RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

POLSCI 796

Term 1, Fall 2021

Instructor: Karen Bird
Email: kbird@mcmaster.ca
Office: virtual
Office Hours: Thursday 5:30-6:30 pm, Friday 9:00-10:00 am, and by appointment

Seminar: Thursday 2:30-5:20 pm
Classroom: virtual via ZOOM

"Begin at the beginning", the King said gravely, "and go on till you come to the end: then stop." — *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, Lewis Carroll

"We shall not cease from exploration and the end of all of our exploring will be to arrive where we started and to know the place for the first time." — *Little Gidding,* T.S. Eliot

Contents

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 office hours immediately after class via Zoom and can make arrangements for in-person office meetings at other times.

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. This includes 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, gaining an understanding of how to apply selected qualitative methods to collect, process and analyze data, 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 the basic matter of acquiring knowledge in the field of political science and social sciences broadly, and understand how these ideas about knowledge (epistemologies) are optimized through alternative research methods toward different aims;
- Formulate a research question or problem to pursue as a thesis project;
- Understand and be able to apply the broad elements of research design (e.g., conceptual development, case selection, strategies for descriptive and causal

assessment) in order to build up a research argument in a consistent and reasonable way;
- Demonstrate familiarity with a range of qualitative data collection and data analysis methods;
- 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. 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 epistemologically driven 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.). *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences: A Pluralist Perspective*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Kristen Luker. *Salsa Dancing into the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2008.

Both books can be accessed free online, as is the case for most of the readings for this course (which are available on-line through the Mills library catalogue). Required readings that are not accessible online will be made available via a pdf linked to the Avenue to Learn course page (designated "pdf" 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 completed the required readings and reviewed any assigned

videos. As you take notes and prepare for class, aim to summarize the main ideas and arguments, and think about how the readings fit together (or don't) and how they relate to previous weeks' readings. As the readings are intended to assist you in developing your own research project, you should consider those links as well. The expectation is that everyone is progressively working on a research design that will culminate in 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.

There are slightly different expectations for MA and PhD students, as reflected in the assignments and course evaluation.

As to the readings: This is a reading intensive course, where you should count on roughly 75-125 pp of readings per week. PhD students are expected to complete and comprehend all required readings. MA students can be a bit more selective (excepting when you are a seminar leader and are expected to cover all readings): aim to read at least 75% of the materials, though making sure you have at least read the abstract/introduction so that you have a basic familiarity with each piece.

Course Evaluation – Overview

Evaluative component	**Weight**
Participation	15%
Reading/discussion posts - MA students complete 7 - PhD students complete 6 + 1 "extra-curricular"	20%
Seminar leader - MA students lead/co-lead once - PhD students lead/co-lead twice	5%
Methods memos (selected dates) - Complete 3	30%
Qualitative method presentation (Nov. 17 & 24)	10%
Final paper (due Dec. 18)	20%

Course Evaluation – Details

Participation (15%)

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) and to ask relevant questions that advance understanding and discussion about the readings. You can also address aspects that you find practically useful for 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, and that your ideas and questions contribute to an open and mutually supportive dialogue. You are not being evaluated in terms of the amount of time you speak, so please avoid dominating discussion. Often, a good question is one that invites another person to expand on what they meant in their post, or how they think a particular reading impacts an aspect of their research design.

Weekly reading/discussion posts (20%)

Across our 11 class meetings, there are several weeks in which you must submit brief (350-500 word) reading/discussion posts to A2L. The standard format is that posts must be submitted by end of day Wednesday (technically 11:59 pm) to ensure that we all – and especially the seminar leaders – have an opportunity to read them prior to class. I have included a "Topics" guide with each week's readings that lists some questions to reflect on. Your post should: a) indicate familiarity with assigned readings; b) answer at least one question from the topics guide; and b) raise at least one additional discussion question. In writing your reflections you should aim to raise points and pose questions that bridge, juxtapose, or somehow address multiple readings, highlighting their shared perspectives as well as differences/disagreements. A slightly different format applies to Week 1 (Introduction). Read the specific instructions to understand what is expected for this week.

Submissions are due every week EXCEPT when you are the seminar leader and Weeks 10 & 11 when we have qualitative methods presentations; also, everyone is entitled to take a "pass" on one week. This means that MA students will submit 7 reading posts, while PhD students will submit 6.

PhD students must in addition complete one "extra-curricular" assignment. You are to attend and submit a brief (350-500 word) review of a research methods talk or workshop. There are typically numerous such events in a term, but I recommend the SPARK monthly workshop series. There are also past SPARK talks that have been recorded, however the benefit of attending a talk virtually is that you can ask questions and engage with other participants. The content of your submission depends somewhat on the nature of the talk, but it is imperative that it address research design or methodological issues, techniques, tools or resources. Be sure to:

- Describe the event: Title, speaker(s), date, abstract
- Provide a synopsis of the key issues discussed
- Raise and tentatively answer a set of questions thematically related to the talk. This can take a form similar to the "Topics" guide for weekly course themes.

Due date is flexible, but you should submit your reflection no later than one week after the event (assuming it is a scheduled talk), and in all cases no later than the last day of classes which is Wed., Dec. 8.

Seminar leader (5%)

You will take on the role of discussion facilitator, normally in collaboration with a fellow student. MA students must do this once, while PhD students will to so twice during the term. It is the seminar leader(s)' responsibility to review their colleagues' responses on A2L and compile a 1-2 page discussion guide, submitted to me through the A2L submission folder prior to class (i.e., no later than Thursday at 2:00 pm). 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). The guide should be prepared jointly when there is more than one student assigned to the week: in this case, please submit only ONE document, but be sure to include names of each co-leader and indicate which themes or parts of the discussion each person will be leading.

The discussion leader(s) will take about 20-30 minutes at the beginning of class to introduce the questions and key themes, explain why they are interesting or important, and initiate the discussion by proposing some answers; following this introduction, they will help facilitate discussion throughout the seminar.

Applied methods memos (30%)

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 (approx. 1500-2000 words) is required of all students and serves as the foundation that you will build on across subsequent memos. Other memos will be about 1000-1250 words. Details on the parameters of each memo are in the Appendix. Memos are always due by 9:00 am on the Monday *following* class. Each memo is worth 10% and you must submit three in total. If you wish to do a fourth memo, I will drop your lowest score.

Memo #1: Research question (* REQUIRED *) – Oct. 11
Memo #2: Concepts – Oct. 25
Memo #3: Causality – Nov. 1
Memo #4: Casing – Nov. 8
Memo #5: Experiments – Nov. 15
Memo #6: Research ethics – Dec. 6

Qualitative methods presentations (10%): *Weeks 10 & 11*

Weeks 10 & 11 will be given over to discussions of qualitative research methods. Please review the detailed package on "Qualitative methods resources and recommended readings" posted to A2L. We will spend some time in our class meeting on Week 6 going over what is expected and assigning selections and dates. For your assigned date, you must post an informative set of slides on your selected method. Your presentation 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; f) a brief discussion of how you might apply the method in your research. You will post this to the A2L course page prior to class (*i.e.*, no later than Thursday at 2:00 pm) on your assigned date. During class, each person will take about 20 minutes to present and discuss their method, with particular attention to how you would apply it in future research. This will be followed by about 5-10 minutes of Q&A (maximum of 25-30 minutes per method, depending on the number of presenters).

Final paper (20%): *due Fri. Dec. 17*

There are different parameters for the final paper for PhD and MA students.

For PhD students: you are to write a 5-page "addendum" to your SSHRC research prospectus that is particularly focused on your research design and methods. This is not expected to be a full thesis proposal, but it is a critical step in understanding and developing your own method. Your addendum should include a clear research question, and lay out in a detailed and convincing way one or two key design and methodological aspects of your intended project. Explain why your choices make sense, but also take account of any key problems. 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 appropriate methodological literature (from this course and, if necessary, from beyond) to show why your research design and methodological choices are sound ones, and that the research can be carried out and will yield worthwhile results. The 5-page length excludes references. It also assumes that your research question has evolved only modestly since your SSHRC proposal, so that it is not necessary to re-write the background review of substantive literature. However, if you have significantly revised your research question, or if you are an international student who did not submit a SSHRC proposal, then your 796 paper will need to stand on its own to a greater extent and should be somewhat longer. Please submit your original SSHRC proposal (or equivalent, if you have one), as well as your addendum.

For MA students: Drawing on your previously submitted research memos and relevant course readings, you are to write a short "research prospectus" for your intended study. A research prospectus is a preliminary plan for conducting a study, not a detailed technical research proposal. In addition to a clear research question, it should offer a considered analysis of the challenges to answering this question, and a feasible research design. Unlike PhD students, you are not expected to lay out cogent methodological strategies for executing this design. Your study should be of a scope that is feasible for an MA thesis student, and it must plan for some original empirical element. Though no actual data collection or analysis is expected in the paper, you should have put some thought into how you would collect data, or find and leverage

existing data, to answer your question. For example, don't just say "I will draw on available public opinion (or World Bank, or policing, or socio-economic, etc.) data" but actually locate that data and ensure that it includes items that reasonably measure or estimate the phenomena you are interested in. Your prospectus should be 4 to 5 single-spaced pages (excluding references).

Weekly Course Schedule and Required Readings

Week 1 (Sept. 16) 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.
- Luker, Chapter 1 Salsa Dancing? In the Social Sciences? (pp. 1-21).
- della Porta & Keating, ch. 1 (pp 1-7) and 14 (pp 263-95).
- Gerring, John. 2012. "Postscript: Justifications" (pp. 394-401) in *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. (pdf)

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 reading/discussion post to A2L by 9:00am on the Monday *following* our first meeting. Your post must include the following 5 things: 1) one solid idea that you took away from the readings; 2) one question, concern or remark about some broad area of the course - this can be related to substantive topics, or to the course format, resources, assignments, or assessments and expectations; 3) a short description of your main topic of research interest, written so that it is understandable to someone who is not an expert in your subfield; 4) an explanation of how you came to be personally interested in that topic. Finally 5) Please indicate your 1st, 2nd (and for PhD students also your 3rd) choices of when you wish to serve as Seminar Leader where your job will be to facilitate discussion (normally in collaboration with a fellow student). To find the weeks and topics available, go to the Learning Guide/Learning Schedule within the "Start Here" module. I will review everyone's preferences and post your name on the schedule by end of day Monday of Week 2.

Week 2 (Sept. 23) 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? How might current events (COVID-19, global mobilization to address racial injustice) impact our work as political scientists with respect to our responsibilities as scholars, our modes of engaging knowledge, or the methodological challenges we face?

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. (pdf)
- 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.
- APSR incoming editorial team. 2019. "We're an all-women team chosen to edit political science's flagship journal. Here's why that matters." *The Monkey Cage*, Aug 29.
- 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. 30) 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? Do these matters weigh more heavily in the social sciences than in the natural sciences? If so, why is that? Is the contrast between quantitative (positivist) and qualitative (interpretive, constructivist, critical) approaches a practically useful one? Is there a place for judgement or opinion in science? Can the study of politics be considered a 'science' and what are the criteria for assessing this?

Required readings:

- della Porta & Keating, ch. 2 (pp 19-39).
- 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,* pp 1-29 (pdf)
- Shreeve, Jamie. 2015. "This Face Changes the Human Story. But How?" *National Geographic* (10 Sept.)

Week 4 (Oct. 7) 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? What are key mistakes to avoid in developing a 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), or is better to remain detached and avoid introducing my 'bias' into the research?

Required readings:

- Luker, ch. 4 "What Is This a Case of, Anyway? (pp. 51-75), ch. 5 "Reviewing the Literature" (pp 76-98) and "Appendix One: What to Do If You Don't Have a Case" (pp. 229-232)
- Gerring, John. 2012. Ch. 2 "Beginnings" (pp 27-57) in *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. (A2L)
- Day, C., & Koivu, K. L. (2019). "Finding the Question: A Puzzle-Based Approach to the Logic of Discovery." *Journal of Political Science Education*, 15(3), 377–386.
- 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 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.
- LaPorte, Jody. 2014. "Confronting a Crisis of Research Design." *PS: Political Science & Politics, 47*(2): 414-417.

NOTE: There will be no assigned seminar leader for this session. Instead, 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 by 9am on the Monday following class).

Week 5 (Oct. 14) 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. Make sure you have reviewed the "Qualitative methods resources and recommended readings" package posted to A2L, and please submit your preferred topic of presentation using the Discussion board for Week 5 .

Week 6 (Oct 21) 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.
- Kurki, Milja. 2015. "Concepts, International Relations, and the Universe." Watch video (1h 17min).
- Maxwell, Joseph A. 2013. Ch. 3 "Conceptual Framework: What Do You Think is Going On?" (pp 39-72) in *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach.* Thousand Oaks: Sage. (pdf)
- 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 the Monday following class)

Week 7 (Oct. 28) 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.* (Read only pp 1-31 up to Table 49.3: "Causality checklist"; you do not need to go on to Part 9).
- Kurki, Milja. 2006. "Causes of a Divided Discipline: Rethinking the Concept of Cause in International Relations Theory." *Review of International Studies*, 32(2): 189–216 (especially p. 199 to end).
- Gerring, John. 2012. Ch. 8 "Causal Arguments" (pp 197-217) Ch. 11 "Causal reasoning" (read only pp 321-324). In *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. (pdf)
- 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 (pp 267-271) in Henry E. Brady and David Collier (eds.) *Rethinking Social Inquiry* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield. (pdf)

Research memo #3 (due the Monday following class)

Week 8 (Nov. 4) 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 "Comparative analysis: case-oriented versus variable-oriented research" (pp 198-222).
- Luker, ch. 6 "On Sampling, Operationalization and Generalization" (pp 99-128 – there are some good insights here, but aim to read this one fairly quickly)
- 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 (pp 3-36) in *Case Studies and Theoretical Development.* Boston: MIT Press. (pdf)
- Varshney, Ashutosh. 2001. "Ethnic Conflict and Civil Society: India and Beyond." *World Politics*, 53: 362-398. (This is a long piece, and while not everyone may be interested in the substantive topic, it offers especially in parts II and IV some exemplary lessons on case selection, the logic of comparison, and generalization – very much from a "salsa dancing social science" approach).

Research memo #4 (due the Monday following class)

Week 9 (Nov. 11) Experimental methods

Topic: Why are experiments considered to be the "gold standard" for establishing causal inference? Are they always really this good, and what can be done to get them to that standard? Are experiments purely "quantitative" or in what ways are they compatible with qualitative research approaches? What are the differences between field, natural and laboratory experiments? What are the 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 video: Esther Duflo: Social experiments to fight poverty
- John, Peter. 2017. Ch 1 (pp 1-16) "Field Experimentation: Opportunities and Constraints." *Field Experiments in Political Science and Public Policy: Practical Lessons in Design and Delivery.* New York: Routledge. (pdf)
- Dunning, Thad. 2012. Ch. 1 (pp. 1-36) "Introduction: Why Natural Experiments?" *Natural Experiments in the Social Sciences: A Design-Based Approach.* New York: Cambridge University Press. (pdf)
- 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 the Monday following class)

Week 10 - 11 (Nov 18 & 25) Qualitative methods presentations

Required readings:

- As background for all:

  - Read Luker, Ch. 8 "Field (and Other) Methods" (pp 155-89).
  - Watch either of the following two panels of the IQMR (Institute for Qualitative and Multi-Method Research) webinar on Conducting Fieldwork Under COVID Constraints: 1) Interpretive Approaches and Ethnography; OR 2) Interviews, Surveys, and Experiments.
- Presenters are to select their additional readings from the course package of **"Qualitative methods resources and recommended readings"** posted to A2L.

Week 12 (Dec 2) 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." Ch. 7 (pp 111-24) in Posel, D, Ross, FC (eds.) *Ethical Quandaries in Social Research*, Capetown, South Africa: HSRC Press. (pdf)
- 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 the Monday following class)

Appendix I: Methods Memos (submit 3)

Memo #1 – Research question – *due Monday, Oct. 11 (*REQUIRED*)*

Research question, motivation, and review of scholarship.

The purpose of this memo is to begin to develop your research question, to be explicit about the motivation or puzzle that lurks behind that question, and to work on your review of the literature. That seems like a lot, but we will take a gradual approach to these objectives throughout the course, and this week you will make a concrete start. Even though your thinking is expected to evolve as you work towards your near and longer term goals (SSHRC proposal, thesis proposal, and eventual thesis itself), laying some of your ideas out now will help to shape your conceptual framework (Memo #2), and elements of your eventual research design (Memos #3-5). It will also help you to clarify how your project relates to the field, as well as how it is original, fresh, and substantively relevant. Finally, this early exercise can help ensure that your own core interests and motivations are at play in driving the project, which should help you from getting lost in the lit review, and remind you down the road what can and cannot be sacrificed from your research agenda (for example, when you need to make tough decisions about what parts of a project must be trimmed for reasons of feasibility). This memo has two parts.

Part 1: Research question & motivation (about 250-500 words)

1) As best you can, write a clear statement of your research question. The key here is to show that you are moving from a general 'topic' of interest to a research question.
2) Describe the puzzle or motivation behind the research question. Think about convincing a skeptic or a funding agency why this is an important problem to study. It is perfectly acceptable to discuss how your research question relates to your personal identity and goals, or to your own experiences and prior assumptions about the phenomenon or interest.

Part 2: Review of related literature/scholarship (about 1250-1500 words)

3) Following Luker, ch. 5, draw yourself a daisy. Put in all the items that you think your study covers as petals of the daisy, and then see where there are overlaps that someone is writing about or has written about. Identify about 3-5 overlapping areas that you consider to be especially important, and identify at least one research article or book in each of those areas that relates to your research topic or question. You can do all of this as part of your daisy or Venn diagram, using simple labels.
4) Now, write an annotated bibliography on those selected articles or books. Ideally, this should cover a minimum of 3 overlapping areas and a minimum of 5 articles/books (you don't need to go overboard, as there will be opportunities to add more in subsequent memos). For a brief guide on how to do this, see https://advice.writing.utoronto.ca/types-of-writing/annotated-bibliography/

5) Finally, and this is really the last piece, do some background research on each author you have included in your annotated bibliography, which may involve reading their website bio, the preface to their book, etc. This can include their university affiliation, rank, educational background (where did they get their PhD?), and other relevant information. Pay attention to any statements about what has motivated their research. Now, reflecting back on discussions in weeks 1 & 2, ask yourself (and answer) the question: Is your list "representative" of scholars who might be working on this topic? What does it mean to be representative in this instance, and what consequences are there of non-representativeness? If you were to look for one or two additional scholars to round out your list, where would you start? (You don't actually have to find these additional scholars yet, but it will be something to keep in mind for subsequent memos.)

Memo #2 – Concepts – *due Monday, Oct. 25*

Identifying, defining and mapping your concepts.

Returning to your work in Memo #1, identify a key concept that is important to your research question. Why is this concept important? What work will it do (or will you do with respect to it)? Drawing from your literature review (if necessary, find and add an article or two), discuss at least two contending ways that it has been operationalized and measured in existing research. What distinctive assumptions, expectations or contextual factors underlie these different treatments? What implications does this have for the way the research was carried out, and for the findings?

Now take a stab at designing your own concept map (*à la* Maxwell) that can inform and guide your research. You can do this exercise with pencil and paper, or try using software such as Inspiration which provides some good tools for concept mapping. A concept map is not intended to be definitive but is rather part of a creative, iterative process of developing and refining your key concepts, making hunches or implicit ideas more explicit, and beginning to theorize about typologies, causes and effects, processes and mechanisms. At this point, don't worry about having a complete or perfect conceptual framework; rather, the focus should be on generating and exploring ideas, concepts and problems and thinking about relationships and connections between them. Make sure you use arrows and links to connect concepts, as well as words or phrases that illustrate the relationships between them. It is fine to have some components of your map that are less developed/detailed, as part of this process is about homing in on your key concepts and distinguishing them from elements that, for reasons of feasibility, might remain on the periphery of your work.

Write a brief narrative to accompany the visual map, explaining the pathways and dynamics that you are most interested in. (The Inspiration software allows you to transfer your concept map into a Word document that includes the diagram and all text elements).

Train your efforts on identifying and clarifying the key conceptual and theoretical points of interest within your proposed area of study.

Memo #3 – Causality – *due Monday, Nov. 1*

Establishing and understanding the logic of causality.

Returning to your annotated bibliography, identify (or if necessary, find and add) one article that advances a reasonably convincing *causal* explanation. Your main task in this memo is to consider how the research design and empirical methods that the author has applied contribute to (or undermine) the plausibility of their causal explanation. To begin, make sure you briefly explain the author's research question or hypothesis, and describe what they found. Discuss the particular methodological approach (*i.e.*, aspects of the research design) that was leveraged to empirically assess whether something is actually causing something else. Also identify and discuss the underlying logic of causation that informs this approach. For example, is this a study of the effects of causes, or causes of effects? Looking concretely at how the author(s) did their analysis, how confident can/should we be about the causal inferences they have drawn? For example, did they take steps to test their findings against plausible alternative causal explanations, and if so how did they do this? Drawing on assigned readings, discuss and explain how satisfied you are with the causal argument/inferences the author makes, and consider further research design strategies that might strengthen or render less ambiguous the causal explanation. (Please do not choose a study that uses an experimental design, as this is the subject for Memo #5).

Memo #4 – Casing – *due Monday, Nov. 8*

What counts as a case?

Returning to your annotated bibliography, choose or find another research article or book that employs a small-n comparison or a case study (case-oriented) design. Make sure you review the definitions presented in course readings and understand the difference and the purpose of each. Briefly explain what research question or hypothesis the author posed and what they found. Discuss the particular approach (*i.e.*, aspects of the research design) that the author used. What constitutes the formal case(s) in this study, and are there other informal cases that are also used? How, if at all, does the author justify the formal case selection strategy? Is the study ideographic, intended as a first step for generating hypotheses, and perhaps chosen on the basis of the researcher's familiarity with a particular site? Or is case selection more strategic, with the identification of the cases selected for study intended to elevate the implications of findings in important ways? (Strategic case selection might allow the researcher to perform a crucial test of a particular proposition/theory, rather than the more preliminary step of using their case(s) for theory

building.) Does what *counts* as a case change in the course of the study (is the unit studied at different levels of analysis)? Again, how explicit is the author about this, and are there ways that they could strengthen this part of their research design? Do they have some ideas about how they might build out from this study, to assess whether their theory works or needs modifications to explain the phenomenon of interest in other cases or contexts?

Memo #5 – Experiments – *due Monday, Nov. 15*

Experimental methods.

Experimentation is relatively common in the field of public policy and occupies a small but growing place in international relations researchers' methodological toolboxes. Returning to your annotated bibliography, find and add a study that applies experimental methods in an area related to your research interests. (I think this should be feasible for everyone. It's fine if what you find is a bit more distant from your specific interests, as it will likely still be quite enlightening to review how researchers in your field have deployed experiments.) Under part 1, your memo should cover some of the following questions concerning the study you have chosen. But also address part 2 with respect to your own research design. This latter part can be quite brief, as it is intended merely to get you thinking creatively!

Part 1: The following questions are suggestive and intended to get you thinking about the way the experiment in your study was designed. Please avoid answering them in a 'laundry list' format, but rather focus on and describe in a narrative format the key strengths and weaknesses of this particular study.

1) What is the central research question or hypothesis?
2) What kind of experimental approach is involved: is it lab-based, field or natural?
3) What is the treatment or intervention? Is this a planned intervention under the control of the researcher, or is it observational? If planned, what is the substantive relevance (or triviality) of the treatment? If observational, how reasonable a test is this of the researcher question?
4) Discuss the measurement and collection of data. What are the outcome measures, and how were these data collected? Are these appropriate measures or are there any problems of measurement validity?
5) Strength and threats to "internal validity": To what extent do the design elements of the experiment measure up to the gold standard for establishing causal inference? Especially for field and natural experiments, does the researcher satisfy the assumptions of "as-if random" controlled trials (RCT)? What are some of the key challenges the researcher faced in this respect, and how effectively did they address them?

6) Strength and threats to “external validity”: What are the challenges of extrapolating from findings based on the study group to some broader population?
7) Issues of implementation and ethics: Were there particular challenges in the recruitment of study subjects? Were research partners necessary to implement the trial, and if so what kinds of relationships (e.g., with what kinds of organizations) were needed? What degree of control or “veto power” did partners have, and how might this have changed the nature of the study? Were there implementation problems in doing the experiment? How were these managed? What ethical considerations were (or should have been) built into the study design?

Part 2: Having gained a better understanding of experiments, do you think there is scope in your own research project for some experimentation. What might this look like? What would be the advantages and particular challenges would it present?

Memo #6 – Research ethics – *due Monday, Dec. 6*

Ethics and consent.

Write a memo describing a nuanced recruitment and informed consent process that you may use as part of a research interview (these may be individual or focus group interviews). Make sure you explain the context: Who are your intended interviewees? What do you intend to ask them? How will you recruit them? What is the context in which you expect interviews to take place? Turning to the ethics of interviews, explain whether the aim is to empower the people you wish to interview (more likely if you are using ethnographic or participant observation methods), or if your interviewees hold relative power in the research process (more likely if you are doing elite interviews). Outline the steps that you will take to grant your interviewees agency over decisions regarding their information, while also facilitating academic openness. Your memo must include an actual “letter of information/consent form” that matches the needs of your specific study. This can be adapted if oral consent is appropriate. For sample templates, see https://research.mcmaster.ca/support-for-researchers/forms-templates/

Appendix II: Supplementary Readings

There are many excellent materials on research design and methods that cannot be fit into an introductory course of this scope. Here is what I have cut from previous iterations as I have updated this course over the years. Many of these are "classics" and while I no longer include them as required readings, it's worth knowing about them.

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.
- Schwatrz-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 Shaprio, 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.
- 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 Shaprio, 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 Maohoney 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 Deitrich 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 Maohoney 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 some classic texts. Please don't confuse this with the more detailed course package of ***"Qualitative methods resources and recommended readings"*** *that should guide your Week 10 & 11 presentations*

- *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: Ethnical 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.

Appendix III: Course Policies

Submission of Assignments

There are a variety of style guides that are commonly used in political science publications. The CMS (Chicago Manual of Style, 17th edition) and the APA (American Psychological Association) referencing formats are most widely used, while the *Canadian Journal of Political Science* has its own slightly distinct style guide. Assignments may be submitted in any of these formats; most important is that you apply it correctly and consistently. You can find useful guides at Purdue Online Writing Lab or Political Studies Writing & Citing. Referencing within your online posts may be less formal (you need to provide sufficient information so that the material referenced may be easily found).

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

Deadlines for assignments are set. All work must be submitted to the A2L Dropbox by the due date and time as stated. Do not submit work by email. Late assignments will be penalized 10% (e.g., half a point on a 5-point assignment) for every 24 hours, or part thereof, they are submitted past their due date and time. If you anticipate being unable to complete an assignment on the due date, please contact me prior to the due date. Requests for extensions will not be considered within 48 hours of the deadline except under extenuating circumstances.

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.