

PO8003: Research Design (M.Sc.)  
Michaelmas Term 2017  
Phoenix House 202, Thursday 13:00–16:00

Constantine Boussalis  
Email: [boussalc@tcd.ie](mailto:boussalc@tcd.ie)  
Office hours: Monday, 4-6 PM  
Office: 4.07, 3 College Green  
Department of Political Science  
Trinity College Dublin

## 1 Description & Objectives

This graduate seminar provides an introduction to the scientific inquiry of the political world. Students will learn how to identify compelling research questions and how to structure a study so as to contribute to an existing body of research. The emphasis of the module will be on the development of novel, falsifiable, and empirically testable explanations of political phenomena.

## 2 Module Requirements and Policies

### 2.1 Participation (10%)

Student participation in class discussion and debate on the readings is a central element of the seminar. Students are expected to have read all required readings and to have acquired detailed knowledge and developed informed critiques of the readings *prior to the class meeting*. This means active engagement in class discussion: listening to your peers' views and constructively engaging with them, while also demonstrating a clear understanding of the weekly readings. Students will be evaluated on the quality of their input in class discussion and debate—merely attending class is not a sufficient condition for achieving a passing participation mark. Seminar attendance is mandatory and absence may result in a lowered *overall* module grade if no medical certificate or similar documentation is provided.

### 2.2 Response Papers (22.5%): 2 required + 1 extra

Students will be required to engage critically with the readings in the form of short response papers. Response papers are not mere descriptions or summaries of the readings, but rather offer original insight and commentary on the weeks readings. Assume that the reader is familiar with the content of the reading so as to keep your arguments concise. The focus here is on the quality of your argumentation, not your position on the issue *per se*. Effective response papers typically consists of the following elements:

- Critical engagement with the arguments presented in the readings. Note that good response papers engage with multiple readings to support your main point.
- Contrast of arguments from different readings to explain your own position (with coherent and logically valid arguments).
- A review of the research design of one or more of the required or optional research examples from the reading list, with a focus on the issues relevant to the week. This means that you may bring in research examples assigned before and after the current week.
- A delineation of steps forward for a given body of work, based on the critical review of readings. What new research questions can you derive from your assessment?

Students are required to submit two (2) short response papers over the duration of the module. Students also have the opportunity to submit one (1) extra response paper. The final grade will count the highest two submitted response papers.

The required length of the response paper is between 600-800 words. Late submissions will not be accepted. You may not submit more than one response paper per week. Submission of response papers must comply with the following schedule:

- One paper due between weeks 2-6
- One paper due between weeks 8-11

Response papers should be submitted by Thursday 11:59 AM, prior to class via Turnitin.

### **2.3 Research Proposal (22.5% + 45%)**

The main course objective is to submit a research proposal at the end of Michaelmas Term based on principles of comparative research design as discussed in the weekly seminars. The focus should be on emphasizing the issues of research design rather than the substantive importance of the research project. That is, the focus of the proposal is not on providing a lengthy literature review (although some knowledge of academic work in the area should be demonstrated), but rather on writing a research proposal that specifies a well-defined research question which is grounded in theory and methodologically feasible. Although you may use this paper as a first attempt for your M.Sc. dissertation project, there is no need to do so, and you are not at all required to write your M.Sc. dissertation on the topic you choose to pursue for this particular module. However, you should not submit a proposal that overlaps with material submitted to another M.Sc. module.

#### **Three-step approach to writing your research proposal**

1. **The research question:** (1) must be *causal* in nature and should outline a broad question you are interested in exploring further; and (2) should include a short discussion of the variation to be explained, proposed causal explanation and significance of research. You will receive (and provide) peer feedback on each other's research question paper. Submission is due by **6pm on Friday, 20 October 2017**, via Turnitin. The paper should not exceed 800 words.
  - After the assignments have been submitted, you provide peer comments to two (2) papers via Turnitin. You are assigned one paper and you can select another yourself. Please provide helpful comments to your fellow students; you will also depend on their input to develop your own proposal! Login to Turnitin to fulfil this part of the assignment between **21-24 October 2017**. Peer review comments should be at least 300 words.
  - The research question and peer review are not graded, but they are a required part of the coursework. If you fail to hand in a serious attempt at this, your marks for the project outline and final research design will be penalized.
2. **Project outline:** outline/summary of project including a more refined discussion of your research question, an indication of your causal explanatory variable, a discussion of observable implications of your key causal variable and the importance/significance of the project. This paper will count 22.5% towards your overall grade. The project outline at **6pm on Wednesday, 15 November 2017**. The length of the project outline should be between 1250-1750 words (including reference list, footnotes, and title page). We will discuss some of these papers in class the following week.
3. **Final research design:** the final proposal will include a precise definition of your dependent variable, an outline of alternative explanations and observable implications of your key causal variable, address issues of testing and measurement, data collection and analysis. It essentially covers all the topics discussed throughout the course. This paper will count 45% towards your overall grade. The final research design paper is due at **6pm on Friday, 15 December 2017**. The length of the

paper should be between 2,750 and 3,250 words (including reference list, footnotes, and title page). You may find a handout with guidelines for the final research design paper on Blackboard.

## 2.4 Written Work Submission Guidelines

- **Academic & Professional Ethics:** Please do not plagiarize. Academic dishonesty is a serious matter, with serious consequences that can result in receiving no credit for an assignment, a failing grade for the module, and even expulsion from the programme. It is never permissible to turn in any work that contains others' ideas without proper acknowledgment. It is your responsibility to make sure that your work meets the standard of academic honesty set forth in the College Calendar (see <http://tcd-ie.libguides.com/plagiarism/calendar>). Useful information is available at <http://tcd-ie.libguides.com/plagiarism>. If you are paraphrasing, cite the source. If you are quoting, use quotation marks and appropriate citation. Remember that academic integrity is a reflection of one's character. In addition, we strongly recommend that you visit <http://www.plagiarism.org/> for more information on what *is* and *is not* plagiarism. Lastly, students are required to only submit "new work" in each module, which means work that has not been submitted previously in any other university module. Students who wish to use previously submitted work as part of a new project will need the approval of the lecturer.
- The [Assignment Submission Form](#) available from the Departmental website should be filled out and included as the first page of all your submissions.
- All written assignments are to be submitted through [turnitin.com](http://turnitin.com). The class ID is **16367639** and the password is **po8003** (case-sensitive). Also, you will be required to register for turnitin.com by **Friday, 29 September 2017**.
- All papers should be typeset in a 12 point font, using 1.5pt spacing. When in doubt follow usual practices for academic work, as exemplified by articles in major political science journals. Use a consistent reference style throughout the paper (author-year is preferred).

## 2.5 Syllabus Modification Rights

I reserve the right to reasonably alter the elements of the syllabus at any time. More often than not this will mean adjusting the reading list to keep pace with the course schedule, although I may add reading assignments as well.

## 3 Readings

The main texts for this module are:

- King, G., Keohane, R.O. and Verba, S., 1994. *Designing social inquiry: Scientific inference in qualitative research*. Princeton University Press.
- Gerring, J., 2012. *Social science methodology: A unified framework*. Cambridge University Press.

We will also read a selection of articles and chapters as detailed in the module schedule below.

For those with a limited social science methods background, it might be helpful to start by reading chapters from an introductory text, such as:

- Manheim, J.B., Rich, R.C., Willnat, L., Brians, C.L. and Babb, J., 2012. *Empirical political analysis*. Pearson Higher Ed
- Shively, W.P., 2016. *The craft of political research*. Routledge

## 4 Course Outline

|             |                                                 |       |
|-------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------|
| Week 1      | Can we study politics scientifically?           | p. 4  |
| 29/9/17     | <i>Turinitin.com registration</i>               |       |
| Week 2      | Descriptive Inference & Concept Formation       | p. 5  |
| Week 3      | Theory Development                              | p. 6  |
| Week 4      | Causal Inference & Causal Mechanisms            | p. 7  |
| 20/10/17    | <i>Research question paper due, 6 PM</i>        |       |
| 21-24/10/17 | <i>Research question paper peer-review</i>      |       |
| Week 5      | Falsifiability & Hypothesis Testing             | p. 8  |
| Week 6      | Case Studies & Case Selection                   | p. 9  |
| Week 7      | <i>Reading Week (no class)</i>                  |       |
| 15/11/17    | <i>Project outline due, 6 PM</i>                |       |
| Week 8      | Mixed Methods Design                            | p. 10 |
| Week 9      | Operationalization and Measurement              | p. 11 |
| Week 10     | Methods of Data Collection                      | p. 12 |
| Week 11     | Bias in Measurement and Research                | p. 13 |
| Week 12     | Writing the Research Proposal                   | p. 14 |
| 15/12/17    | <i>Final research design proposal due, 6 PM</i> |       |

## 5 Course Schedule

### Week 1. Can we study politics scientifically?

#### Introductory readings (optional):

- Manheim, J.B., Rich, R.C., Willnat, L., Brians, C.L. and Babb, J., 2012. *Empirical political analysis*. Pearson Higher Ed, **Chapter 1**.

#### Theoretical readings (required):

- King, G., Keohane, R.O. and Verba, S., 1994. *Designing social inquiry: Scientific inference in qualitative research*. Princeton university press, **Chapter 1**.
- Gerring, J., 2012. *Social science methodology: A unified framework*. Cambridge University Press. **Chapter 2**.
- Firebaugh, G., 2008. The first rule: There should be the possibility of surprise in social research. In: *Seven Rules for Social Research*. Princeton University Press, **pp. 1-13 & “Is meaningful social science possible?” pp. 26-29**.  
URL: <http://press.princeton.edu/chapters/s8593.pdf>

#### Theoretical readings (optional):

- Mahoney, J. and Goertz, G., 2006. A tale of two cultures: Contrasting quantitative and qualitative research. *Political analysis*, 14(3), **pp. 227-249**.  
URL: <http://pan.oxfordjournals.org/content/14/3/227.short>

#### Audiovisual (optional):

- Feynman, Richard (1964) “On the Scientific Method.”
- Gladwell, Malcolm (2015) “School Shootings.”

## Week 2. Descriptive Inference & Concept Formation

### Introductory readings (optional):

- Manheim, J.B., Rich, R.C., Willnat, L., Brians, C.L. and Babb, J., 2012. *Empirical political analysis*. Pearson Higher Ed, ‘**Measurement error: the enemy**’, pp. **75-79**.

### Theoretical readings (required):

- King, G., Keohane, R.O. and Verba, S., 1994. *Designing social inquiry: Scientific inference in qualitative research*. Princeton university press, **Chapter 2**.
- Gerring, J., 1999. What makes a concept good? A criterial framework for understanding concept formation in the social sciences. *Polity*, pp. **357-393**.  
URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3235246>

### Theoretical readings (optional):

- Goertz, G., 2006. Social science concepts: A user’s guide. *Princeton University Press*. **Chapters 1-2**.

### Research examples (required):

- Howard, M.M. and Roessler, P.G., 2006. Liberalizing electoral outcomes in competitive authoritarian regimes. *American Journal of Political Science*, 50(2), pp. **365-381**.  
URL: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1540-5907.2006.00189.x/full>
- Soifer, H., 2008. State infrastructural power: Approaches to conceptualization and measurement. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 43(3-4), pp. **231-251**.  
URL: <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s12116-008-9028-6>

### Week 3. Theory Development

#### Introductory readings (optional):

- Manheim, J.B., Rich, R.C., Willnat, L., Brians, C.L. and Babb, J., 2012. *Empirical political analysis*. Pearson Higher Ed, **Chapter 2**.
- Shively, W.P., 2016. *The craft of political research*. Routledge, **Chapter 11**.

#### Theoretical readings (required):

- Gerring, J., 2012. Social science methodology: A unified framework. Cambridge University Press. **Chapter 3**.
- Okasha, S., 2002. Scientific reasoning. In: *Philosophy of science: A very short introduction* (Vol. 67). Oxford Paperbacks. **Chapter 2**.

#### Research examples (required):

- Downs, A., 1957. An economic theory of political action in a democracy. *The Journal of Political Economy*, pp. 135-150.  
URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1827369>

## Week 4. Causal Inference & Causal Mechanisms

### Introductory readings (optional):

- Manheim, J.B., Rich, R.C., Willnat, L., Brians, C.L. and Babb, J., 2012. *Empirical political analysis*. Pearson Higher Ed, **Chapter 6**.
- Shively, W.P., 2016. *The craft of political research*. Routledge, **Chapter 6**.

### Theoretical readings (required):

- King, G., Keohane, R.O. and Verba, S., 1994. *Designing social inquiry: Scientific inference in qualitative research*. Princeton university press, **Chapter 3**.
- McDermott, R., 2002. Experimental methods in political science. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 5(1), **pp. 31-61**.  
URL: <http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev.polisci.5.091001.170657>
- Titunik, R., 2015. Can big data solve the fundamental problem of causal inference?. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 48(01), **pp. 75-79**.  
URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1049096514001772>

### Theoretical readings (optional):

- Holland, P.W., 1986. Statistics and causal inference. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 81(396), **pp. 945-960**.  
URL: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01621459.1986.10478354>
- Imai, K., Keele, L., Tingley, D. and Yamamoto, T., 2011. Unpacking the black box of causality: Learning about causal mechanisms from experimental and observational studies. *American Political Science Review*, 105(4), **pp. 765-789**.  
URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23275352>
- Humphreys, M. and Weinstein, J.M., 2009. Field experiments and the political economy of development. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 12, **pp. 367-378**.  
URL: <http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev.polisci.12.060107.155922>
- Gelman, A., & Imbens, G. (2013). Why ask why? Forward causal inference and reverse causal questions (No. w19614). *National Bureau of Economic Research*.  
URL: [http://www.stat.columbia.edu/gelman/research/unpublished/reversecausal\\_3oct05.pdf](http://www.stat.columbia.edu/gelman/research/unpublished/reversecausal_3oct05.pdf)

### Research examples (required):

- Gerber, A.S. and Green, D.P., 2000. The effects of canvassing, telephone calls, and direct mail on voter turnout: A field experiment. *American Political Science Review*, 94(03), **pp. 653-663**.  
URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2585837>
- Bond, R.M., Fariss, C.J., Jones, J.J., Kramer, A.D., Marlow, C., Settle, J.E. and Fowler, J.H., 2012. A 61-million-person experiment in social influence and political mobilization. *Nature*, 489(7415), **pp. 295-298**.  
URL: <http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v489/n7415/pdf/nature11421.pdf>
- Barberá, P., Jost, J.T., Nagler, J., Tucker, J.A. and Bonneau, R., 2015. Tweeting From Left to Right: Is Online Political Communication More Than an Echo Chamber? *Psychological science*, **pp. 1-12**.  
URL: <http://pss.sagepub.com/content/26/10/1531>

### Real-world examples (required):

- Krugman, P., 2008. Bartels = Alfred Wegener? *The New York Times*  
URL: <http://krugman.blogs.nytimes.com/2008/04/02/bartels-alfred-wegener/>
- BBC, 2014. Spurious correlations: Margarine linked to divorce?  
URL: <http://www.bbc.com/news/magazine-27537142>



## Week 5. Falsifiability and Hypothesis Testing

### Introductory readings (optional):

- Manheim, J.B., Rich, R.C., Willnat, L., Brians, C.L. and Babb, J., 2012. *Empirical political analysis*. Pearson Higher Ed, **Chapter 5**.

### Theoretical readings (required):

- Gerring, J., 2012. Social science methodology: A unified framework. Cambridge University Press. **Chapter 4**.
- King, G., Keohane, R.O. and Verba, S., 1994. *Designing social inquiry: Scientific inference in qualitative research*. Princeton university press, '**Rule 1: Construct Falsifiable Theories**', pp. 100-105.
- Popper, K. 1963 Science as Falsification. In: Conjectures and Refutation. pp. 33-39.  
URL: <http://staff.washington.edu/lynnhank/Popper-1.pdf>
- Wilkinson, M., 2013. Testing the null hypothesis: The forgotten legacy of Karl Popper?. *Journal of sports sciences*, 31(9), pp. 919-920.  
URL: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23249368>

### Theoretical readings (optional):

- Fearon, J.D., 1991. Counterfactuals and hypothesis testing in political science. *World Politics*, 43(02), pp.169-195.  
URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2010470>

### Research examples (required):

- Mutz, D.C., 2008. Is deliberative democracy a falsifiable theory?. *Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci.*, 11, pp. 521-538.  
URL: <http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev.polisci.11.081306.070308>
- Collier, P. and Hoeffler, A., 2004. Greed and grievance in civil war. *Oxford economic papers*, 56(4), pp. 563-595.  
URL: <http://oep.oxfordjournals.org/content/56/4/563.short>

### Real-world examples (optional):

- *The Economist* (19 October 2013) "How science goes wrong."  
URL: <http://www.economist.com/news/leaders/21588069-scientific-research-has-changed-world-now-it-needs-change-itself-how-science-goes-wrong>
- Planet Money (15 January 2016) "The Experiment Experiment." [Podcast, 20:43]  
URL: <http://www.npr.org/sections/money/2016/01/15/463237871/episode-677-the-experiment-experiment>
- This American Life (8 April 2016) "Knock, Knock. Who's there? The Truth."  
[Podcast, 27:00]  
URL: <http://www.thisamericanlife.org/radio-archives/episode/584/for-your-reconsideration?act=1#play>

## Week 6. Case Studies and Case Selection

### Introductory readings (optional):

- Manheim, J.B., Rich, R.C., Willnat, L., Brians, C.L. and Babb, J., 2012. *Empirical political analysis*. Pearson Higher Ed, **Chapters 7 and 13**.

### Theoretical readings (required):

- King, G., Keohane, R.O. and Verba, S., 1994. *Designing social inquiry: Scientific inference in qualitative research*. Princeton university press, **Chapter 4**.
- Gerring, J., 2004. What is a case study and what is it good for? *American political science review*, 98(02), **pp. 341-354**.  
URL: [http://www.journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_50003055404001182](http://www.journals.cambridge.org/abstract_50003055404001182)
- Seawright, J. and Gerring, J., 2008. Case selection techniques in case study research a menu of qualitative and quantitative options. *Political Research Quarterly*, 61(2), **pp. 294-308**.  
URL: <http://prq.sagepub.com/cgi/doi/10.1177/1065912907313077>

### Theoretical readings (optional):

- Coppedge, M., Lieberman, E.S., Mahoney, J., Smith, R.M., Gerring, J., 2007. Symposium: John Gerring, Case Study Research: Principles and Practices. Qualitative Methods: Newsletter of the APSA Organized Section for Qualitative and Multi-Method Research 5(2), **pp. 2-15**.  
URL: <http://www1.maxwell.syr.edu/uploadedFiles/moynihan/cqrm/Newsletter5.2.pdf>

### Research examples (required):

- Lijphart, A., 1996. The puzzle of Indian democracy: A consociational interpretation. *American Political Science Review*, **pp. 258-268**.  
URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2082883>
- Posner, D.N., 2004. The political salience of cultural difference: Why Chewas and Tumbukas are allies in Zambia and adversaries in Malawi. *American Political Science Review*, 98(04), **pp. 529-545**.  
URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0003055404041334>

## Week 8. Mixed Methods Design

### Theoretical readings (required):

- Gerring, J., 2007. Case study research: Principles and practices. Cambridge University Press. **Chapter 7**.
- Lieberman, E.S., 2005. Nested analysis as a mixed-method strategy for comparative research. *American Political Science Review*, 99(03), **pp. 435-452**.  
URL: <http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract/S0003055405051762>
- Collier, D., 2011. Understanding process tracing. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 44(04), **pp. 823-830**.  
URL: <http://www.journals.cambridge.org/abstract/S1049096511001429>

### Theoretical readings (optional):

- Hall, P.A., 2006. Systematic process analysis: when and how to use it. *European Management Review*, 3(1), **pp. 24-31**.  
URL: <http://www.palgrave-journals.com/doi/10.1057/palgrave.epr.2210130>

### Research examples (required):

- Miguel, E., 2004. Tribe or nation? Nation building and public goods in Kenya versus Tanzania. *World Politics*, 56(03), **pp. 328-362**.  
URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0043887100004330>
- Weaver, V.M., 2007. Frontlash: Race and the development of punitive crime policy. *Studies in American political development*, 21(02), **pp. 230-265**.  
URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0898588X07000211>

## Week 9. Operationalization and Measurement

### Introductory readings (optional):

- Manheim, J.B., Rich, R.C., Willnat, L., Brians, C.L. and Babb, J., 2012. *Empirical political analysis*. Pearson Higher Ed, **Chapters 4, 10 and 11**.
- Shively, W.P., 2016. *The craft of political research*. Routledge, **Chapters 4-5**.

### Theoretical readings (required):

- Gerring, J., 2012. Social science methodology: A unified framework. Cambridge University Press. **Chapter 7**.
- Adcock, R. and Collier, D. 2001. Measurement validity: A shared standard for qualitative and quantitative research. *American Political Science Association* 95(3), **pp. 529-546**.  
URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0003055401003100>
- Collier, D. and Levitsky, S., 1997. Democracy with adjectives: Conceptual innovation in comparative research. *World politics*, 49(03), **pp. 430-451**.  
URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/wp.1997.0009>

### Research examples (required):

- Paxton, P., 2000. Women's suffrage in the measurement of democracy: Problems of operationalization. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 35(3), **pp. 92-111**.  
URL: <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF02699767>
- Bollen, K., 1993. Liberal democracy: Validity and method factors in cross-national measures. *American Journal of Political Science*, **pp.1207-1230**.  
URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2111550>

### Audiovisual (optional):

- Lasswell, Harold (1946) "Despotism." [9:56]

## Week 10. Methods of Data Collection

### Introductory readings (optional):

- Manheim, J.B., Rich, R.C., Willnat, L., Brians, C.L. and Babb, J., 2012. *Empirical political analysis*. Pearson Higher Ed, **Chapters 8, 12, 19 and 21**.

### Theoretical readings (required):

- Lilleker, D.G., 2003. Interviewing the political elite: Navigating a potential minefield. *Politics*, 23(3), **pp. 207-214**.  
URL: <http://pol.sagepub.com/content/23/3/207.short>
- Aberbach, J.D. and Rockman, B.A., 2002. Conducting and coding elite interviews. *Political Science & Politics*, 35(04), **pp. 673-676**.  
URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1049096502001142>
- Neuendorf, K.A., 2011. Content analysis—A methodological primer for gender research. *Sex Roles*, 64(3-4), **pp. 276-289**.  
URL: <http://link.springer.com.elib.tcd.ie/article/10.1007/s11199-010-9893-0>

### Theoretical readings (optional):

- Miller, A.H., Hesli, V.L. and Reisinger, W.M., 1995. Comparing citizen and elite belief systems in post-Soviet Russia and Ukraine. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 59(1), **pp. 1-40**.  
URL: <http://poq.oxfordjournals.org/content/59/1/1.short>
- Grimmer, J. and Stewart, B.M., 2013. Text as data: The promise and pitfalls of automatic content analysis methods for political texts. *Political Analysis*, **pp. 1-31**.  
URL: <http://pan.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2013/01/21/pan.mps028.short>
- Lucas, C., Nielsen, R.A., Roberts, M.E., Stewart, B.M., Storer, A. and Tingley, D., 2015. Computer-assisted text analysis for comparative politics. *Political Analysis*, **pp. 1-21**.  
URL: <http://pan.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2015/02/04/pan.mpu019.short>

### Research examples (required):

- Fenno, R.F., 1977. US House members in their constituencies: An exploration. *American Political Science Review*, 71(03), **pp. 883-917**.  
URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0003055400265143>
- Mattes, R. and Bratton, M., 2007. Learning about democracy in Africa: Awareness, performance, and experience. *American Journal of Political Science*, 51(1), pp.192-217.  
URL: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1540-5907.2007.00245.x/full>
- King, G., Pan, J. and Roberts, M.E., 2013. How censorship in China allows government criticism but silences collective expression. *American Political Science Review*, 107(02), **pp. 326-343**.  
URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0003055413000014>

## Week 11. Bias in Measurement and Research

### Introductory readings (optional):

- Manheim, J.B., Rich, R.C., Willnat, L., Brians, C.L. and Babb, J., 2012. *Empirical political analysis*. Pearson Higher Ed, **Chapter 4**.

### Theoretical readings (required):

- King, G., Keohane, R.O. and Verba, S., 1994. *Designing social inquiry: Scientific inference in qualitative research*. Princeton university press, **Chapters 5 and 6**.
- Geddes, B., 1990. How the cases you choose affect the answers you get: Selection bias in comparative politics. *Political analysis*, 2(1), **pp.131-150**.  
URL: <http://pan.oxfordjournals.org.elib.tcd.ie/content/2/1/131.short>
- Lustick, I.S., 1996. History, historiography, and political science: Multiple historical records and the problem of selection bias. *American Political Science Review*, 90(03), **pp. 605-618**.  
URL: <http://dx.doi.org.elib.tcd.ie/10.2307/2082612>

### Research examples (required):

- Lieshout, R.H., Segers, M.L. and van der Vleuten, A.M., 2004. de Gaulle, Moravcsik, and The Choice for Europe: soft sources, weak evidence. *Journal of Cold War Studies*, 6(4), **pp.89-139**.  
URL: <http://www.mitpressjournals.org.elib.tcd.ie/doi/abs/10.1162/1520397042350900.V-BxgHUrL0o>
- Prosser, J., Mellon, C., 2015. Why did the polls go wrong?  
URL: <http://www.britishelectionstudy.com/bes-resources/why-did-the-polls-go-wrong-by-jon-mellon-and-chris-prosser/.V-BxpXUrL0o>

## Week 12. Writing the Research Proposal

### Introductory readings (optional):

- Manheim, J.B., Rich, R.C., Willnat, L., Brians, C.L. and Babb, J., 2012. *Empirical political analysis*. Pearson Higher Ed, **Chapter 24**.

### Theoretical readings (required):

- APSA Committee on Publications, 2006. Style Manual for Political Science.  
URL: <http://www.apsanet.org/Portals/54/APSA%20Files/publications/APSAStyleManual2006.pdf>
- King, G., 1995. Replication, replication. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 28(03), **pp. 444-452**.  
URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/420301>