

Seminar PO8046  
MSc Research Design A  
Michaelmas Term 2021  
Wednesdays 12:00–14:00  
Room: 4050B Arts Building

Lecturer: Dr. Jan Berz  
Email: [berzj@tcd.ie](mailto:berzj@tcd.ie)

Office hours: Tuesday 14:00 – 15:30 (F2F or Zoom), please send an email to schedule a slot

Office: 1.C, 1 College Green  
Department of Political Science  
Trinity College Dublin

September 26, 2021

## 1 Module Content

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. Moreover, students will engage with problems of causal inference and multiple methodological approaches (statistical analysis, process tracing, case studies) to the empirical study of politics. The emphasis of the module will be on the development of novel, falsifiable, and empirically testable explanations of political phenomena.

## 2 Covid-19 procedures

We envision face to face (f2f) teaching for the complete but all students should be aware and prepared that teaching conditions could change on short notice if infections rise and government regulations changes. Teaching will be dynamically adapted if several of us are unable to attend due to Covid-related self-isolation and I will seek to accommodate the continued exposure to the lecture material for any self-isolating student.

Please do not attend any f2f class if you have Covid-19 related symptoms. All participants must follow government and Trinity guidelines when attending a f2f session, which means social distancing, and wearing a face-mask!

If I have to isolate myself our weekly sessions will naturally move online – you will be notified by email. Office hours will predominantly take place on Zoom. Please schedule a separate appointment if there is an issue which you would rather discuss f2f.

### 3 Module Requirements and Policies

The overall grade will be based on:

- Participation, counting 10%
- Academic Peer-Review Report, counting 22.5%
- Research Proposal consisting of:
  - Research question, counting 5%
  - Project outline, counting 22.5%
  - Final research design, counting 40%

#### 3.1 Written Assignment Guidelines

Please make sure you are aware of the Turnitin submission arrangements via Blackboard at least several days prior to the deadline for each assignment. All submission deadlines are naturally in Irish time. All late work, unless excused in advance by the course lecturer will be penalized at a rate of 5 marks per day (up to a maximum of 30 marks). All requests for excuses from submission penalties, whether justified by a medical certificate, a LENS report, or other reason, must be submitted in advance of the deadline to the course instructor. Where any assignment is submitted after the deadline to Turnitin for any reason, the student must also email me at [berzj@tcd.ie](mailto:berzj@tcd.ie) to inform me it has been submitted. All coursework needs to be submitted via the plagiarism detector Turnitin, now integrated into the course's Blackboard account.

The Assignment Submission Form available from the Departmental website ([https://www.tcd.ie/Political\\_Science/assets/word/Plagiarism%20cover%20sheet.docx](https://www.tcd.ie/Political_Science/assets/word/Plagiarism%20cover%20sheet.docx)) should be filled out and included as the first page of all your submissions.

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).

Under no circumstances will written work be accepted after the set work has been marked and returned to other students, or after the end of the term. Requests for special consideration advanced at a later stage will not be accepted. Essays may, of course, be handed in earlier than the due date. All material will be marked by the lecturer. Turnitin assignments should be clearly marked with the student's name.

#### 3.2 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.

### **3.3 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 working papers. You will be able to choose between six papers, most from the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, which have been selected by the lecturer. The papers can be found on Blackboard. Guidelines on how to produce an effective peer-review report can also be found on Blackboard.

The required length of the peer-review report is between 1,000-1,500 words (including reference list, footnotes, and title page). The report should be submitted by 6pm on Friday, 19 November 2021 via Turnitin in Blackboard. Late submissions will not be accepted.

### **3.4 Research Proposal (5% + 22.5% + 40%)**

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 (including a discussion of the causal logic – i.e. the different steps – that links the independent variable to the dependent variables) and significance of research. Submission is due by 6pm on Friday, 8 October 2021, via Turnitin in Blackboard. The paper should not exceed 800 words. The research question counts as 5% of your final grade.

2. Project outline: outline/summary of project including a more refined discussion of your research question, an indication of your causal explanatory variable (including a discussion of the causal logic that links your independent and dependent variables), 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 is due at 6pm on Friday, 5 November 2021. The length of the project outline should be between 1250-1750 words (including reference list, footnotes, and title page).
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 40% towards your overall grade. The final research design paper is due at 6pm on Friday, 10 December 2021. 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.

#### **4 Plagiarism**

Students are reminded that plagiarism is unacceptable in any circumstances and both the Department and College takes all plagiarism cases very seriously. Offenders will be referred to tutors and plagiarized essays may be given a zero mark or penalized in other ways. Students are strongly recommended not to look at all at any previous essays on similar topics written by students at Trinity or other universities, as the likelihood of incurring plagiarism penalties becomes high.

#### **5 Course Readings**

Each week we will have a few selected mandatory readings/media (number of which vary depending on length and difficulty) that all of us are required to prepare diligently. In addition, the syllabus provides a number of readings marked as optional which are not required but highly recommended. You will be able to find all required readings in the Blackboard module of the course. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any issues accessing optional material through TCD Library.

#### **6 Syllabus Modification**

Please note that I reserve the option to reasonably alter the elements of the syllabus at any time. Most likely this will mean the addition of new media or an additional reading, but can also entail the exchange of a required with an additional reading to match the focus of our in-class discussions.

## General Readings

King, G., Keohane, R.O. and Verba, S., 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton University Press. *This book is also available online through TCD Library.*

Gerring, J., 2012. *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework*. Cambridge University Press.

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

Kellstedt, P. M. and Whitten, G. D., 2018. *The Fundamentals of Political Science Research*. 3rd edition, New York: Cambridge University Press.

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.

## 7 Course Outline

Week 1. Can we study politics scientifically?

Week 2. Concept Formation, Theory Development & Hypothesis Testing

Week 3. The Logic of Statistical Analysis

Week 4. Challenges of Causal Inference & Directed Acyclic Graphs

8. October 2021: Research question paper due, 6 PM

Week 5. Causal Mechanisms & Process Tracing

Week 6. Case Studies & Case Selection

Week 7. Study/Review Week

5. November 2021: Project outline due, 6 PM

Week 8. The Nuts-and-Bolts of Process Tracing & Mixed Methods Design

Week 9. Operationalization and Measurement

Week 10. Methods of Data Collection

19. November 2021 Academic peer-review report due, 6 PM

Week 11. Bias in Measurement and Research

Week 12. Writing the Research Proposal

10. December 2021: Final research design proposal due, 6 PM

## Detailed Schedule

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

#### 15. September

##### 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. (you can skim this article)

##### Audio & Video (optional):

Feynman, Richard (1964) "On the Scientific Method." [9:59], available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EYPapE-3FRw>

##### Tool suggestion:

Connected Papers – <https://www.connectedpapers.com/>

### Week 2. Concept Formation, Theory Development & Hypothesis Testing

#### 22. September

##### 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 and chapter 2.

Shively, W.P., 2016. The craft of political research. Routledge, Chapter 11.

##### 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, pp. 100-107 (Rules 1 and 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>

Gerring, J., 2012. *Social science methodology: A unified framework*. Cambridge University Press. Chapter 3.

**Theoretical readings (optional):**

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

Okasha, S., 2002. *Scientific reasoning*. In: *Philosophy of science: A very short introduction* (Vol. 67). Oxford Paperbacks. Chapter 2.

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):**

Putnam, Robert D., Leonardi, R., and Nanetti, R., 1993. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, p. 8-9.

Downs, A., 1957. "An economic theory of political action in a democracy." *The Journal of Political Economy*, pp. 135-150.

**Audio & Video (optional):**

In Our Time BBC 4 (2007) "Karl Popper" [42:09], available at:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qWRWMD5QGs>

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 3. The Logic of Statistical Analysis**

### **29. September**

**Theoretical readings (required):**

King, G., Keohane, R.O. and Verba, S., 1994. *Designing social inquiry: Scientific inference in qualitative research*. Princeton university press, sections 2.6 and 2.7 (you can skim the rest of chapter 2).

Kellstedt, P. M. and Whitten, G. D., 2013. *The Fundamentals of Political Science Research*. 2 nd edition, New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 7-15, 171-178, 202-206, 214-216.

Sykes, Alan. O., 1993. "An Introduction to Regression Analysis," University of Chicago Law School, Working Paper in Law and Economics No. 20.

**Theoretical readings (optional):**

Kellstedt, P. M. and Whitten, G. D., 2013. *The Fundamentals of Political Science Research*. 2nd edition, New York: Cambridge University Press, chapters 8 and 9.

**Research examples (required):**

Colaresi, Michael, and William R. Thompson, 2003. "The Economic Development-Democratization Relationship: Does the Outside World Matter?" *Comparative Political Studies* 36, no. 4: 381-403.

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>

**Week 4. Challenges of Causal Inference & Directed Acyclic Graphs (DAGs)**

**6. October**

**Introductory readings (optional):**

Manheim, J.B., Rich, R.C., Willnat, L., Briens, 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.

Cunningham, S., 2021. *Causal Inference: The Mixtape*. Yale University Press. Read Sections 1.2 & 1.3: <https://mixtape.scunning.com/introduction.html#what-is-causal-inference>

**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>

Cunningham, S., 2021. *Causal Inference: The Mixtape*. Yale University Press: Read pages: 118–135 (Also available online [though you'll miss the Jay-Z quote]: <https://mixtape.scunning.com/dag.html>)

**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>

**Real-world examples, Audio & Video (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>

**Theoretical readings (optional):**

Keele, L., Stevenson, R. T., & Elwert, F. (2020). The causal interpretation of estimated associations in regression models. *Political Science Research and Methods*, 8(1), 1-13.

Blackwell, M. (2013). A framework for dynamic causal inference in political



science. *American Journal of Political Science*, 57(2), 504-520.

Titunik, R., 2015. "Can big data solve the fundamental problem of causal inference?" *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 48(01), pp. 75-79.

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.

Humphreys, M. and Weinstein, J.M., 2009. "Field experiments and the political economy of development." *Annual Review of Political Science*, 12, pp. 367-378.

#### Research examples (optional):

Owen, John M. 1994. "How Liberalism Produces Democratic Peace." *International Security* 19 (2):87-125. (a good example for process tracing)

Snyder, Jack, and Erica D. Borghard. "The Cost of Empty Threats: A Penny, Not a Pound." *American Political Science Review* 105 (03):437-56. (process tracing)

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.

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>

## **Week 5. Causal Mechanisms & Process Tracing**

### **13. October**

#### 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):

Hall, P.A., 2006. "Systematic process analysis: when and how to use it." *European Management Review*, 3(1), pp. 24-31.

Gerring, J., 2007. *Case study research: Principles and practices*. Cambridge University Press. Chapter 7.

Collier, David, Henry E. Brady, and Jason Seawright. "Toward an Alternative View of Methodology: Sources of Leverage in Causal Inference." in *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*, edited by Henry E. Brady and David Collier, pages 244-266 only.

Collier, D., 2011. "Understanding process tracing." *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 44(04), pp. 823-830.

#### Theoretical readings (optional):

Mahoney, J. (2015). "Process tracing and historical explanation." *Security Studies*, 24(2), 200-218.

Hall, Peter A. 2003. "Aligning Ontology and Methodology in Comparative Politics." Pp. 373-404 in *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*,

edited by James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer. New York: Cambridge University Press.

**Research examples (required):**

McKeown, Timothy J. 1983. "Hegemonic Stability Theory and 19th Century Tariff Levels in Europe." *International Organization* 37:73-91. (an example of process tracing; see next week)

Weaver, V.M., 2007. "Frontlash: Race and the development of punitive crime policy." *Studies in American political development*, 21(02), pp. 230-265.

**Week 6. Case Studies and Case Selection**

**20. October**

**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.

**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.

**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. The Nuts-and-Bolts of Process Tracing & Mixed Methods Design**

**3. November**

**Theoretical readings (required):**

Bennett, Andrew. 2010. "Process Tracing and Causal Inference." In *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*, 2nd ed., ed. Brady, Henry E.

and Collier, David, 207–19. Lanham, MD. Rowman and Littlefield. Available at: [http://philsci-archive.pitt.edu/8872/1/Bennett\\_Chapter.pdf](http://philsci-archive.pitt.edu/8872/1/Bennett_Chapter.pdf)

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/abstractS0003055405051762>

**Research examples (required):**

Jacobs, Alan M. 2009. "How Do Ideas Matter? Mental Models and Attention in German Pension Politics." *Comparative Political Studies* 42 (2):252-79.

Miguel, E., 2004. "Tribe or nation? Nation building and public goods in Kenya versus Tanzania." *World Politics*, 56(03), pp. 328-362.

**Theoretical readings (optional):**

Brady, Henry E. 2010. "Data-Set Observations versus Causal-Process Observations: The 2000 U.S. Presidential Election." In Henry E. Brady and David Collier, eds., *Rethinking Social Inquiry*, 2nd ed. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

## **Week 9. Operationalization and Measurement**

### **10. November**

**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 Review* 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.

**Research examples (required):**

Putnam, Robert D., Leonardi, R., and Nanetti, R., 1993. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, Chapter 3.

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], available at:  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tIwXdOvEPXE>

## **Week 10. Methods of Data Collection**

### **17. November**

#### 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.

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.

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.

#### 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**

### **24. November**

#### 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.

King, G., Keohane, R.O. and Verba, S., 1994. *Designing social inquiry: Scientific inference in qualitative research*. Princeton university press, section 5.1.

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>

Dunning, T. 2012. *Natural experiments in the social sciences: a design-based approach*. Cambridge University Press pp. 1-15.

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>

Cunningham, S., 2021. *Causal Inference: The Mixtape*. Princeton University Press. Read Chapters 6, 7 & 9: <https://mixtape.scunning.com/index.html>

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", available at: <http://theconversation.com/the-reinhart-rogo-off-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](http://www.slate.com/articles/news-_and_politics/politics/2017/01)

Prosser, J., Mellon, C., 2015. "Why did the polls go wrong?" URL: <https://www.britishelectionstudy.com/bes-resources/why-did-the-polls-go-wrong>

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**

### **1. December**

#### 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, 2018. Style Manual for Political Science.

URL: <https://mk0apsaconnectbvy6p6.kinstacdn.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/43/2018/11/Style-Manual-for-Political-Science-2018.pdf>

King, G., 1995. "Replication, replication." PS: Political Science & Politics, 28(03), pp. 444-452. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/420301>