

MSC RESEARCH DESIGN B

POU 8047

Fall 2021

 : Jeffrey Ziegler, PhD	 : Wednesdays 9:00 - 11:00
 : www.jeffreyziegler.org	 : Arts 2043
 : zieglerj@tcd.ie	 : Course website

1. Description

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. Office Hours

I will hold office hours for individual 15-min meetings, please [sign up!](#) If you cannot attend regular office hours, please contact me via email.

3. Requirements

- *Readings and Participation:* The value of this course depends on students' participation, and a precondition for participation is presence and preparation, i.e., students are expected to have done all mandatory readings and completed any assignments.

The best learning environment—whether in the online classroom, laboratory, or work place—is one in which all members feel respected while being productively challenged. The course is dedicated to fostering an inclusive atmosphere, in which all participants can contribute, explore, and challenge their own ideas as well as those of others. All interactions in class will be civil, respectful, and supportive of an inclusive learning environment for all students. These rules are reciprocal, i.e, students are also expected to interact with instructors in a civil and respectful manner. Students are encouraged to speak to the instructor about any concerns they may have about classroom participation and classroom dynamics. Every participant has an active responsibility to foster a climate of intellectual stimulation, openness, and respect for diverse perspectives, questions, personal backgrounds, abilities, and experiences.

As a part of being an active participant, you will be asked to lead our weekly discussions on a rotating basis and to assume the responsibility of bringing a number of questions for discussion. 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. Your performance in class will constitute 10% of your grade.

The discussion leader should provide a short overview of the readings and leading the discussion on the required, and often optional, readings. The discussant should prepare a list of discussion questions and submit these no later than 08:00 Tuesday morning before class so the entire class has 24 hours to prepare.

The discussion questions should focus on issues like:

- Research question and motivation
- Theory (Is the argument clear and internally consistent? Is the author considering alternatives? Could you apply a different argument to explain the same set of results? What are some other observable implications from the theory that could be tested?)
- Research design (Is the design appropriate for testing the argument? Is case selection justified? Are scope conditions specified?)
- Conceptualization and measurement
- Methods
- New research ideas that the piece generated

This is the list of issues that I would like to be covered in most discussions. But, please also express any other ideas/questions/comments/agreements/disagreement etc. that you may have!

- *Academic Peer-Review Report*: 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 paper. You will review a paper which has been selected by the lecturer. The paper and guidelines on how to produce an effective peer-review report can be found on the course website.

The required length of the peer-review report is between 1,000-1,500 words. The report should be submitted by class on November 24 via Blackboard.

- *Research Proposal*:

The main course objective is to submit a research proposal at the end of 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:

- (a) 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 class on October 6, via Blackboard. The paper should not exceed 800 words. The research question counts as 5% of your final grade.

- (b) **Project outline:** The 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 by class on November 10. The length of the project outline should be between 1250-1750 words (including reference list, footnotes, and title page).
- (c) **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 by 9:00am December 8. 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.

- *Final grade:* The final grade is a weighted average of your participation (10%), academic peer-review (22.5%), and project proposal (67.5%).

4. **Readings:** This is a list of interesting and pertinent books that will be used during the course. You need to consult them occasionally, but you **do not need to purchase them**. I will provide the assigned readings in PDF format on the course website.

- Ashworth, S., Berry, C. R., and de Mesquita, E. B. (2021). *Theory and Credibility: Integrating Theoretical and Empirical Social Science*. Princeton University Press.
- Gerring, J. (2012). *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework*. Cambridge University Press.
- Huntington-Klein, N. (2021). *The Effect: An Introduction to Research Design and Causality*.
- Kellstedt, P. M. and Whitten, G. D. (2018). *The Fundamentals of Political Science Research*. 3rd edition, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- King, G., Keohane, R.O. and Verba, S. (1994). *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton 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.

5. **Class Materials, Structure, and Assignments**

- *Class materials:* All materials presented in class, and the readings used to prepare for this course, will be made available on the course website.
- *Class Structure:* This semester is unusual, clearly, in that there is still a pandemic. We are initially meeting in-person, but we may need to switch to meeting remotely. I want our class to thrive no matter how we meet or your individual methods of participating in class. I cannot guarantee an identical experience for each student, nor an experience that is identical to pre-pandemic semesters. But, my goal is that all students receive a high-quality experience to the extent possible, and that all students are treated equitably and consistently.

Due to the unusual nature of the semester, communication is important. I commit to responding to emails within 48 hours of receipt, and my intention is to respond faster than that most of the

time. I will likely be slower on weekends. Likewise, if your situation changes regarding health, housing, or in any other aspect with regard to your ability to participate in class, please contact me and the appropriate student support organization as soon as feasible. It is easier for me to address your needs if I know about them. This does not mean I can successfully respond to every request, but I want to emphasize that I aim for you succeed in life, not just this course.

This semester, due to the pandemic, some students might be sick or will need to go into isolation or quarantine. If you are sick, understand that I will be flexible. Please make sure to email me so that we can discuss your individual circumstances. Otherwise, it is expected that you prepare for class and participate in office hours. Attendance directly and indirectly impacts your final grade. If you do attend meetings, please arrive on time; we will start promptly. You can use this [link](#) to download the course calendar for Outlook or iCal.

The lectures will provide you with core concepts and theoretical foundations of research design in the social sciences. Lectures will be supported by a PowerPoint style presentation. Lectures will be synchronous when possible, and I will post a handout of the shortened, student version of the lecture on the course website, under the “Slides” tab. You may want to use this brief outline to follow the lecture and take additional notes.

All class sessions on Zoom will be recorded for students in the course to refer back. The content presented through video conferencing will be posted on the course website for the sole purpose of educating the students enrolled in the course. The release of such information (including but not limited to directly sharing, screen capturing, or recording content) is strictly prohibited, unless the instructor states otherwise. Doing so without the permission of the instructor will be considered an Honor Code violation.

Students who participate with their camera engaged or utilize a profile image are agreeing to have their video or image recorded. If you are unwilling to consent to have your profile or video image recorded, be sure to keep your camera off and do not use a profile image. Likewise, students who un-mute during class and participate orally are agreeing to have their voices recorded. Please read the [Rules of Zoom Engagement](#) for further advice on participating in our Zoom class sessions.

- *Absences, Late Work, and Appeals:* Late work will not be accepted without prior permission, and students who miss assignments will receive a score of 0 absent extraordinary circumstances. With that said, please consult me as soon as possible if there is an event that hinders your ability to participate in the class.

Appeals made on the validity of grading or assignment questions have to be made within five working days after publication of the results. The appeal has to be submitted with the original assignment. The appeal must explain in detail why an error has been made, and provide supporting evidence. If an assignment is re-graded due to a successful appeal, this may result in a better grade, a lower grade, or no grade change. Insufficient grounds for an appeal include: a student missed a lecture that covered relevant material, a student does not feel well but decided to complete the assignment anyway, a student did not understand the material, a student says that she/he wanted to give the correct answer but made a typographical error, a student would like additional consideration to receive a better letter grade.

- *Academic Integrity:* Cheating and plagiarism will not be tolerated. I strongly encourage you to review the College’s policies regarding academic honesty. In general, if you have any questions, please feel free to ask me.

6. Additional Information

- *Students with Disabilities:* Students with disabilities enrolled in this course who may need disability-related classroom accommodations are encouraged to make an appointment to speak with me within the first week of the semester. All conversations will remain confidential. If you have a disability-related need for reasonable academic adjustments in this course, you are required to provide the instructor with an accommodation notification letter from the [Office of Disabilities Services](#). If you need immediate accommodations or physical access, please arrange to meet with me as soon as your accommodations have been finalized.
- *Religious observances:* Some students may wish to take part in religious observances that occur during this semester. If you have a religious observance that conflicts with your participation in the course, please talk to me within the first week of the semester to discuss accommodations.
- *Physical Health:* Though we are all minimizing our contact with others, at the very first sign of not feeling well, stay at home and reach out for a health consultation. Please consult the [campus FAQ](#) for how to get a health consultation. If you live in Dublin, TCD [does testing](#), so please take the proper pre-cautions to keep yourself and others safe.
- *Mental Health:* This is a difficult time. Please reach out to me with any concern, and know that [Mental Health Services](#)' professional staff members work with students to resolve personal and interpersonal difficulties, many of which can affect the academic experience during even "normal times". These include conflicts with or worry about friends or family, concerns about eating or drinking patterns, and feelings of anxiety and depression. Your health is a critical part of your success in life, not just your coursework.

7. Reading and Assignment Schedule

The following is an anticipated schedule of course topics. The plan is to cover a new topic each week, but we will go as fast as needed to make sure that everyone is understanding the material. Check the course website to see what we will be covering in the upcoming lecture. We also have a Google Calendar that is posted on the course website with up-to-date information on problem sets, office hours, lectures, and assignments.

Module Outline

- Week 1: Can we study politics scientifically? Research Questions & Designs
- Week 2: What is a good research question? Concept Formation
- Week 3: Theory Development: Basic Concepts, Discussions and Axioms in the Philosophy of Science
- Week 4: Challenges of Causal Inference
- Week 5: Causal Mechanisms
- Week 6: Case Studies and Case Selection
- Week 7: Reading Week (no class)
- Week 8: The Nut and Bolts of Process Tracing & Mixed Methods Design
- Week 9: Operationalisation and Measurement
- Week 10: Methods of Data Collection
- Week 11: Bias in Measurement and Research
- Week 12: Writing the Research Proposal

Week	Topic	Assignments
1 (13/09)	<p>Can we study politics scientifically?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theoretical readings (required): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Chapter 1, KKV 1994. – Chapter 2, Gerring 2012. – Mahoney, J. and Goertz, G., (2006). “A tale of two cultures: Contrasting quantitative and qualitative research.” <i>Political analysis</i>, 14(3), 227-249. (skim this article) • Introductory readings (optional): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Chapter 1, MRWBB 2012. – Firebaugh, G., (2008). ”The first rule: There should be the possibility of surprise in social research.” In: <i>Seven Rules for Social Research</i>. Princeton University Press, 1-13 & “Is meaningful social science possible?” 26-29. • Audiovisual (optional): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Feynman, Richard (1964) “On the Scientific Method.” [length 9:59] 	
2 (20/09)	<p>Concept Formation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theoretical readings (required): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Popper, K., (1963). “Science as Falsification.” In: <i>Conjectures and Refutation</i>. 33-39. – 100-107 (Rules 1 and 2), KKV 1994. – Gerring, J., (1999). “What makes a concept good? A criterial framework for understanding concept formation in the social sciences.” <i>Polity</i>, 357-393. – Chapter 3, Gerring 2012. • Research examples (required): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Chapter 1, , Robert D., Leonardi, R., and Nanetti, R., (1993). <i>Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy</i>. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press. • Introductory readings (optional): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Chapter 2 and 75-79, MRWBB 2012. – Chapter 11, Shively 2016. • Theoretical readings (optional): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Goertz, G., (2006). <i>Social science concepts: A user’s guide</i>. Princeton University Press. Chapters 1-2. – The Guardian (18 August 2012) “Thomas Kuhn: the man who changed the way the world looked at science.” • Audiovisual (optional): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – This American Life (8 April 2016) “Knock, Knock. Who’s there? The Truth.” [Podcast, 27:00] 	
3 (27/09)	<p>Theory Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theoretical readings (required): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Sections 2.6 and 2.7 (skim the rest of chapter 2), KKV 1994. – p. 7-15, 171-178, 202-206, 214-216, KW 2013. – Sykes, Alan. O., (1993). “An Introduction to Regression Analysis,” University of Chicago Law School, Working Paper in Law and Economics No. 20. 	

4 (04/10)

Challenges of Causal Inference

Research question
paper due by Oct. 6

- 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), 563-595.
 - Theoretical readings (optional):
 - Chapters 8 and 9, KW 2013.
-
- Theoretical readings (**required**):
 - Chapter 3, KKV 1994.
 - McDermott, R., (2002). “**Experimental methods in political science.**” *Annual Review of Political Science*, 5(1), 31-61.
 - 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), p 653-663.
 - Introductory readings (optional):
 - Chapter 6, MRWBB 2012.
 - Chapter 6, Shively 2016.
 - Real-world examples (optional):
 - Ionica Smeets (2012) “**The danger of mixing up causality and correlation**” [5:56]
 - Stephen Dubner and Steven Levitt (2011) “**Correlation vs. Causality**” [3:22]
 - Theoretical readings (optional):
 - Titunik, R., (2015). “Can big data solve the fundamental problem of causal inference?” *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 48(01), 75-79.
 - Dunning, T. (2012). *Natural experiments in the social sciences: a design-based approach*. Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1-4.
 - 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), 765-789.
 - Humphreys, M. and Weinstein, J.M., (2009). “Field experiments and the political economy of development.” *Annual Review of Political Science*, 12, 367-378.
 - 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*, 26(10), 1531-1542.
 - 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), 295-298.
 - Hersh, E. D. (2013). Long-term effect of September 11 on the political behavior of victims’ families and neighbors. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(52), 20959-20963.

- Miguel, E., Satyanath, S., and Sergenti, E. (2004). Economic shocks and civil conflict: An instrumental variables approach. *Journal of political Economy*, 112(4), 725-753.
- Process Tracing:
 - * Owen, John M. (1994). "How Liberalism Produces Democratic Peace." *International Security* 19 (2):87-125.
 - * Snyder, Jack, and Erica D. Borghard, (2011). "The Cost of Empty Threats: A Penny, Not a Pound." *American Political Science Review* 105 (03):437-56.

5 (11/10)

Causal Mechanisms & Process Tracing

- Theoretical readings (**required**):
 - Hall, P.A., (2006). "Systematic process analysis: when and how to use it." *European Management Review*, 3(1), 24-31.
 - Collier, D., 2011. "Understanding process tracing." *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 44(04), 823-830.
- Research examples (**required**):
 - McKeown, Timothy J. (1983). "Hegemonic Stability Theory and 19th Century Tariff Levels in Europe." *International Organization* 37:73-91. next week)
 - Weaver, V.M., (2007). "Frontlash: Race and the development of punitive crime policy." *Studies in American political development*, 21(02), 230-265.
- Introductory readings (optional):
 - Chapter 5, MRWBB 2012.
- Theoretical readings (optional):
 - Gerring, J., (2007). *Case study research: Principles and practices*. Cambridge University Press. Chapter 7.
 - Collier, David, and Henry E. Brady (2004). "Toward an Alternative View of Methodology: Sources of Leverage in Causal Inference." in, edited by Henry E. Brady and David Collier, pages 244- 266 only.
 - 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." In *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*, edited by James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer. New York: Cambridge University Press. 373-404.

6 (18/10)

Case Studies & Case Selection

- Theoretical readings (**required**):
 - Gerring, J., (2004). "What is a case study and what is it good for?" *American political science review*, 98(02), 341-354.
 - 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), 294-308.
- 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), 529-545.
- Introductory readings (optional):
 - Chapters 7 and 13, MRWBB 2012.
- Theoretical readings (optional):
 - Chapter 4, KKV 1994.
 - 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), 2-15.

7 (25/10)	Rest Week
8 (01/11)	<p>The Nuts-and-Bolts of Process Tracing & Mixed Methods Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theoretical readings (required): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Bennett, Andrew. (2010). “Process Tracing and Causal Inference.” In <i>Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards</i>, 2nd ed., ed. Brady, Henry E. and Collier, David, 207–19. Lanham, MD. Rowman and Littlefield. – Lieberman, E.S., (2005). “Nested analysis as a mixed-method strategy for comparative research.” <i>American Political Science Review</i>, 99(03), 435-452. • Research examples (required): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Miguel, E., (2004). “Tribe or nation? Nation building and public goods in Kenya versus Tanzania.” <i>World Politics</i>, 56(03), 328-362. • Theoretical readings (optional): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 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., <i>Rethinking Social Inquiry</i>, 2nd ed. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield. • Research examples (optional): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Jacobs, Alan M. (2009). ”How Do Ideas Matter? Mental Models and Attention in German Pension Politics.” <i>Comparative Political Studies</i> 42 (2):252-79.
9 (08/11)	<p>Operationalisation and Measurement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theoretical readings (required): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Chapter 7, Gerring 2012. – Adcock, R. and Collier, D. (2001). “Measurement validity: A shared standard for qualitative and quantitative research.” <i>American Political Science Review</i> 95(3), 529- 546. • Research examples (required): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – McHenry Jr, D. E. (2000). “Quantitative measures of democracy in Africa: an assessment.” <i>Democratization</i>, 7(2), 168-185. – Bollen, K., (1993). “Liberal democracy: Validity and method factors in cross-national measures.” <i>American Journal of Political Science</i>, 1207-1230. • Introductory readings (optional): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Chapters 4, 10-11, MRWBB 2012. – Chapters 4-5, Shively 2016. • Theoretical readings (optional): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Collier, D. and Levitsky, S., 1997. “Democracy with adjectives: Conceptual innovation in comparative research.” <i>World politics</i>, 49(03), 430-451. • Research examples (optional): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Chapter 3, Putnam, Robert D., Leonardi, R., and Nanetti, R., (1993). <i>Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy</i>. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press. • Audiovisual (optional): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Lasswell, Harold. 1946. “Despotism.” [9:56].
10 (15/11)	Methods of Data Collection

Project outline due by Nov. 10

- Theoretical readings (**required**):
 - Aberbach, J.D. and Rockman, B.A., (2002). “Conducting and coding elite interviews.” *Political Science & Politics*, 35(04), 673-676.
 - Neuendorf, K.A., (2011). “Content analysis. A methodological primer for gender research.” *Sex Roles*, 64(3-4), 276-289.
- Research examples (**required**):
 - Fenno, R.F., (1977). “US House members in their constituencies: An exploration.” *American Political Science Review*, 71(03), 883-917.
 - 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), 326-343.
- Introductory readings (optional):
 - Chapters 8, 12, 19-21, MRWBB 2012.
- Theoretical readings (optional):
 - Lilleker, D.G., (2003). “Interviewing the political elite: Navigating a potential minefield.” *Politics*, 23(3), 207-214.
 - 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), 1-40.
 - Grimmer, J., and Stewart, B. M. (2013). ”Text as data: The promise and pitfalls of automatic content analysis methods for political texts”. *Political Analysis*, 21(3), 267-297.
 - 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*, 23(2), 254-277.

11 (22/11)

Bias in Measurement and Research

Academic
peer-review
by Nov. 24

due

- 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), 131-150.
 - Lustick, I.S., (1996). “History, historiography, and political science: Multiple historical records and the problem of selection bias.” *American Political Science Review*, 90(03), 605-618.
- 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.
- Introductory readings (optional):
 - Chapter 4, MRWBB 2012.

- Theoretical readings (optional):
 - Chapters 5 and 6, KKV 1994.
 - Nuzzo, R., (2015). “How scientists fool themselves – and how they can stop How scientists fool themselves - and how they can stop.” Nature News, 526(7572), 182.
 - Loken, E., & Gelman, A. 2017. “Measurement error and the replication crisis.” Science, 355(6325), 584-585.
 - Section 5.1, KKV 1994.
- Research examples (optional):
 - The Conversation (22 April 2013) “The Reinhart-Rogoff error - or how not to Excel at economics”.
 - Gelman, A. (4 January 2017) “The Bad Research Behind the Bogus Claim That North Carolina Is No Longer a Democracy” Slate.
 - The Economist (19 October 2013) “How science goes wrong.”
 - Prosser, J., Mellon, C., 2015. “Why did the polls go wrong?”
- Audiovisual (optional):
 - Planet Money (15 January 2016) “The Experiment Experiment.” [Podcast, 20:43]

12 (29/11)

Writing the Research Proposal

- Theoretical readings (**required**):
 - King, G., (1995). “Replication, replication.” PS: Political Science & Politics, 28(03), 444- 452.
- Introductory readings (optional):
 - Chapter 24, MRWBB 2012.
- Theoretical readings (optional):
 - APSA Committee on Publications, (2018). *Style Manual for Political Science*.

Final research design
proposal due by Dec.
8