<div align="center">

McMaster University
Department of Political Science
POL SCI 796: Research Design and Methods
Fall 2017

</div>

Class information:
Tuesdays 8:30am-11:20am
KTH-709

Instructor information:

Dr. Karen Bird   Email: kbird@mcmaster.ca
Office: KTH-527   Phone: ext. 23124
Office hours: Mon 9-11am or by appointment

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

Note: One's choice of approach, method and analysis can be controversial. Many supporters of specific methods are unsympathetic to others. This course endeavours to present an overview of the various perspectives and approaches toward empirical research in political science. However, no method is perfect, thus this course will encourage thoughtful critiques of *all* methods. Students are expected to come with an open mind and be prepared to think, analyze and challenge their own preconceptions about how research is conducted by political scientists and what makes for good research. As one aim of this course is to help students to advance their own research projects, it is expected that you will approach discussions in the spirit of genuine respect and mutual support for each other and our various projects.

Learning objectives:
The course will help you to:
- assess and understand whether political science is a *"science,"* and why political scientists either agree with or object to that characterization;
- build capacity in selecting research topics, identifying research problems, formulating research proposals and research programs, and developing research designs that bring evidence to bear on causal or descriptive/conceptual propositions;
- through the topics covered, gain an appreciation of major issues related to research design, and demonstrate your ability to navigate through them.

Course materials:
Required texts are available for sale at the Campus Store and on reserve loan at Mills Library:

- A. F. Chalmers. 2103. *What is this thing called science?* (3rd or 4th edition is acceptable). Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Co.
- John Gerring. 2012. *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework* (2nd edition). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Joseph A. Maxwell. 2013. *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach* (2nd or 3nd edition is acceptable). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Readings not drawn from these books can be accessed via Scholars Portal, or made available on AvenueToLearn (http://avenue.mcmaster.ca/).

Assignments and evaluation:

- **Participation (20%)**

Your attendance and active and constructive participation in seminar are central to succeeding in this course. You are expected to complete all reading assignments for each week. You should think about the readings and have at least 1-2 questions or critical reflections ready to advance the discussion.

- **Book review (10%) – due date: Fri. Oct. 6**

You will choose a book from the list below (or one agreed upon by the instructor) and prepare a book review in which the author's central research question, analytical approach, research design, methodological choices, and major findings/conclusions are identified and critiqued. You are expected to comment on how the author's approach to the research shaped and/or influenced the conclusions reached. This paper should be approximately 3-5 pages and no more than 1,500 words (1.5 line spacing preferred).

Books:
Christopher Alcantara. *Negotiating the Deal: Comprehensive Land Claims Agreements in Canada.* University of Toronto Press, 2013.
Eric Bleich. Race Politics in Britain and France: Ideas and Policymaking since the 1960s. Cambridge University Press, 2003.
Irene Bloemraad. *Becoming a Citizen: Incorporating Immigrants and Refugees in the United States and Canada.* University of California Press, 2006.
Rogers Brubaker. *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany.* Harvard University Press, 1992.
Raphaela Dangygier. *Immigration and Conflict in Europe.* Cambridge University Press, 2010.
Martin Gilens. *Why Americans Hate Welfare: Race, Media, and the Politics of Antipoverty Policy.* University of Chicago Press, 1999.
Ronald Inglehart and Pippa Norris. *Rising Tide: Gender Equality and Cultural Change Around the World.* Cambridge University Press, 2003
Christopher F. Karpowitz and Tali Mendelberg. *The Silent Sex: Gender, Deliberation, and Institutions.* Princeton University Press, 2014.
Margaret E. Keck and Kathryn Sikkink. *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics.* Cornell University Press, 1998.

Mona Lena Krook. *Quotas for Women in Politics: Gender and Candidate Selection Reform Worldwide.* Oxford University Press, 2009.

David Laitin. *Identity in Formation: The Russian-Speaking Populations in the Near Abroad.* Cornell University Press, 1998.

Evan Lieberman. *Race and Regionalism in the Politics of Taxation in Brazil and South Africa.* Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Peggy Levitt. *God Needs No Passport: Immigrants and the Changing American Religious Landscape*. New Press, 2007.

Anthony Marx. *Making Race and Nation: A Comparison of South Africa, the United States, and Brazil.* Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Paul Pierson. *Dismantling the Welfare State: Reagan, Thatcher, and the Politics of Retrenchment.* Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Sven-Oliver Proksch and Jonathan B. Slapin, *The Politics of Parliamentary Debate: Parties, Rebels and Representation.* Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Robert Putnam. *Making Democracy Work.* Princeton University Press, 1993.

Joe Soss, Richard C. Fording, Sanford F. Schram. *Disciplining the Poor: Neoliberal Paternalism and the Persistent Power of Race.* University of Chicago Press, 2011.

Nancy Scheper-Hughes. *Death Without Weeping: The Violence of Everyday Life in Brazil.* University of California Press, 1993.

James C. Scott. *Weapons of the Weak.* Yale University Press, 1985.

Susan Stokes, Thad Dunning, Marcelo Nazareno and Valeria Brusco. *Brokers, Voters and Clientelism: The Puzzle of Distributive Politics.* Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Erin Tolley. *Framed: Media and the Coverage of Race in Canadian Politics.* UBC Press, 2016.

Phil Triadafilopoulos. *Becoming Multicultural: Immigration and the Politics of Membership in Canada and Germany.* UBC Press, 2012.

Ashutosh Varshney. *Ethnic Conflict and Civic Life.* Yale University Press, 2003.

Lisa Wedeen. *Peripheral Visions: Publics, Power and Performance in Yemen.* University of Chicago Press, 2008.

- **Research design comment paper (2 x 10%) – due dates: Tue. Oct. 24 & Nov. 14**

There are six weeks in which we read about and discuss specific elements of research design. You are to submit two papers over this period, in which you reflect and comment on how issues raised in the readings apply to your own research project. Your comment papers are intended to help you to work through aspects of research design and methodology as they apply to your own research design proposal. The work you do here should help you to advance your final term paper. Each paper should be approximately 3-5 pages and no more than 1,500 words (1.5 line spacing preferred).

- **Qualitative methods presentation & handout (10%) – Tues. Nov. 21 & 28**

Each student will choose a qualitative research method (e.g., elite interviewing, focus groups, participant observation, content or discourse analysis, archival methods, etc.), and present a 15-minute overview of that method in class. A detailed handout of methods and associated readings will be available on ATL. You are to look this over carefully, and come to class on Week 6 prepared to sign up for a selected method (please have a first and second choice ready). Once you have your assigned topic, you will read 4 or 5 related readings, and then present an overview addressing: i)

the nuts and bolts of how the method is done; ii) the kinds of research problems to which it can be usefully applied; iii) its strengths and weaknesses; iv) tips and traps for applying it effectively. If possible, choose a method that you anticipate using for your own research, and discuss v) advantages and challenges of using it in that context. Please provide a short handout that can be shared with the other members of the class to help build a personal resource library. You are also welcome to use power-point slides. The final two weeks of regular seminar will be given over to these presentations.

- **Research design paper, workshop & peer critique (40%) – Fri. Dec. 8, MUSC-311/313**
  Peer critique (10%) – due: Fri. Dec. 1
  Final paper (30%) – due: Fri. Dec. 15

The major assignment for the course is a research design proposal, in which you will present your research question and initial plans for empirical research to answer that question. Hopefully, this can form the basis of a tentative dissertation idea. Your paper should be approximately 4,000–5,000 words (12-16 pages, 1.5 line spacing preferred), and should apply relevant knowledge you have gained throughout the course. The proposal should identify the topic and provide a concise literature review that serves to frame your research question, problem, or testable hypothesis. You should develop the concepts, and outline the procedure (case selection, operationalization, measurement, data) to be used. Specific data gathering techniques (i.e., details of interview or survey questions, etc.) are not expected, but a clear discussion of the type(s) of data required to address the research question should be developed. You are also expected to demonstrate some awareness of concrete opportunities and/or challenges regarding data collection and overall project feasibility – for example, ethical, language, trust or safety problems you will need to confront in fieldwork; or availability of existing data, expert reports, or networks of key actors related to your specific topic. As you would in a grant proposal, you should write for an informed but non-specialist reader who wants to know why your research question is a novel and important one, how your research will help to answer it, what are the concrete steps that will be involved in the research process, and what is the overall feasibility of your project.

The **first draft of your research design is due on Fri. Dec. 1**. Each student will sign up as a discussant, and drafts will be distributed so that peer critiques can be prepared for the Proposal Workshop on Fri. Dec. 8. Your **written peer critique should be approximately 2-3 pages, and is to be submitted to the instructor at the Workshop.**

The **Proposal Workshop** is a collaborative exercise at which each student will present his/her research proposal, and discussants will follow with their critiques. Time will also be set aside for general discussion and feedback on each proposal. Note that faculty will be invited to attend, so that they can learn more about the research that first-year PhD and MA-thesis students intend to undertake. To strengthen the collaborative ethos of our graduate program, the department will host all participants to lunch. A detailed Workshop itinerary will be distributed one to two weeks prior, so that everyone knows their role and allotted time for presentation. You should plan on reserving the full day for this exercise.

You will have the opportunity to revise your paper in light of comments and discussion at the Workshop. A hard copy of the **final paper is due on Fri. Dec. 15.**

Course Policies:

This syllabus is tentative and subject to change. Students are responsible for finding out about announced changes if they miss class.

- **MA and PhD students**

Both MA and PhD students are welcome to enrol in this course. However, the course is intended to prepare students to design and conduct thesis research and much of the discussion will focus on the relative value of certain approaches or methods for MA or PhD thesis-length studies.

- **General evaluation policies**

Assignments are to be submitted in hard copy. They can be handed in during class, or to my mailbox no later than 4pm on the due dates, unless otherwise specified. Assignments handed in after the deadline will lose 5% per day (*i.e.,* half a point on a 10-point assignment), including weekend days. If you anticipate having problems meeting these deadlines, please contact me *before* the assignment is due to discuss your situation. To avoid late penalties and ensure fairness, written documentation of your emergency may be required. 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.

- **Missed classes**

Regular attendance is expected of all graduate students. No 'make-up' assignments will be provided in the event of missed classes; rather students should double their effort in subsequent classes and assignments.

McMaster Policies:

Academic Dishonesty

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.

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. It is your responsibility to understand what constitutes academic dishonesty. For information on the various kinds of academic dishonesty please refer to the Academic Integrity Policy, specifically Appendix 3, located at http://www.mcmaster.ca/policy/Students-AcademicStudies/

The following illustrates only three forms of academic dishonesty:

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

Statement on Electronic Resources

In this course we will be using Email and/or AvenueToLearn (ATL). Students should be aware that, when they access the electronic components of this course, private information such as first and last names, user names for the McMaster e-mail accounts, and program affiliation may become

apparent to all other students in the same course. The available information is dependent on the technology used. Continuation in this course will be deemed consent to this disclosure. If you have any questions or concerns about such disclosure please discuss this with the course instructor.

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 Statement
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 their McMaster email and course websites weekly during the term and to note any changes.

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

Course roadmap

Week	Date	Topic	Assignments due
		INTRODUCTION and PERSPECTIVES ON POLITICAL SCIENCE	
1	Sept. 5	No class meeting	Review syllabus
2	Sept. 12	So, you're thinking of becoming a political scientist?	
3	Sept. 19	What is science? Is political science a science?	
4	Sept. 26	Unity, plurality, praxis: US and Canadian political science	
		ELEMENTS OF RESEARCH DESIGN	
5	Oct. 3	Research ethics	Book review due Fri. Oct. 6
--	Oct. 9-15	MID-TERM BREAK	--
6	Oct. 17	Choosing topics and building arguments	Sign-up for qualitative method
7	Oct. 24	Conceptualization, description and measurement	Research design comment paper 1 (wks 5,6,7)
8	Oct. 31	Construing causation and explanation	
9	Nov. 7	Comparative and case study approaches	
10	Nov. 14	Experimental approaches	Research design comment paper 2 (wks 8,9,10)
		SURVEY OF QUALITATIVE METHODS	
11	Nov. 21	Roundtable I	Qualitative methods oral presentations
12	Nov. 28	Roundtable II	Qualitative methods oral presentations
		COURSE WRAP-UP	
13	Fri. Dec. 8	Research Proposal Workshop	Submit draft research proposal Fri. Dec. 1 Submit peer critique at Workshop
--	Fri. Dec. 15	--	Final paper due

Detailed Topics and Readings

WK 1 – Sept. 5   No meeting

WK 2 – Sept. 12   So, you're thinking of becoming a political scientist?
- A Wuffle (1989). "Uncle Wuffle's Advice to the Advanced Graduate Student." *PS: Political Science and Politics,* 22(4): 838-839.
- A Wuffle (2015). "Uncle Wuffle's Reflections on Political Science Methodology." *PS: Political Science and Politics,* 48(1): 176-182.
- Katharina Holzinger (2007). "Career Incentives." *European Political Science,* 6: 177-184.
- Christopher H. Achen (2014). "Why do we need Diversity in the Political Methodology Society?" *The Political Methodologist,* 22(2): 25-28.
- Anonymous (2014). "No Shortcuts to Gender Equality: The Structures of Women's Exclusion in Political Science." *Politics & Gender* 10(3): 437-447.

WK 3 – Sept. 19   What is Science? Is Political Science a Science?
- Chalmers, ch. 1, 5-9.
- John S. Dryzek (1986). "The Progress of Political Science." *Journal of Politics,* 48, 2 (May): 301-320.
- William H. Riker (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.
- Thomas C. Walker (2010). "The Perils of Paradigm Mentalities: Revisiting Kuhn, Lakatos, and Popper." *Perspectives on Politics,* 8(2): 433-451.
- Ruth Grant (2002). "Political Theory, Political Science, and Politics." *Political Theory* 30(4): 577-595.
- Jamie Shreeve (2015). "This Face Changes the Human Story. But How?" *National Geographic* (10 Sept.) http://news.nationalgeographic.com/2015/09/150910-human-evolution-change/

  Additional recommended readings:
  - 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.
  - 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.

WK 4 – Sept. 26   Unity, Plurality, Praxis: US and Canadian Political Science

- Gerring, ch. 1, 13, 14, and "Postscript: Justifications" (pp 394-401).
- Various (2010). Symposium: Perestroika in Political Science. *PS: Political Science and Politics,* 43(4): 725-754. Luke & McGovern, Yanow & Schwartz-Shea, Sadiq & Monroe, and Caterino pieces.
- James Mahoney and Gary Goertz (2006). "A tale of two cultures: Contrasting quantitative and qualitative research." *Political Analysis* 14(3): 227–249.Henry E. Brady and David Collier (2004). *Rethinking Social Inquiry* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield), ch. 13.
- John E. Trent (1987). "Factors Influencing the Development of Political Science in Canada: A Case and a Model." *International Political Science Review,* 8(1): 9-24.
- Nicole Goodman, Karen Bird, and Chelsea Gabel (2017). "Towards a More Collaborative Political Science: A Partnership Approach." *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 50(1): 201-218.
- Christopher Alcantara, Dianne Lalonde, and Gary N. Wilson (2017). "Indigenous Research and Academic Freedom: A View from Political Scientists." *The International Indigenous Policy Journal,* 8(2), http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/iipj/vol8/iss2/3/

  <small>Additional recommended readings:</small>
  - Almond, Gabriel A. (1988). "Separate Tables: Schools and Sects in Political Science." *PS: Political Science and Politics,* 21, 4 (Autumn): 828-42.
  - 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.
  - 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.
  - Nossal, Kim Richard (2000). "Home Grown IR: The Canadianization of International Relations." *Journal of Canadian Studies,* 35, 1 (Spring): 95-114.
  - Schram, Sanford F., and Brian Caterino (eds.), *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.
  - Fox Piven, Frances (2010). "Reflections on Scholarship and Activism." *Antipode,* 42, 4: 806-10.

WK 5 – Oct. 3   Research Ethics

- McMaster REB Guidelines: http://reo.mcmaster.ca/policies/copy_of_guidelines
- Tony Porter (2008). "Research Ethics Governance and Political Science in Canada," *PS: Political Science and Politics,* (July): 495-99.
- Christie Aschwandene (2015). "Science Isn't Broken. It's just a hell of a lot harder than we give it credit for." *Five-thirty-eight,* 19 August, http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/science-isnt-broken/#part1
- Pamela Nilan (2002). 'Dangerous Fieldwork' Re-examined: The Question of Researcher Subject Position." *Qualitative Research*, 2, 3: 363-86.
- Patricia Siplon (1999). "Scholar, Witness, or Activist? The Lessons and Dilemmas of an AIDS Research Agenda," *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 32, 3: 576-78.

Additional recommended readings:
- o 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.
- o CPSA (2010). "CPSA Response to December 2009 Draft of the 2nd edition of the TCPS." Online at http://cpsa-acsp.ca/documents/pdfs/2010_CPSA_Response_to_TCPSII.pdf
- o Van Noorden, Richard (2015). "Political Science's Problem with Research Ethics." *Nature,* June 29, doi:10.1038/nature.2015.17866. Online at http://www.nature.com/news/political-science-s-problem-with-research-ethics-1.17866?WT.mc_id=TWT_NatureNews
- o Konnikova, Maria (2015). "How a Gay-Marriage Study Went Wrong." *The New Yorker* (May 22). Online at http://www.newyorker.com/science/maria-konnikova/how-a-gay-marriage-study-went-wrong
- o Scheper-Hughes, Nancy (1992). *Death without Weeping: The Violence of Everyday Life in Brazil.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. Read "Moral relativism and the primacy of the ethical" in Introduction, pp 21-30.
- o Woliver, L. R. (2002) "Ethical Dilemmas in Personal Interviewing," *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 35, 4: 677-8.
- o 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.

WK 6 – Oct. 17   Choosing Topics and Building Arguments

- Maxwell, ch. 1, 2, 4
- Gerring, ch. 2-4
- Irene Bloemraad (2007). "Of Puzzles and Serendipity: Doing Cross-national, Mixed Method Immigration Research." Pp 34-49, in Louis DeSipio (ed.), *Researching Migration: Stories from the Field.* New York: SSRC. Online at http://www.ssrc.org/workspace/images/crm/new_publication_3/%7B42451838-264a-de11-afac-001cc477ec70%7D.pdf
- Rogers M. Smith (2007). "Systematizing the Ineffable: A Perestroikan's Methods for Finding a Good Research Topic." *Qualitative Methods: Newsletter of the American Political Science Association Organized Section on Qualitative Methods,* 5, 1 (Spring): 6-8. http://www.maxwell.syr.edu/uploadedFiles/moynihan/cqrm/Newsletter5.1.pdf

    Additional recommended readings:
    - o Mills, C. Wright (1959). "Appendix: On Intellectual Craftsmanship." *The Sociological Imagination.* Oxford: Oxford University Press (pp 195-226).
    - o Wildavsky, Aaron (1989). "Reading with a Purpose." Ch. 3 in *Craftways: On the Organization of Scholarly Work.* New York: Transaction Press.
    - o Most, Benjamin A. (1990). "Getting Started on Political Research." *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 23, 4: (December): 592-6.
    - o Useem, Bert (1997). "Choosing a Dissertation Topic." *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 30, 2 (June): 213-6.
    - o Varios (2001). Symposium on Advisors and the Dissertation Proposal. *PSOnline* (December). www.apsanet.org
    - o 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.
    - o Tuhiwai Smith, Linda (1999). "The Indigenous Peoples' Project: Setting a new Agenda." Ch. 5 in *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples.* London: Zed Books.

WK 7 – Oct. 24   Conceptualization, Description and Measurement
- Maxwell, ch. 3
- Gerring, ch. 5-7
- Charles O. Jones (1974). "Doing Before Knowing: Concept Development in Political Research." *American Journal of Political Science,* 18, 1: 215-228.
- Zachary Elkins (2000). "Gradations of Democracy? Empirical Tests of Alternative Conceptualizations." *American Journal of Political Science* 44(2): 293-300.
- Michael Coppedge and John Gerring (2011). "Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy: A New Approach." Perspectives on Politics, 9, 2 (June): 247-67.

    Additional suggested readings:
    - Adcock, Robert and David Collier (2001). "Measurement Validity: A Shared Standard for Qualitative and Quantitative Research." *American Political Science Review*, 95 (September): 529-546.
    - 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 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.

WK 8 – Oct. 31   Construing Causation and Explanation
- Gerring, ch. 8, 9, and pp 321-33.
- Gary King, 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.
- James Mahoney and Gary Goertz. 2006. "A tale of two cultures: Contrasting quantitative and qualitative research." *Political Analysis* 14(3): 227–249.
- Jon Elstern (1988). "A Plea for Mechanisms." In Peter Hedstrom and Richard Swedberg (eds.), *Social Mechanisms: An Analytical Approach to Social Theory.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Alexander L. George, and Andrew Bennett (2005). "Process-Tracing and Historical Explanation." Ch. 10 in *Case Studies and Theoretical Development.* Boston: MIT Press.
- Henry E. Brady (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.

    Additional suggested readings:
    - 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.
    - 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.
    - Chattopadhyay, Raghabendra, and Esther Duflo (2004). "Women as Policy Makers: Evidence from a Randomized Policy Experiment in India." *Econometrica* 72(5): 1409-1443.
    - 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.

WK 9 – Nov. 7   Comparative and Case Study Approaches

- Arend Lijphart (1971). "Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method." *American Political Science Review,* 65, 3 (September): 682-93.
- Charles C. Ragin (1987). "The Distinctiveness of Comparative Social Science." *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. (Berkeley: University of California Press), ch. 1.
- Peter Hall (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).
- Jack S. Levy (2008). "Case Studies: Types, Designs, and Logics of Inference." Conflict Management and Peace Science, 25:1–18.
- Bent Flyvberg (2006). "Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research." Qualitative Inquiry, 12, 2 (April): 219-45.Mahoney, James (2007). "Qualitative Methodology and Comparative Politics." *Comparative Political Studies,* 40(2): 122-44.

    Additional suggested readings:
    - Ragin, Charles C. (1987). The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies. Berkeley: University of California Press.
    - 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.
    - 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.

- o Collier, David, James Mahoney and Jason Seawright (2004). "Claiming Too Much: Warnings about Selection Bias." Ch. 6 in Henry E. Brady and David Collier (eds.) *Rethinking Social Inquiry* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- o 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.
- o Snyder, Richard (2001). "Scaling Down: The Subnational Comparative Method." *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 36(1): 93-110.
- o Gerring, John (2004). "What is a Case Study and What is it Good for?" *American Political Science Review*, 98: 341-54.
- o 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.
- o 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.
- o Bennett, Andrew and Colin Elman (2007). "Case Study Methods in International Relations Subfield." *Comparative Political Studies,* 40, 2 (February): 170-95.

WK 10 – Nov. 14   Experimental Approaches

- Gerring, ch. 10
- Peter John (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.
- Thad Dunning (2012). "Introduction: Why Natural Experiments?" *Natural Experiments in the Social Sciences: A Design-Based Approach.* (New York: Cambridge University Press), ch. 1.
- David E. Broockman (2013). "Black Politicians are More Intrinsically Motivated to Advance Blacks' Interests: A Field Experiment Manipulating Political Incentives." *American Journal of Political Science,* 57(3): 521-536.
- Posner, Dan N. (2004). "The Political Salience of Cultural Difference: Why Chewas and Tumbukas are Allies in Zambia and Adversaries in Malawi." *American Political Science Reivew*, 98(4): 529-546.

Additional suggested readings:
- o Gerber, Alan and Donald Green (2012). *Field Experiment: Design, Analysis, and Interpretation* (W.W. Norton & Company)
- o McDermott, Rose (2002). "Experimental Methods in Political Science." *Annual Review of Political Science*, 5:31–61.
- o 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.
- o Orr, Larry L. (1999). *Social Experiments: Evaluating Public Programs with Experimental Methods* (Sage).
- o Kapiszewski, Diana, Lauren M. MacLean, and Benjamin L. Read (2015). "Experiments in the Field." Chapter 9 in *Field Research in Political Science: Practices and Principles* (Cambridge University Press).

WK 11 – Nov. 21   Qualitative Methods Roundtable I

WK 12 – Nov. 28   Qualitative Methods Roundtable II

WK 13– Dec. 8   Research Proposal Workshop