

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

POLSCI 796

Term 1, Fall 2020

Instructor: Karen Bird

Email: kbird@mcmaster.ca

Seminar: Tuesdays, 2:30-5:20 pm

Classroom: virtual via ZOOM

Office: virtual

Office Hours: Tuesdays 5:30-6:00pm
and by appointment

Contents

Note: COVID pandemic and virtual course format	3
Course Description.....	3
Course Objectives.....	3
Required Texts.....	4
Class Format.....	4
Course Evaluation – Overview	5
Course Evaluation – Details	5
Participation (20%)	5
Weekly reading posts (10%).....	5
Seminar leader (10%): <i>dates to be determined the first week of class</i>	6
Applied methods memos: <i>PhDs submit 5 (25%), MAs submit 4 (40%)</i>	6
Qualitative method presentation (10%): <i>due Weeks 10 & 11</i>	7
Final paper (15%): <i>PhD students only, due Dec. 15</i>	7
Weekly Course Schedule and Required Readings	8
Week 1 (Sept. 15) Introduction to research design & course overview.....	8
Week 2 (Sept. 22) Finding our disciplinary bearings.....	8
Week 3 (Sept. 29) Contending conceptions of science and politics	9
Week 4 (Oct. 6) The research question as a starting point.....	9
Week 5 (Oct. 13) Fall mid-term recess, NO CLASS	10
Week 6 (Oct 20) Conceptual definition & measurement.....	10
Week 7 (Oct. 27) Causation and explanation	11
Week 8 (Nov. 3) Comparative and case study methods.....	11
Week 9 (Nov. 10) Experimental methods	12
Week 10 - 11 (Nov 17 & 24) Qualitative methods presentations	12
Week 12 (Dec 1) Ethics in political science research	13

Week 13 (Dec. 8) Now let's hear from the professionals!	13
Appendix I: Supplementary Readings	14
Course Policies	20
Submission of Assignments.....	20
Grades.....	20
Late Assignments	20
Absences, Missed Work, Illness	20
Courses with An On-Line Element.....	20
Online Proctoring.....	20
Authenticity / Plagiarism Detection	21
Copyright and Recording	21
Academic Accommodation for Religious, Indigenous or Spiritual Observances (RISO)	21
Academic Integrity Statement.....	21
Conduct Expectations.....	22
Academic Accommodation of Students with Disabilities.....	22
Faculty of Social Sciences E-mail Communication Policy	22
Course Modification	23
Extreme Circumstances.....	23

Note: COVID pandemic and virtual course format

This course will be delivered in a synchronous online format using Zoom. We have a three-hour window for the course, but adjustments will be made to allow for an engaging online experience. Plan on two approximately hour-long segments, with a short break in between. I will hold Zoom office hours during the 30 minutes immediately following our meetings, and by appointment.

Course Description

This course presents an overview of research design and methodology for political science. The aim is to heighten your attention to key elements of research design and the need for methodological rigour. By the end of the course, you should have a better understanding of how to design your own empirical research – including, eventually, a graduate thesis.

Alongside this broad aim sit both “upstream” and more practical “hands-on” aspects of the course. Upstream course themes include fundamental questions about what we think we are doing when we do social science, and what kinds of knowledge we can obtain about the phenomena of interest to us (including what degree of generality or specificity we should strive for in the development and application of our theories, what makes for ‘good’ explanatory accounts of social or political phenomena, and how to manage bias and establish valid propositions). The practical hands-on part of the course is intended to get you working on elements of your own research design including formulating a sound research question, defining key concepts, making prior arbitrations about the definition of cases and case selection, developing techniques for making descriptive and causal inferences, and anticipating and managing ethical concerns.

Course Objectives

The primary aim of this course is to assist students in preparing a well-developed research design. The course is intended specifically for PhD and MA students who are expected to eventually prepare a full-length thesis, but is also good preparation for students who plan to pursue research in non-academic careers.

By the end of the course, students should be able to:

- Recognize contending ideas about epistemology, strategies of inquiry and standards of evidence appropriate to the production of social scientific knowledge;
- Understand the broad elements of research design, including how to pose good research questions, clarify concepts, select cases, and establish descriptive and causal propositions;
- Demonstrate familiarity with a range of empirical research approaches (case- or variable-oriented, comparative, interpretive/ethnographic, experimental, etc.),

and with a selection of qualitative tools and techniques for data collection (structured, semi-structured or unstructured interviews, focus groups, ethnography and participation observation, archival research, photovoice, etc.);

- Understand key principles for assuring integrity and ethical practice in the conduct of research.

A note on supporting one another to advance our best research...

There is an undeniable plurality of research approaches and methods within the discipline of political science. This is a good thing. But while there is public acceptance of this diversity, in private there is a quiet war going on in which supporters of specific approaches and methods can be highly dismissive and unsympathetic to others. This often amounts to a politics (or power struggle) of methodologies. We see this in our discipline generally, but also within individual departments and home institutions. This can be a complicated and fraught issue especially for graduate students who are relatively new to the field and who may identify with, and seek to establish their own reputation based on a particular theoretical worldview, methodological skillset, or key scholar(s) within the organizational structure of their discipline or department. We will all get more out of this course if we sidestep the pitched “quant vs qual” battle and aim instead to be mutually supportive of each other. This means resisting the urge to enforce our own epistemologies and diagnostics on other people’s projects. Rather, we should do our best get inside each other’s methodologies and ask critical questions about the quality of the work as it was done. It is through this spirit of genuine consideration for each others’ work that we can help each other in advancing our best research.

Required Texts

- Donatella della Porta and Michael Keating (eds.). 2008. [*Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences: A Pluralist Perspective*. New York: Cambridge University Press.](#)

We will read several chapters this volume, which can be accessed free online. Remaining course materials are available on-line through the Mills library catalogue. Required readings that are not accessible online will be made available on the course’s Avenue to Learn page (designated “ATL” in the reading list below).

Class Format

This course will use a seminar format. Students are expected to come to our weekly online meetings having done all required readings and reviewed any assigned videos. You should be prepared to summarize the main ideas and arguments, and to think about how the readings fit together (or don’t) and how they relate to previous weeks’ readings. Students will also have structured time in class to discuss elements of their

own research projects. The expectation is that everyone is progressively working on a research design that will culminate in an MRP, or an MA or PhD thesis proposal, and that you will draw insights from the weekly readings, specific assignments, and collegial discussions with each other to help advance and refine that project.

Course Evaluation – Overview

Evaluative component	MA students	PhD students
Participation	20%	20%
Weekly reading posts	10%	10%
Seminar leader	10%	10%
Methods memos	4 x 10% = 40%	5 x 5% = 25%
Qualitative method presentation	20%	20%
Final paper	N/A	15%

Course Evaluation – Details

Participation (20%)

All students are expected to participate. While speaking in seminar can be intimidating at times, it is an essential skill in academia, and will equip you to be a better communicator in general. Because of the limits of time (and attention spans) in the online format, you are strongly encouraged to prepare remarks that are ‘on topic’ (*i.e.*, relate directly to the ideas and themes of the readings). You can ask relevant questions that advance understanding and discussion about the readings. You can also address aspects that you find practically useful in your own research or that may be helpful in others’ projects. In assessing student participation, I am looking for evidence that you have done the readings and can effectively leverage them in discussion. You are not being evaluated in terms of the amount of time you speak. I expect you to avoid dominating discussion, and to contribute to an open-minded and mutually supportive intellectual environment.

Weekly reading posts (10%)

Across our 12 weeks of class meetings, there are 10 weeks where students are to submit 10 brief (350-500 word) posts to ATL. You are also expected to read other students’ posts and offer at least one substantive response (e.g. respond to their question or comment on additional questions it might raise, rather than saying “good point!”). Posts cannot be submitted for the week that you are the seminar leader, or for the week that you present your qualitative method. This means, in fact, that posts are

expected for all other weeks. That said, I will allow you a “pass” on one week, meaning that you can submit 9 posts and get one “free” point.

There are two kinds of weekly posts. The standard format is intended to help you prepare for seminar discussions. These are to be posted by Monday noon prior to class. To help you, I have included a “Topics” guide with each week’s readings that lists some questions to reflect on. Your readings post should include: a) a preliminary answer to at least one question from this guide; b) at least one additional discussion question; and c) should indicate familiarity with all the assigned readings. The best type of questions will be those that bridge, juxtapose, or somehow address multiple readings, highlighting methodological similarities and differences.

A slightly different format applies to Weeks 1 (Introduction), 10 & 11 (Qualitative methods presentations) and 13 (Let’s hear from the professionals!). Make sure you read the specific NOTES for those weeks to understand when and what to post in your weekly response.

Seminar leader (10%): *dates to be determined the first week of class*

You will take on the role of discussion facilitator for one week, in some cases in collaboration with a fellow student. It will be the seminar leader(s)’ responsibility to review their colleagues’ responses on ATL and compile a 1-2 page discussion guide, submitted to me by email no later than Tuesday at 9am. The guide should include my questions and a synthesis of student questions (so you will have to merge, edit, and organize according to the themes you identify). During class, the discussion leader(s) will introduce the questions and key themes, explain why they are interesting or important, initiate the discussion by proposing some answers, and facilitate throughout the seminar. The discussion guide should be prepared jointly when there is more than one student assigned to the week.

Applied methods memos: *PhDs submit 5 (25%), MAs submit 4 (40%)*

The methods memos ask you to build on weekly readings and seminar discussion, by applying what you have learned to your own research topic. They will vary somewhat in scope and length. Memo #1 (about 1500-2000 words max.) is required of all students and serves as the foundation that you will build on across subsequent memos. Other memos should be about 1000 words (max.). PhD students are to submit 5 memos, which will be graded out of 5 points each; MA students must submit 4 memos which are graded out of 10 points each. They are due by 5pm on the Friday following class:

Memo #1: Research question (* REQUIRED *) – Oct. 9

Memo #2: Defining your concepts – Oct. 23

Memo #3: Establishing causality – Oct. 30

Memo #4: Casing – Nov. 6

Memo #5: Experiments – Nov. 13

Memo #6: Research ethics – Dec. 4

Qualitative method presentation (10%): *due Weeks 10 & 11*

Two weeks of the course will be given over to discussions of qualitative research methods. Please review the detailed package on “Qualitative methods resources and recommended readings” that I have posted to ATL. We will spend some time in our class meeting on Week 6 going over what is expected and assigning selections and dates. On your assigned date, each student is to record and post an informative video-presentation on their selected method. Video-presentations should be 15-20 min (max.) and must address: a) the name of the method b) the nuts and bolts of what it involves; c) the kinds of research questions it is best suited to; d) techniques and strategies that are essential to successful implementation (as well as common challenges and problems to avoid); e) the overall strengths and weaknesses of the method; and f) a brief discussion of how you might apply the method in your research. Your video must be accompanied by a separate 1-2 page resource sheet. Both your video and resource sheet are to be posted to the ATL course page no later than 6pm on the Sunday prior to your assigned date.

All students must watch all of the videos for each week, and review the resource sheets prior to class. Students who are NOT posting their video on a given week can submit one of their weekly posts (350-500 words) as a response to any of the methods reviewed that week. This can take any number of forms: for example, you can raise substantive issues about one or more of the methods reviewed, you can reflect on how a particular method was applied in a study from your annotated bibliography, or you can discuss whether or not the method would be a fruitful one for you to apply in future research.

When we meet online on Tuesday, each presenter will get 5 minutes to review their method and highlight the main takeaways, followed by 15 minutes of Q&A (for a maximum of 20 minutes per method).

Final paper (15%): *PhD students only, due Dec. 15*

For the final paper you are to re-write your SSHRC research proposal with the aim of improving your description of your proposed methodology. In particular, you are to elaborate on one of the main methodological and research design choices/challenges in your proposal. I am looking, as SSHRC assessors do, for “specific, focused, and feasible research question(s) and objective(s)” and for a “clear description of the proposed methodology.” I also want to see sophisticated thinking and an ability to effectively leverage and apply appropriate methodological literature – from this course and, if necessary, from beyond – to support your choices. For this assignment, you can double the length of your original SSHRC research proposal, to 4 single-spaced pages. Please submit your original SSHRC proposal, as well as your methodologically improved one.

Weekly Course Schedule and Required Readings

Week 1 (Sept. 15) Introduction to research design & course overview

Required readings:

- THE SYLLABUS! Read the whole entire thing. It'll be worth it in the long run, I promise.
- della Porta & Keating, ch. 1 (pp 1-7) and 14.
- Gerring, John. 2012. "Postscript: Justifications", in *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. (ATL).

NOTE: We will spend this first class session discussing this short set of readings, with the aim of understanding what research design broadly involves. We will go over the scope and aims of this course, and the nuts and bolts of assignments, assessments, and expectations. We will also spend some time doing introductions and getting comfortable with the online learning platform. Please submit your first (350-500 word) weekly discussion post to ATL prior to class (for this first day, exceptionally, just post it no later than 12 noon). Your post must include 5 things: 1) one solid idea that you took away from the readings; 2) a question or concern that you have about the syllabus, course format or course expectations; 3) a short (two or three sentence) description of your main topic of research interest; 4) a short explanation of how you came to be personally interested in that topic; 5) the most remarkable thing that you have done or that has happened to you since COVID.

Week 2 (Sept. 22) Finding our disciplinary bearings

Topics: What are the arguments for seeking a unified framework of methodological standards? What did the "Perestroika" movement in political science stand for, and what have been some of the other challenges to the discipline in the US and Canada. How, if at all, has the discipline changed in response? Is political science sufficiently relevant, and if not what can be done to address this?

Required readings:

- Gerring, John. 2012. Chapter 1 In *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press, pp 1-23 and 394-401. (ATL)
- Various. 2010. Symposium: Perestroika in Political Science. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 43(4): 725-754. Read especially the Luke & McGovern, Yanow & Schwartz-Shea, Sadiq & Monroe, and Caterino pieces.
- Achen, Christopher H. 2014. "[Why do we need Diversity in the Political Methodology Society?](#)" *The Political Methodologist*, 22(2): 25-28.
- 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.

- Brown-Dean, Khalilah L. (2015). "Emphasizing the Scholar in Public Scholarship." *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 48 (Special Issue S1: Let's Be Heard! How to Better Communicate Political Science's Public Value): 55-57.

Week 3 (Sept. 29) Contending conceptions of science and politics

Topic: Methodology involves a coherent set of ideas about epistemology, strategies of inquiry and standards of evidence appropriate to the production of knowledge. What are these contending epistemological-methodological conceptions? Why do these matters weigh more heavily in the social sciences than in the natural sciences? Is the contrast between quantitative (positivist) and qualitative (interpretive/constructivist/critical) approaches a practically useful one?

Required readings:

- della Porta & Keating, ch. 2.
- Grant, Ruth. 2002. "Political Theory, Political Science, and Politics." *Political Theory* 30(4): 577-595.
- Dryzek, John S. 1986. "The Progress of Political Science." *Journal of Politics* 48(2): 301-320.
- Stauffer, Katelyn E. and Diana Z. O'Brien. 2018. "Quantitative Methods and Feminist Political Science." *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics* (ATL).
- Shreeve, Jamie. 2015. "[This Face Changes the Human Story. But How?](#)" *National Geographic* (10 Sept.)

Week 4 (Oct. 6) The research question as a starting point

Topic: This week looks at some strategies for coming up with a good research question (and making necessary revisions along the way). Questions to consider in reviewing these readings include: What makes for a 'good' research question? Does my question need to take the form of a hypothesis? What is a research puzzle and why does it help to have one? Can I change my research question at any point along the way? Is there a place for the 'self' in the development of my research question, or in other parts of the research cycle?

Required readings:

- Gerring, John. 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*, 17(4), 634-648.
- 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

- Smith, Rogers M. 2007. "[Systematizing the Ineffable: A Perestroika'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.
- LaPorte, Jody. 2014. "Confronting a Crisis of Research Design." *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 47(2): 414-417.

NOTE: You are to come to class prepared to talk about the research topic that interests you. In class, we will move through a series of paired, timed discussions as you present to each other what makes this topic interesting and important to you, and why it is a puzzle. Partners will discuss their puzzles and together develop each into a research question. Each student will then present their research question to the class. This exercise will form the basis for **Research memo #1** (this is **required** and due Friday after class).

Week 5 (Oct. 13) Fall mid-term recess, NO CLASS

NOTE: We will spend some time at the beginning of class in Week 6 selecting topics and dates for the qualitative methods presentations in Wks 10 & 11.

Week 6 (Oct 20) Conceptual definition & measurement

Topic: Before we can study something we need to know what that "something" is. This is concept definition. We then need to be able to observe and measure it. How do we define concepts and how do we separate different concepts from one another? What are the criteria for good concept formation? Can the same concepts be applied across different (e.g., historical, cultural or national) contexts? How does one move from conceptualization to measurement? What is measurement validity, and why is it important? What are the methodological approaches for assessing and assuring measurement validity?

Required readings:

- Gerring, John. 1999. "What Makes a Good Concept? A Criterial Framework for Understanding Concept Formation in the Social Sciences." *Polity* 31(3): 357-393.
- 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)
- Jones, Charles O. 1974. "Doing Before Knowing: Concept Development in Political Research." *American Journal of Political Science*, 18, 1: 215-228.
- Paxton, Pamela (2000). "Women's suffrage in the measurement of democracy: Problems of operationalization." *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 35(3): 92-111.

- Mansbridge, Jane. 2003. "Rethinking representation." *American Political Science Review*, 97(4): 515–528.

Research memo #2 (due Friday after class)

Week 7 (Oct. 27) Causation and explanation

Topic: What is the logic and what are the challenges of establishing causal propositions? Why is the experimental method considered best for establishing causation? Can qualitative methods be used to establish causation?

Required readings:

- Brady, Henry E. 2011. "Causation and Explanation in Social Science." In Robert E. Goodin (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Science*. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199604456.013.0049
- Gerring, John. 2012. "Causal Arguments." In *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press, pp 197-217 and 321-324. (ATL)
- Mahoney, James, and Gary Goertz. 2006. "A tale of two cultures: Contrasting Quantitative and Qualitative research." *Political Analysis* 14(3): 227–249.
- Beach, Derek. 2016. "It's All About Mechanisms – What Process-tracing Case Studies Should be Tracing." *New Political Economy*, 21(5): 463-472.
- 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)

Research memo #3 (due Friday after class)

Week 8 (Nov. 3) Comparative and case study methods

Topic: What are the tradeoffs between variable-oriented and case-oriented approaches? What is the logic and purpose of comparison? Is it better to study more than one case, are many cases better than few? How should cases be chosen for comparison? What counts as a case? What determines the relevant unit of analysis for a study? Can we use cases to test theory, or only to develop theories and concepts?

Required readings:

- della Porta & Keating, ch. 11.
- Lijphart, Arend. 1971. "Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method." *American Political Science Review*, 65(3): 682-93.
- Levy, Jack S. 2008. "Case Studies: Types, Designs and Logics of Inference." *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, 25: 1-18.

- George, Alexander L., and Andrew Bennett. 2005. "Case Studies and Theory Development." Ch. 1 in *Case Studies and Theoretical Development*. Boston: MIT Press, pp 3-36. (ATL)
- Varshney, Ashutosh. 2001. "Ethnic Conflict and Civil Society: India and Beyond." *World Politics*, 53: 362-398.

Research memo #4 (due Friday after class)

Week 9 (Nov. 10) Experimental methods

Topic: Why are experiments considered to be the "gold standard" for establishing causal inference? Are experiments purely "quantitative" or can they be compatible with qualitative research approaches? What are key characteristics required for experiments to 'work' and what are some of their common pitfalls? What ethical challenges do they present, and how can these be managed?

Required readings:

- Watch [Esther Duflo: Social experiments to fight poverty](#)
- 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.
- 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.

Research memo #5 (due Friday after class)

Week 10 - 11 (Nov 17 & 24) Qualitative methods presentations

NOTE: All students must watch the videos and review the resource sheets prior to class. Students who are NOT posting their video on a given week can submit one of their weekly posts (350-500 words) as a response to any of the methods reviewed that week. (See p. 7 for further details.)

Week 12 (Dec 1) Ethics in political science research

Topic: What are the core principles of research ethics and integrity? What are the various kinds of ethical challenges and risks we can expect in the course of our research? Are universities (or other institutions) helping us to conduct research ethically, or are they contributing in any way to the challenges we face? Are there different challenges graduate students? How is the research ethics landscape changing in an era of truth and reconciliation? How does it vary for qualitative versus quantitative research?

Required readings:

- Begin by taking the [McMaster Research Ethics tutorial](#)
- Fujii, Lee Ann. 2012. "Research Ethics 101: Dilemmas and Responsibilities" *PS Political Science and Politics* 45(4): 717-723.
- Porter, Tony. 2008. "Research Ethics Governance and Political Science in Canada," *PS: Political Science and Politics*, (July): 495-99.
- 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.
- Matebeni, Zethu. 2014. "My best participants' informed consent." In Posel, D, Ross, FC (eds.) *Ethical Quandaries in Social Research*, Capetown, South Africa: HSRC Press, pp. 111–124. (ATL)
- 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.

Research memo #6 (due Friday after class)

Week 13 (Dec. 8) Now let's hear from the professionals!

Topic: Guests in this career panel will discuss the role of research and the techniques and methods that they have found most useful in their work. They will discuss the nature of the organization they work for, share insights on specific projects that were especially challenging or impactful, describe the skills needed or acquired along their career pathway, and what they consider most essential for students entering the job market.

Required readings: TBA

NOTE: You may submit a weekly post on the Friday *following* this session.

Appendix I: Supplementary Readings

What/where/who are we as a discipline?

- APSA has a [collection of articles](#) that examine gender differences in the profession of Political Science from a variety of perspectives, including career progression, citation levels, authorship claims, article submission and peer review processes, and publication outcomes.
- Anonymous. 2014. "No Shortcuts to Gender Equality: The Structures of Women's Exclusion in Political Science." *Politics & Gender* 10(3): 437-447.
- Albaugh, Quinn M. 2017. "The Americanization of Canadian Political Science? The Doctoral Training of Canadian Political Science Faculty." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 50(1): 243-262.
- Freeman, Donald M. 1991. "The Making of a Discipline." Pp 15-56 in William Crotty (ed.), *Political Science: Looking to the Future, Vol 1, The Theory and Practice of Political Science*. Evanston: Northwestern Univ Press.
- 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.
- 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.
- Schwatz-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.

Conceptions of science and politics

- 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.
- 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.

Developing 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).
- 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.

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. 2017. "Sex isn't Gender: Reforming Concepts and Measurements in the Study of Public Opinion." *Political Behavior*, 39:1019-1041.
- Brady, Henry and Cynthia Kaplan. 2000. "Categorically Wrong? Nominal Versus Graded Measures of Ethnic Identity." *Studies in Comparative International Development* 35(3): 56-91
- Kroeber, Corinna. 2018. "How to measure the substantive representation of traditionally excluded groups in comparative research : a literature review and new data." *Representation* 54(3): 241-59.

- Elkins, Zachary. 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.

Causation and explanation

- 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.
- George, Alexander L. and Andrew Bennett. 2005. "Process-Tracing and Historical Explanation." Ch. 10 in *Case Studies and Theoretical Development*. Boston: MIT Press.
- King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane and Sidney Verba. 1994. "Causality and Causal Inference." Ch. 3 in *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- 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.

Comparative & case study methods

- 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.

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.

Qualitative methods & techniques

- **This is an overview of general readings and resources. A detailed handout of selected methods and associated readings to guide your presentation will be available on ATL**
- [Qualitative & Multi-Method Research Newsletter](#) is a semi-annual publication of the organized QMMR section of APSA, and is devoted to the study, development, and practice of qualitative and multi-method research techniques.
- Hammersley, Martyn, and Paul Atkinson. 2007. *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*. London, UK: Routledge, ch. 1 and 2.
- 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.

Research ethics for political science

- 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.](#)"
- Dauphinee, Elizabeth. 2020. "The ethics of autoethnography." *Review of International Studies*, 36(3): 799-818.

- Van Noorden, Richard. 2015. "[Political Science's Problem with Research Ethics.](#)" *Nature*, June 29, doi:10.1038/nature.2015.17866.
- Konnikova, Maria. 2015. "[How a Gay-Marriage Study Went Wrong.](#)" *The New Yorker* (May 22).
- 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.

Course Policies

Submission of Assignments

All assignments and are to be submitted in 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., 1.25 points/day on a 25-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

Courses with An On-Line Element

Some courses may use on-line elements (e.g. e-mail, Avenue to Learn (A2L), LearnLink, web pages, capa, Moodle, ThinkingCap, etc.). Students should be aware that, when they access the electronic components of a course using these elements, 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 a course that uses on-line elements will be deemed consent to this disclosure. If you have any questions or concerns about such disclosure please discuss this with the course instructor.

Online Proctoring

Some courses may use online proctoring software for tests and exams. This software may require students to turn on their video camera, present identification, monitor and

record their computer activities, and/or lock/restrict their browser or other applications/software during tests or exams. This software may be required to be installed before the test/exam begins.

Authenticity / Plagiarism Detection

Some courses may use a web-based service (Turnitin.com) to reveal authenticity and ownership of student submitted work. For courses using such software, students will be expected to submit their work electronically either directly to Turnitin.com or via an online learning platform (e.g. A2L, etc.) using plagiarism detection (a service supported by Turnitin.com) so it can be checked for academic dishonesty.

Students who do not wish their work to be submitted through the plagiarism detection software must inform the Instructor before the assignment is due. No penalty will be assigned to a student who does not submit work to the plagiarism detection software.

All submitted work is subject to normal verification that standards of academic integrity have been upheld (e.g., on-line search, other software, etc.). For more details about McMaster's use of Turnitin.com please go to

www.mcmaster.ca/academicintegrity.

Copyright and Recording

Students are advised that lectures, demonstrations, performances, and any other course material provided by an instructor include copyright protected works. The Copyright Act and copyright law protect every original literary, dramatic, musical and artistic work, **including lectures** by University instructors

The recording of lectures, tutorials, or other methods of instruction may occur during a course. Recording may be done by either the instructor for the purpose of authorized distribution, or by a student for the purpose of personal study. Students should be aware that their voice and/or image may be recorded by others during the class. Please speak with the instructor if this is a concern for you.

Academic Accommodation for Religious, Indigenous or Spiritual Observances (RISO)

Students requiring academic accommodation based on religious, indigenous or spiritual observances should follow the procedures set out in the [RISO](#) policy. Students should submit their request to their Faculty Office **normally within 10 working days** of the beginning of term in which they anticipate a need for accommodation or to the Registrar's Office prior to their examinations. Students should also contact their instructors as soon as possible to make alternative arrangements for classes, assignments, and tests.

Academic Integrity Statement

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

academic integrity. **It is your responsibility to understand what constitutes academic dishonesty.**

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 behaviour 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. For information on the various types of academic dishonesty please refer to the [Academic Integrity Policy](#), located at <https://secretariat.mcmaster.ca/university-policies-procedures-guidelines/>

The following illustrates only three forms of academic dishonesty:

- plagiarism, e.g. the submission of work that is not one’s own or for which other credit has been obtained.
- improper collaboration in group work.
- copying or using unauthorized aids in tests and examinations.

Conduct Expectations

As a McMaster student, you have the right to experience, and the responsibility to demonstrate, respectful and dignified interactions within all of our living, learning and working communities. These expectations are described in the [Code of Student Rights & Responsibilities](#) (the “Code”). All students share the responsibility of maintaining a positive environment for the academic and personal growth of all McMaster community members, **whether in person or online.**

It is essential that students be mindful of their interactions online, as the Code remains in effect in virtual learning environments. The Code applies to any interactions that adversely affect, disrupt, or interfere with reasonable participation in University activities. Student disruptions or behaviours that interfere with university functions on online platforms (e.g. use of Avenue 2 Learn, WebEx or Zoom for delivery), will be taken very seriously and will be investigated. Outcomes may include restriction or removal of the involved students’ access to these platforms

Academic Accommodation of Students with Disabilities

Students with disabilities who require academic accommodation must contact [Student Accessibility Services](#) (SAS) at 905-525-9140 ext. 28652 or sas@mcmaster.ca to make arrangements with a Program Coordinator. For further information, consult McMaster University’s [Academic Accommodation of Students with Disabilities](#) policy.

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.

Extreme Circumstances

The University reserves the right to change the dates and deadlines for any or all courses in extreme circumstances (e.g., severe weather, labour disruptions, etc.). Changes will be communicated through regular McMaster communication channels, such as McMaster Daily News, A2L and/or McMaster email.