- Zachary Elkins (2000). "Gradations of Democracy? Empirical Tests of Alternative Conceptualizations." *American Journal of Political Science* 44(2): 293-300.
- Treier, Shawn and Simon Jackman (2008). "Democracy as a Latent Variable." *American Journal of Political Science* 52(1): 201-217.
- Paxton, Pamela (2000). "Women's Suffrage in the Measurement of Democracy: Problems of Operationalization." *Studies in Comparative International Development* 35(3): 92-111.
- Collier, David and Steven Levitsky (1997). "Democracy with Adjectives: Conceptual Innovation in Comparative Research." *World Politics* 49(3): 430-451.
- Munck, Gerardo L. and Jay Verkuilen (2002). "Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy: Evaluating Alternative Indices." *Comparative Political Studies*. 35(1): 15-34.
- Putnam, Robert D. (1993). "Measuring Performance." Ch. 3 in *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Wedeen, Lisa (2004). "Concepts and commitments in the study of democracy." In Ian Shapiro, Rogers M. Smith, and Tarek Masoud (eds.), *Problems and Methods in the Study of Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (pp 274-306).
- Sartori, Giovanni (1970). "Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics," *American Political Science Review*, 64(4):1033-1053.
- McIntyre, Alisdair (1975). "The Essential Contestability of Some Social Concepts." *Ethics*, 83: 1-9.
- Carmines, Edward G. and Richard A. Zeller (1979). *Reliability and Validity Assessment*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage (pp 9-27).
- Collier, David, Jody LaPorte, and Jason Seawright (2012) "Putting typologies to work concept formation, measurement, and analytic rigor." *Political Research Quarterly*, 65(1): 217-232.
- Collier, David and James E. Mahon (1993). "Conceptual 'Stretching' Revisited: Adapting Categories in Comparative Analysis," *American Political Science Review*, 87, 4: 845-855.
- Mair, Peter. 2009. "Getting Concepts Right." *APSA-CP Newsletter*, 20, 2: 1-4.
- Mazur, Amy G. and Gary Goertz (2008). *Politics, Gender, and Concepts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Week 7: Causation and explanation

- Chandra, Kanchan (2006). "Mechanisms v/s Outcomes." Essay for Symposium on David Laitin's Work, Newsletter of APSA Section on Qualitative Methods.
- Tilly, Charles (1995). "To Explain Political Processes." *American Journal of Sociology*, 100, 6 (May): 1594-1610.
- Tilly, Charles (2001). "Mechanisms in Political Processes." *Annual Review of Political Research*, 4: 21-41.
- Lieberman, Evan S. (2001). "Causal inference in historical institutional analysis." *Comparative Political Studies*, 34(9): 1011-35.
- Mahoney, James (2003). "Strategies of Causal Assessment in Comparative Historical Analysis" Ch. 10 in James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer (eds.), *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Fenno, Richard F. (1986). "Observation, Context, and Sequence in the Study of Politics". *The American Political Science Review* 80(1): 3–15.
- Petersen, Roger D. (2006). *Resistance and Rebellions: Lessons from Eastern Europe*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, ch. 1, 2 and 6.
- Klemmensen, Robert, et al. (2012). "The Genetics of Political Participation, Civic Duty, and Political Efficacy across Cultures: Denmark and the United States." *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 24(3): 409–427.

Week 8: Comparative method & case study

- Ragin, Charles C. (2004). "Turning the Tables: How Case-oriented Research Challenges Variable-oriented Research." Ch. 8 in Henry E. Brady and David Collier (eds.) *Rethinking Social Inquiry*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Ragin, Charles C. (1987). "The Distinctiveness of Comparative Social Science." *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hall, Peter (2006). "Aligning Ontology and Methodology in Comparative Politics." In James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer (eds.), *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (pp 373-405).
- McIntyre, Alisdair (1978). "Is a Science of Comparative Politics Possible?" Ch. 22 in *Against the Self-Images of the Age*. University of Notre Dame Press.
- Various (1998). Symposium: Comparative Method in the 1990s. *APSA-CP Newsletter*, 9-1 (Winter): 1-31.
- Collier, David (1991). "The Comparative Method: Two Decades of Change." Pp 7-31 in Dankwart A. Rustow and Kenneth Paul Erickson (eds.) *Comparative Political Dynamics: Global Research Perspectives*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Mill, John Stuart (1970). "Two Methods of Comparison." Pp 205-13 in Amitai Etzioni and F. Dubow (eds.), *Comparative Perspectives: Theories and Methods*. Boston: Little Brown.
- Snyder, Richard (2001). "Scaling Down: The Subnational Comparative Method." *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 36, 1 (Spring): 93-110.
- Gerring, John (2004). "What is a Case Study and What is it Good for?" *American Political Science Review*, 98: 341-54.
- Geddes, Barbara (2003). "How the Cases you Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias and Related Issues." Ch . 3 in *Paradigms and Sand Castles: Theory Building and Research Design in Comparative Politics*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Rueschemeyer, Dietrich (2003). "Can One or a Few Cases Yield Theoretical Gains?" Ch. 9 in James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer (eds.), *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bennett, Andrew and Colin Elman (2007). "Case Study Methods in International Relations Subfield." *Comparative Political Studies*, 40, 2 (February): 170-95.

Week 9: Experimental methods

- Gerber, Alan and Donald Green (2012). *Field Experiment: Design, Analysis, and Interpretation* (W.W. Norton & Company)

- McDermott, Rose (2002). "Experimental Methods in Political Science." *Annual Review of Political Science*, 5:31–61.
- Campbell, Donald T., and H. Laurence Ross (1968). "The Connecticut Crackdown on Speeding: Time-Series Data in Quasi-Experimental Analysis." *Law & Society Review*, 3(1): 33-54.

Week 10: Qualitative methods & techniques

Overviews

- Denzin, Norman K. and Yvonna S. Lincoln, eds. 2013. *The Landscape of Qualitative Research* (4th edition). London: Sage.
- Silverman, David. 2001. *Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for Analyzing Talk, Text and Interaction* (2nd edition). London: Sage.
- Taylor, Steven J. and Robert Bogdan. 1984. *Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods: The Search for Meanings*. New York: John Wiley & Sons
- Dick, Hobbs, and Richard, Wright, eds. 2006. *The SAGE Handbook of Fieldwork*, London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Martin, W. B., and George, G., eds. (2000). *Qualitative Researching with Text, Image and Sound*. London: SAGE Publications.

Ethnographic methods

- Agar, Michael H. (1986). *Speaking of Ethnography*. Sage.
- Jorgensen, Danny L. (1989). *Participant Observation: A Methodology for Human Studies*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Symposium: Ethnographic Methods in Political Science. *Qualitative Methods Newsletter*, 2009 and Symposium on fieldwork in *Qualitative Methods Newsletter* Fall 2006.
- Wedeen, Lisa. 2010. "Reflections on Ethnographic Work in Political Science." *Annual Review of Political Science* 13: 255-272 [good source for finding other examples]

Fieldwork

- Kapiszewski, Diana, Lauren M. MacLean, and Benjamin L. Read. 2015. *Field Research in Political Science: Practices and Principles*. Cambridge University Press. Chapter 1 (See KMR below).
- Wood, Elisabeth Jean. 2007. "Field Research." In *Handbook of Comparative Politics*, edited by Carles Boix and Susan Stokes (Oxford University Press).
- Symposium: Fieldwork in Political Science: Encountering Challenges and Crafting Solutions. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 47, 1 (April 2014): 391-417 OR Symposium on fieldwork in *Qualitative Methods Newsletter* Spring 2004.

Archival methods and Freedom of information requests

- Hill, Michael R. (1993). *Archival strategies and techniques*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Savage, Ashley, and Richard Hyde (2014). "Using freedom of information requests to facilitate research." *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 17(3): 303-317.
- Doolittle, Robyn (2017). Video: The story behind how The Globe's Unfounded series was reported. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x4DuGAoElxI> and <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/canada/how-to-get-your-police-report-through-a-freedom-of-information-act/video/cfa6787e-69c2-4232-987a-8393065e45fc/>

Discourse & content analysis

- Symposium: Discourse and Content Analysis. *Qualitative Methods Newsletter* Spring 2004.
- Phillips, Nelson and Cynthia Hardy (2002). *Discourse Analysis*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Milliken, Jennifer (1999). "The Study of Discourse in International Relations: A Critique of Research and Methods." *European Journal of International Relations* 5:2 (June) 225-54.

Interview methods

- Jaber, F. G., and James, A. H., eds. (2001). *Handbook of Interview Research*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Rubin, Herbert J. and Irene S. Rubin (2005). *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Chapters 4-8.

- Hammer, Dean and Aaron Wildavsky (1989). "The Open-Ended, Semi-Structured Interview: An (Almost) Operational Guide." In Aaron Wildavsky, *Craftways: On the Organization of Scholarly Work*. New Brunswick: Transaction.
- "Symposium: Interview Methods in Political Science," *PS: Political Science and Politics* (December 2002), 35(4): 663-688.
- Aberbach, Joel D., James D. Chesney and Bert A. Rockman (1975). "Exploring Elite Political Attitudes: Some Methodological Lessons." *Political Methodology* 2:1-27.
- Delaney, K. J. (2007). "Methodological Dilemmas and Opportunities in Interviewing Organizational Elites." *Sociology Compass*, 1: 208–221.
- Dexter, Anthony Lewis. (1979). *Elite and Specialized Interviewing*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Leuffen, Dirk (2006). "Bienvenue or Access Denied? Recruiting French Political Elites for In-Depth Interviews." *French Politics*, 4: 342-7.

Focus groups

- David, L. M., (1997). *Focus Groups as Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Hollander, Jocelyn A. (2004). "The social context of focus groups." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 33(5): 602-637.
- Morgan, David L. (1996). "Focus Groups." *Annual Review of Sociology*, 22: 129-152.
- Bird, Karen (2015). "'We are Not an Ethnic Vote!' Representational Perspectives of Minorities in the Greater Toronto Area." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 48(2): 249-279.

Photovoice

- Wang, Caroline, and Mary Ann Burris (1997). "Photovoice: concept, methodology, and use for participatory needs assessment." *Health Education & Behavior*, 24(3): 369-387.
- Sutton-Brown, Camille A. (2014). "Photovoice: A Methodological Guide," *Photography and Culture*, 7:2, 169-185

Week 11: Ethics and relevance

- Canadian Institutes of Health Research, Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, and Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (2010). *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans*, December. Chapters 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, and 10.
- CPSA (2010). "CPSA Response to December 2009 Draft of the 2nd edition of the TCPS." Online at http://cpsa-acsp.ca/documents/pdfs/2010_CPSA_Response_to_TCPSII.pdf
- Van Noorden, Richard (2015). "Political Science's Problem with Research Ethics." *Nature*, June 29, doi:10.1038/nature.2015.17866. Online at http://www.nature.com/news/political-science-s-problem-with-research-ethics-1.17866?WT.mc_id=TWT_NatureNews
- Konnikova, Maria (2015). "How a Gay-Marriage Study Went Wrong." *The New Yorker* (May 22). Online at <http://www.newyorker.com/science/maria-konnikova/how-a-gay-marriage-study-went-wrong>
- Scheper-Hughes, Nancy (1992). *Death without Weeping: The Violence of Everyday Life in Brazil*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. Read "Moral relativism and the primacy of the ethical" in Introduction, pp 21-30.
- Woliver, L. R. (2002) "Ethical Dilemmas in Personal Interviewing," *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 35, 4: 677-8.
- Jacoby, Tami (2006). "From the Trenches: Dilemmas of Feminist IR Fieldwork." Pp 153-73 in B. A. Ackerly, M. Stern and J. True (eds.), *Feminist Methodologies for International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Flyvbjerg, Bent, Todd Landman, and Sanford Schram (2012). *Real Social Science: Applied Phronesis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Schram, Sanford F., and Brian Caterino, eds. (2006). *Making Political Science Matter*. New York: NYU Press.
- Isaacs, Jeffrey C. (2015). "For a More Public Political Science." *Perspectives on Politics*, 13(2): 269-283.
- Stark, Andrew (2002). "Why Political Scientists Aren't Public Intellectuals." *PS: Political Science and Politics*, (September): 577-9.
- Law, John and Urry, John (2004). "Enacting the Social." *Economy and Society*, 33(3): 390–410.