

PO8047: Research Design (M.Sc.)  
Michaelmas Term 2019  
TRISS Seminar Room, Wednesday 09:00–11:00

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 Academic Peer-Review Report (22.5%)

For a scientific study to be published in a peer-reviewed journal, it must pass the scrutiny of anonymous expert reviewers. These reviewers are tasked with closely reading the paper, providing a thorough assessment of the quality and impact of the research, and offering to the journal editor a recommendation on publication (1. accept; 2. revise & resubmit; 3. reject).

Students will be required to submit a peer-review report of a recent political science conference paper. You will choose to review one paper out of a set of five conference papers which have been selected by the lecturer. These papers can be found in the module Dropbox directory. Guidelines on how to produce an effective peer-review report can also be found in the folder.

The required length of the peer-review report is between 1,000-1,500 words. The report should be submitted by **6pm on Friday, 22 November 2019** via **turnitin** on **Blackboard**. Late submissions will not be accepted.

### 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, 4 October 2018**, via **turnitin** on Blackboard. The paper should not exceed 800 words.
  - After the you have submitted your research question paper, you will be required to provide peer comments to two (2) papers via **turnitin**. You will be 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 fulfill this part of the assignment between **5-8th October 2018**. Peer review comments should be at least 300 words.
  - The research question paper will count **5%** towards your overall grade.
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 Friday, 1 November 2019**. 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, 13 December 2019**. The length of the paper should be between 2,750 and 3,500 words (including footnotes, references 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** which is embedded in the **Blackboard** site of our module.
- 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. Most readings and other relevant materials are available in the module Dropbox folder found at <https://goo.gl/dsCtoC>.

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
Week 2	Descriptive Inference & Concept Formation	p. 5
Week 3	Theory Development	p. 6
Week 4	Causal Inference & Causal Mechanisms	p. 7
4/10/19	<i>Research question paper due, 6 PM</i>	
5-8/10/19	<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>	
1/11/19	<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
22/11/18	<i>Academic peer-review report due, 6 PM</i>	
Week 12	Writing the Research Proposal	p. 14
13/12/19	<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>
- 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.” [9:59]

## 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):

- Putnam, R. D., Leonardi, R., & Nanetti, R. Y. (1994). Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy. Princeton university press. **Chapter 4**

### **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):

- De Mesquita, B. B., Smith, A., Morrow, J. D., Siverson, R. M. (2005). The logic of political survival. MIT press. **Chapters 1-2**

#### Research examples (optional):

- 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\\_13oct05.pdf](http://www.stat.columbia.edu/gelman/research/unpublished/reversecausal_13oct05.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>

### Research examples (optional):

- 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):

- Ionica Smeets (2012) “The danger of mixing up causality and correlation” [5:56]  
URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8B271L3NtAw>
- Stephen Dubner and Steven Levitt (2011) “Correlation vs. Causality” [3:22]  
URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t8ADnyw5ou8>



## 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):

- Popper, K. 1963 Science as Falsification. In: *Conjectures and Refutation*. pp. **33-39**.  
URL: <http://staff.washington.edu/lynnhank/Popper-1.pdf>
- 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**.
- Gerring, J., 2012. *Social science methodology: A unified framework*. Cambridge University Press. **Chapter 4**.

### 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>
- 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>
- *The Guardian* (18 August 2012) "Thomas Kuhn: the man who changed the way the world looked at science."  
URL: <https://www.theguardian.com/science/2012/aug/19/thomas-kuhn-structure-scientific-revolutions>

### Research examples (required):

- 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>

### Audiovisual (optional):

- *In Our Time* BBC 4 (2007) "Karl Popper" [42:17]
- This American Life (8 April 2016) "Knock, Knock. Who's there? The Truth." [Podcast, 27:00]  
URL: <https://www.thisamericanlife.org/584/for-your-reconsideration/act-one>

## 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):

- 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\\_S0003055404001182](http://www.journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0003055404001182)
- 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):

- King, G., Keohane, R.O. and Verba, S., 1994. *Designing social inquiry: Scientific inference in qualitative research*. Princeton university press, **Chapter 4**.
- 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):

- 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.emr.2210130>
- Mahoney, J. (2015). Process tracing and historical explanation. *Security Studies*, 24(2), 200-218.  
URL: <https://sci-hub.tw/10.1080/09636412.2015.1036610>

### 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):

- McHenry Jr, D. E. (2000). Quantitative measures of democracy in Africa: an assessment. *Democratization*, 7(2), 168-185.  
URL: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13510340008403664>
- 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>
- 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):

- 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>
- Nuzzo, R. (2015). How scientists fool themselves—and how they can stop. *Nature News*, 526(7572), 182.  
URL: <https://www.nature.com/news/how-scientists-fool-themselves-and-how-they-can-stop-1.18517>

### Theoretical readings (optional):

- King, G., Keohane, R.O. and Verba, S., 1994. *Designing social inquiry: Scientific inference in qualitative research*. Princeton university press, **Chapters 5 and 6**.
- Loken, E., & Gelman, A. (2017). Measurement error and the replication crisis. *Science*, 355(6325), 584-585.  
URL: <http://science.sciencemag.org/content/355/6325/584.summary>

### Research examples (required):

- Lazer, D., Kennedy, R., King, G., Vespignani, A. (2014). The parable of Google Flu: traps in big data analysis. *Science*, 343(6176), 1203-1205.  
URL: <http://science.sciencemag.org/content/343/6176/1203>
- *The Conversation* (22 April 2013) “The Reinhart-Rogoff error – or how not to Excel at economics”  
<http://theconversation.com/the-reinhart-rogooff-error-or-how-not-to-excel-at-economics-13646>
- Gelman, A. (4 January 2017) “The Bad Research Behind the Bogus Claim That North Carolina Is No Longer a Democracy” *Slate*  
URL: [http://www.slate.com/articles/news\\_and\\_politics/politics/2017/01/the\\_bogus\\_claim\\_that\\_north\\_carolina\\_is\\_no\\_longer\\_a\\_democracy.html](http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/politics/2017/01/the_bogus_claim_that_north_carolina_is_no_longer_a_democracy.html)
- *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>
- 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>

### Audiovisual (optional):

- 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>

## 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>