

**POLI 780**  
**Scope and Methods in Political Science**

Fall 2014  
Prof. Layna Mosley  
UNC Chapel Hill  
[mosley@unc.edu](mailto:mosley@unc.edu)

**Class meetings:** Tuesdays, 1:00-3:45pm, Dey Hall 302  
To email all course participants: [poli780fall2014@sakai.unc.edu](mailto:poli780fall2014@sakai.unc.edu)

**Contact Information**

Office: 258 Hamilton Hall  
Phone: (919) 962-0416  
Email: [mosley@unc.edu](mailto:mosley@unc.edu)  
Web: [www.unc.edu/~lmosley/](http://www.unc.edu/~lmosley/)

**Office Hours**

Mondays, 10am-11:30am,  
Tuesdays, 11am-12:30pm,  
and by appointment

**I. Overview**

This required course provides an overview of the field of political science to first-year doctoral students. We focus generally on the philosophy of social science, and more specifically on the tools of contemporary political science. We will discuss the development of theoretical claims, the derivation of hypotheses, and the design of research projects intended to test such hypotheses. In doing so, the course will provide an introduction to a variety of empirical methods, including statistical analyses, case studies, experiments and interviews. The course also will offer examples of recent research from across the discipline; these are intended to illustrate the connections between theoretical reasoning and empirical research.

A second aim of this course is to encourage first-year graduate students to begin to think about their own research interests. The best way to learn how to craft a political science research project is to craft a political science research project. While it certainly is not expected that students will identify dissertation topics so early in their academic careers, students will draft a description of a potential research project, including a review of literature, a set of theoretical claims and testable hypotheses, and a research design that would allow these propositions to be assessed empirically.

Additionally, this course offers an opportunity for new doctoral students to “learn the ropes” of the discipline. We will devote a portion of each class meeting to professional socialization. We’ll generally read a short article, set of articles and/or blog post that deal with a specific issue – adjusting to graduate school, balancing teaching with research responsibilities, presenting at conferences, the journal review process, or choosing a dissertation adviser. These readings are marked with an asterisk on the syllabus. This is an opportunity for students to ask questions, and all questions are welcome. We faculty view our graduate students as future colleagues, and we want to give you the practical (as well as the theoretical) knowledge necessary for success.

**II. Requirements**

The most important course requirement is to arrive prepared for each class meeting – that is, read all of the assigned readings carefully, and be ready to discuss, ask questions and listen to what others have to say.

Evaluation and course grades are based on (a) a series of assignments, including a short draft of a funding application, that will form the basis for a research design paper (30% of final grade); (b) two reaction papers, each approximately five double-spaced pages, which evaluate critically the assigned readings for a given week (15% of final grade); (c) participation in seminar, including leading the discussion during one week (25%); and (d) the final research design paper (30%).

**Reaction papers:** Each student will write **two** reaction papers, which discuss critically all assigned readings (other than the “professional socialization” piece or pieces) for a given week. While reaction papers may begin with a brief summary of the readings, these papers should be primarily analytical in nature. That is, what is your assessment of the arguments made by the authors? What does a given reading or set of readings suggest about conducting political science research? How does a given reading fit with – or contrast with – other things we’ve read for this class, or things you’ve read in other courses? Depending on the weeks for which you sign up, the exact nature of the reaction papers will vary; keep in mind, though, that it’s an analysis of the readings, rather than a rehearsing of the readings, that’s at the core of the assignment.

Papers should be between 1200 and 1400 words, or approximately 4 to 5 double-spaced pages. I will pass around a sign-up sheet for reaction papers during the first class meeting. Reaction papers should be posted to the course Sakai site (in the Forum section, under the Forum marked “Response Papers”) by midnight on the **Sunday** prior to class. This gives ample time for others in the seminar, especially the discussion leader, to read the papers prior to our Tuesday afternoon class meeting. Please keep this deadline in mind when selecting the weeks for which you sign up.

**Discussion leader:** While all students are expected to come to class prepared to discuss each week’s readings, we also will have one (and, occasionally, two) official “discussion leader” for each week. The chief responsibility of the discussion leader is to come up with a set of three to five themes or questions around which to focus discussion during our class meeting. In doing so, the discussion leader should consider the issues raised in the reaction papers, as well as in the readings themselves.

The discussion leader is not responsible for summarizing the readings; rather, his or her responsibility is to structure our discussion and, where necessary, to move the conversation along. The discussion leader also is not responsible for leading discussion of the “professional socialization” reading(s). Sign ups for discussion leader duties also will occur during the first class meeting. One should not serve as discussion leader during a week when one is writing a reaction paper.

**Funding application draft:** One of the things you’ll be asked to do in graduate school – and in your career after graduate school – is to craft proposals for fellowships, grants, summer research money, and the like. It’s never too early to begin learning how to write a good funding application.

The National Science Foundation’s Graduate Research Fellowship Program (GRFP) is one for which most first-year PhD students are eligible: it is open to U.S. citizens and permanent residents who are in their first year of graduate study during Fall 2014, or who have completed no more than twelve months of full time graduate study as of August 1, 2014. The fellowship provides a stipend of \$32,000 for three years, and it also covers some tuition-related expenses. In the most recent GRFP

award cycle, seventeen of these fellowships were given to Political Science PhD students nationwide. The class Sakai site contains proposals and reviews from several UNC Political Science graduate students who have applied in recent years, and who received Honorable Mentions from the NSF GRFP program.

Applications for the GRFP are due on **November 3, 2014**, and they include three letters of reference from faculty members (due to the NSF on **November 6**), as well as three two-page statements – a Personal Statement Essay, Previous Research Essay, and a Proposed Research statement. Each may be no longer than two pages (single spacing is fine), in 12 point Times New Roman and with one inch margins.

Application instructions are at [https://www.nsf.gov/funding/pgm\\_summ.jsp?pims\\_id=6201](https://www.nsf.gov/funding/pgm_summ.jsp?pims_id=6201). Please consult these, as they will provide a sense of what the Proposed Graduate Study statement should contain. And please consider making a full application to the NSF GRFP. I'm happy to provide feedback on drafts of your essays; Frank Baumgartner ([frankb@unc.edu](mailto:frankb@unc.edu)), Tom Carsey ([carsey@unc.edu](mailto:carsey@unc.edu)), and Mark Crescenzi ([crescenzi@unc.edu](mailto:crescenzi@unc.edu)), all of whom have extensive experience with the NSF, also are happy to read drafts of your statements and to give other advice. Shannon Eubanks, our departmental manager and grants administrator, can help you with getting a password and access to the NSF Fastlane system ([seubanks@email.unc.edu](mailto:seubanks@email.unc.edu)). Faculty working in your intended subfield also can provide feedback on your proposal draft.

For this class, everyone – **regardless of eligibility for the NSF fellowship** – is required to draft the Proposed Research Statement. This is due on **October 7**.

**Research Design:** Much of what we will read in this class is about *how* to select, design and implement research projects in political science. We usually begin with a puzzle that motivates a research question; review existing literature on and approaches to the question or subject; develop a theoretical argument and a set of hypotheses; and then design an empirical analysis of the hypotheses (not to mention carrying out the analysis!).

Over the course of the semester, you'll be asked to engage in each of these steps. The topic is entirely up to you; this is a chance to begin to explore an issue in political science that interests you. On the given topic, you'll be asked to submit:

- A one to two page “puzzle statement” (**October 21**). Identify a research question that is of interest to you. Feel free to draw from your funding application statement (or to change course from that statement). Your question should be framed in a way that is broad enough to be of interest not only to specialists in a sub-sub-field, but also narrow enough to be tractable in the space of a research paper, article or dissertation. Admittedly, it's difficult to necessarily know which questions need asking without knowing what's been done on a given topic, so while this is a short writing assignment, it will require some background reading and research. Feel free to ask faculty in your area of interest for suggestions about what to read and/or what questions have yet to be addressed satisfactorily.

- A five to seven page literature review, summarizing past research on your given topic **(November 4)**. Read some of the political science literature related to your chosen question, and decide how to situate your question/interests in this literature. What have others already argued? What have they found? How can their theoretical approaches be improved upon or synthesized? Note that the literature is not simply an annotated bibliography, or a “he said, she said” that summarizes a bunch of things you’ve read. Rather, a good literature review identifies what the state of knowledge is, discusses where the shortcomings/openings are, and sets up your own theoretical thinking on the subject.
- A five to seven page theory discussion **(due November 18)** in which you advance an argument about your chosen puzzle (e.g. under what conditions does multinational production lead to improvements in workers’ rights, and why?), and develop one or more causal claims which flow from this argument. This document should culminate in the statement of one or more testable hypotheses.

The only section of the final research design that you won’t draft along the way is the one that discusses the planned empirical tests of your hypotheses. In that section of the research design, you should discuss how (using what sorts of methods, what kind of data, for which countries/cases etc) you would test your hypotheses, and why your chosen method and evidence is appropriate.

Once you have all of the pieces, you’ll be able to combine them into your final course assignment, which is a full research design. This document (20 to 25 pages, double spaced) should deploy theoretical literature and an empirical puzzle to set up the research question, develop hypotheses, and present a methodology for testing the hypotheses. The research design does not require execution of the research project (e.g. it does not require doing statistical analyses or writing case studies); rather, it focuses on the theoretical development of a project, which might later be turned into a conference paper or article, or might be the basis for a grant or dissertation proposal. The final research design is due on **December 8 at noon**. You may turn this in as a hard copy, or you may submit electronically, via the Dropbox function in Sakai.

### III. Course Schedule and Assigned Readings

Several of the books for this course are available at the UNC Bookstore (and through a variety of online sources).

**Required texts** (we will read most or all of these):

- John Gerring, 2012. *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, second edition.
- Gary Goertz and James Mahoney. 2012. *A Tale of Two Cultures: Qualitative and Quantitative Research in the Social Sciences*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Robert O. Keohane, Gary King and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Thomas Kuhn, 1962. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

**Recommended texts** (we will read a bit from these, and they are useful for further reading or background):

- Henry Brady and David Collier, eds. 2010. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Steven van Evera, 1997. *A Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

All other readings should be available electronically via the course Sakai site (in the “Resources” section). In addition to the required readings, I’ve also listed some supplementary readings on a few topics, in case you’re interested in reading further. Please let me know if you can’t locate a given reading.

## **Week 1: August 19**

## **Course Overview**

Axelrod, Robert. 2008. “Political Science and Beyond: Presidential Address to the American Political Science Association.” *Perspectives on Politics* 6(1): 3-9.

Keohane, Robert O. 2009. “Political Science as a Vocation.” *PS: Political Science and Politics* (April), 359-363.

Lupia, Arthur. 2014. “What is the Value of Social Science? Challenges for Researchers and Government Funders.” *PS: Political Science and Politics* (January 2014), pp. 1-7.

Ostrom, Elinor. 2010. “A Long Polycentric Journey.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 13:1-23.

Verba, Sidney. 2011. “A Life in Political Science.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 14: i-xv.

\*A short blog post on graduate school:

<http://www.whiteoliphant.com/duckofminerva/2014/07/an-open-letter-from-the-new-dgs.html>

## **Week 2: August 26**

## **Philosophy of Social Science**

Huber, John. 2013. “Is Theory Getting Lost in the Identification Revolution?” *Political Economist* newsletter, Summer 2013.

Kuhn, Thomas. 1962. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Entire.

\*David B. Cohen. 2002. "Surviving the PhD." *PS: Political Science and Politics* (September): 585-588.

\*Gupta, Devashree and Israel Weismal-Manor. 2006. "Network in Progress: A Conference Primer for Graduate Students." *PS: Political Science and Politics* (July): 485-490.

### **Week 3: September 2**

### **Political Science and Social Science Methodology**

Gerring, John. 2012. *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, second edition, preface, Chapters 1 and 2.

Imre Lakatos. 1970. "Falsification and the Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes," in Imre Lakatos and Alan Musgrave (eds.), *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, selections.

National Science Foundation. 2011. *Rebuilding the Mosaic*. Entire.

Symposium on the State of Political Science, 2002. Articles by Hardin, Jervis, Rudolph, Smith. *PS: Political Science and Politics*. [on Sakai as a single file, "Symposium 2002."]

\*Rich, Timothy. 2013. "Publishing as a Graduate Student: A Quick and (Hopefully) Painless Guide to Establishing Yourself as a Scholar." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 46(2): 376-379.

### **Week 4: September 9**

### **The International Relations Subfield**

#### **Faculty Guest: Mark Crescenzi**

*Mark will join our discussion during the second half of class.*

Cunningham, Kathleen G. 2013. "Actor Fragmentation and Civil War Bargaining: How Internal Divisions Generate Civil Conflict." *American Journal of Political Science* 57 (3): 659-672.

Danneman, Nathan and Emily Hencken Ritter. 2013. "Contagious Rebellion and Preemptive Repression." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 58 (2): 254-279.

Graham, Erin R., Charles Shipan and Craig Volden 2013, "The Diffusion of Policy Diffusion Research in Political Science." *British Journal of Political Science* 43(3): 673-701.

Kadera, Kelly, Lindsay Reid, Rachel Myrick and Mark Crescenzi. 2014. "Regime Change, Global Democratic Strength, and the Conflict Environment." [Working Paper]

\*Garand, James C. et al. 2009. "Political Science Journals in Comparative Perspective: Evaluating Scholarly Journals in the United States, Canada and the United Kingdom." *PS: Political Science and Politics* (October): 695-717.

\*This blog post also has some useful information:

<http://www.whiteoliphant.com/duckofminerva/2014/01/ranking-ir-journals.html>

**Week 5: September 16**

**American Politics: Parties & Legislative Behavior  
Faculty Guest: Jason Roberts**

Cox, Gary W. and Mathew D. McCubbins. 1994. "Bonding, Structure, and the Stability of Political Parties: Party Government in the House." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 19: 215- 231.

Krehbiel, Keith. 1993. "Where's the Party?" *British Journal of Political Science* 23: 235-66.

Lawrence, Eric D., Forrest Maltzman, and Steven S. Smith. 2006. "Who Wins?: Party Effects in Legislative Voting." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 31: 33-70.

McCarty, Nolan, Keith T. Poole, and Howard Rosenthal. 2001. "The Hunt for Party Discipline in Congress." *American Political Science Review* 95: 673-687.

Rohde, David W. 1994. "Parties and Committees in the House: Member Motivations, Issues, and Institutional Arrangements." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 19: 341-359.

\*Review Process example: *these are intended to give you a sense of how the publication process operates. This file contains a first draft, reviews, response memo, second draft, reviews, response and the final article.*

\*An example – admittedly extreme – of how long publication can take, from Nathan Jensen:  
<http://pages.wustl.edu/nathanjensen/articles/6010>

**Week 6: September 23**

**Normative Political Theory;  
Comparative Politics: The Role of Institutions**

**Comparative [Faculty Guest: Cecilia Martinez-Gallardo]**

Amorim Neto, Octavio. 2006. "The Presidential Calculus: Executive Policymaking and Cabinet Formation in the Americas." *Comparative Political Studies* 39(4): 415-440.

Escobar-Lemmon, Maria and Michelle M. Taylor-Robinson. 2005. "Women Ministers in Latin American Government: When, Where and Why?" *American Journal of Political Science* 49(4): 829-844.

Huber, John and Cecilia Martinez-Gallardo. 2008. "Replacing Cabinet Ministers: Patterns of Ministerial Stability in Parliamentary Democracies." *American Political Science Review* 102(2): 169-180.

**Normative Theory**

Grant, Ruth W. 2002. "Political Theory, Political Science and Politics." *Political Theory* 30: 577-595.

Johnson, Jim. 2014. "Models among the Political Theorists." *American Journal of Political Science* 58(3): 547-560.

Rehfeld, Andrew. 2010. "Offensive Political Theory." *Perspectives on Politics* 8:2, pp. 465-486; **and** response from Ross J. Corbett. 2011. "Political Theory within Political Science." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 44(3): 565-570.

\*Agarwala, Rina and Emmanuel Teitelbaum. 2010. "Trends in Funding for Dissertation Field Research." *PS: Political Science and Politics* (April): 283-293.

\*Altman, Micah. 2009. "Funding, Funding." *PS: Political Science and Politics* (July): 521-526.

### **Week 7: September 30**

### **Description and Explanation (I)**

Gerring, Chapters 3 and 4.

Keohane, Robert O., Gary King and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, Chapters 1, 2 and 3.

Goertz, Gary and James Mahoney. 2012. *A Tale of Two Cultures: Qualitative and Quantitative Research in the Social Sciences*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, Chapters 1 and 2.

\*Lake, David A. 2010. "Who's on First? Listing Authors by Relative Contribution Trumps the Alphabet." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 43(1): 43-47.

\*McDermott, Rose and Peter K. Hatemi. 2010. "Emerging Models of Collaboration in Political Science: Changes, Benefits and Challenges." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 43(1): 49-58.

### **Week 8: October 7**

### **No class meeting this week**

**NSF Draft Statement Due, via Sakai Dropbox**

**Read for next week!**

### **Week 9: October 14**

### **Description and Explanation (II)**

Gerring, Chapters 6, 8 and 9

Goertz and Mahoney, Chapters 3 through 6.

Keohane, King and Verba, Chapter 4.

Przeworski, Adam. 2007. "Is the Science of Comparative Politics Possible?" Chapter 6, pp. 147-171, in Carles Boix and Susan C. Stokes, eds., *Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.



\*Symposium on dissertation proposals and dissertation topics; *PS: Political Science and Politics* 2001. [Available as a single file on Sakai; contributions by Wasby, Benesh, den Dulk, Fox, Andersen, Farrar-Meyers, May].

\*Stephen B. Rothman. 2008. "Comparatively Evaluating Potential Dissertation and Thesis Projects." *PS: Political Science and Politics* (April): 367-369.

*Optional: also see Van Evera, Chapters 3 and 4, on writing a dissertation.*

## **Week 10: October 21**

## **Concepts, Measurement and Research Design**

### **Puzzle/Research Question Statement Due**

Gerring, Chapter 5 and Chapter 7.

Goertz and Mahoney, Chapters 10 through 13.

Keohane, King and Verba, Chapter 6.

\*King, Gary and Maya Sen. 2013. "How Social Science Research Can Improve Teaching." *PS: Political Science and Politics* (July), pp. 621-629.

## **Week 11: October 28**

## **Concerns about Observational Studies, Quantitative Data and Research Design**

Geddes, Barbara. 1990. "How the Cases you Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics," *Political Analysis* 2: 131-150.

Goertz and Mahoney, Chapters 14 through 17.

Keele, Luke and William Minozzi. 2013. "How Much Is Minnesota Like Wisconsin? Assumptions and Counterfactuals in Causal Inference with Observational Data." *Political Analysis* 21(2): 193-216.

Keohane, King and Verba, Chapter 5.

Lupia, Arthur and Colin Elman. 2014. "Openness in Political Science: Data Access and Research Transparency." 2014. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, pp. 19-42.

\*Knopf, Jeffrey. 2006. "Writing a Literature Review." *PS: Political Science and Politics* (January): 127-132.

### Additional readings (optional):

Golden, Miriam. 1995. "Replication and Non-Quantitative Research." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 28:481-483.

King, Gary. 1995. "Replication, Replication." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 28:444–52.

Lerner, Jonah. 2010. "The Truth Wears Off." *The New Yorker*, December 13, 2010.

Lieberman, Evan S. 2010. "Bridging the Qualitative-Quantitative Divide: Best Practices in the Development of Historically Oriented Replication Databases." *Annual Reviews of Political Science* 13: 37-59.

Searight, Jason. 2010. "Regression-Based Inference: A Case Study in Failed Causal Assessment," Chapter 13 in Brady and Collier, *Rethinking Social Inquiry*.

## **Week 12: November 4**

## **Causal Mechanisms: The Qualitative Response**

### **Literature Review Due**

Bennett, Andrew. "Process Tracing and Causal Inference," Chapter 10 in Brady and Collier, *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition), 2010.

Dion, Douglas. 1998. "Evidence and Inference in the Comparative Case Study." *Comparative Politics* 30 (2): 127-145

Freedman, David. "On Types of Scientific Inquiry: The Role of Qualitative Reasoning." Chapter 11 in Brady and Collier, *Rethinking Social Inquiry*.

Gerring, Chapters 11 and 12.

Goertz and Mahoney, Chapters 7 through 9.

\*Burmila, Edward M. 2010. "Graduate Students as Independent Instructors: Seven Things to Know about Teaching Your Own Course in Graduate School." *PS: Political Science and Politics* (July): 557-560.

### Additional readings (optional)

Seawright, Jason. 2002. "Testing for Necessary and/or Sufficient Causation: Which Cases are Relevant?" *Political Analysis* 10 (2002): 178-93.

Sambanis, Nicholas. 2004. "Using Case Studies to Expand Economic Models of Civil War." *Perspectives on Politics* 2 (June): 259-279.

Weller, Nicholas and Jeb Barnes. 2014. *Finding Pathways: Mixed Method Research for Studying Causal Mechanisms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

## Week 13: November 11

## Causal Mechanisms: The Experimental Response

Dunning, Thad and Lauren Harrison. 2010. "Cross-Cutting Cleavages and Ethnic Voting: An Experimental Study of Cousinage in Mali." *American Political Science Review* 104(1): 1-19.

Gaines, Brian J., James H. Kuklinski, and Paul J. Quirk. 2007. "The Logic of the Survey Experiment Revisited." *Political Analysis* 15 (Winter): 1-20.

Grose, Christian R. 2014. "Field Experimental Work on Political Institutions." *Annual Review of Political Science* 17: 355-370.

Healy, Andrew and Neil Malhotra. 2013. "Childhood Socialization and Political Attitudes: Evidence from a Natural Experiment." *Journal of Politics* 75(4): 1023-1037

Lyall, Jason, Graeme Blair and Kosuke Imai. 2013. "Explaining Support for Combatants during Wartime: A Survey Experiment in Afghanistan." *American Political Science Review* 107(4): 679-705.

Nickerson, David. 2008. "Is Voting Contagious? Evidence from Two Field Experiments." *American Political Science Review* 102: 49-57.

\*Przeworski, Adam and Frank Salomon. "On the Art of Writing Proposals." Social Science Research Council.

\*APSA, 2014. Placement Report.

### Additional Readings (Optional):

Beath, Andrew, Christia Fotini and Ruben Enikolopov. 2013. "Do Elected Councils Improve Governance? Experimental Evidence on Local Institutions in Afghanistan." MIT Political Science Department Research Paper No. 2013-24

Dunning, Thad. 2010. "Design-Based Inference: Beyond the Pitfalls of Regression Analysis?" Chapter 14 in Brady and Collier, *Rethinking Social Inquiry*.

Gerber, Alan and Donald Green. 2012. *Field Experiments: Design, Analysis and Interpretation*. New York: W.W. Norton.

McDermott, Rose. 2013. "The Ten Commandments of Experiments." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 46 (July): 605-610.

Olken, Benjamin A. 2007. "Monitoring Corruption: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Indonesia." *Journal of Political Economy* 115(2): 200-249.

Robinson, Gregory, John E. McNulty, and Jonathan S. Krasno. 2009. "Observing the Counterfactual? The Search for Political Experiments in Nature." *Political Analysis* 17 (Autumn): 341-

357.

**Week 14: November 18**

**Research Methods: Rational Choice, Formal Theory and EITM**

**Theory and Hypothesis Section of Research Design Due**

Bates, Robert H. 2007. "From Case Studies to Social Science: A Strategy for Political Research." Chapter 7, pp. 172-185, in Carles Boix and Susan C. Stokes, eds., *Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bates, Robert H., Avner Greif, Margaret Levi, Jean-Laurent Rosenthal and Barry Weingast. 1998. *Analytic Narratives*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Introduction and Chapter 5.

Cox, Gary W. 2004. "Lies, Damned Lies and Rational Choice Analyses." In Ian Shapiro, Rogers M. Smith and Tarek E. Masoud, eds., *Problems and Methods in the Study of Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 167-185.

Gent, Stephen. 2007. "Strange Bedfellows: the Strategic Dynamics of Major Power Military Interventions." *The Journal of Politics* 69(4): 1089-1102.

Granato, James and Frank Scioli. 2004. "Puzzles, Proverbs, and Omega Matrices: The Scientific and Social Significance of Empirical Implications of Theoretical Models (EITM)." *Perspectives on Politics* 2(2): 313-323.

\*Hesli, Vicki L., Jae Mook Lee and Sara McLaughlin Mitchell. 2012. "Predicting Rank Attainment in Political Science: What Else Besides Publications Affects Promotion?" *PS: Political Science and Politics* (July): 475-492.

**Week 15: November 25**

**Research Methods: Ethics and Fieldwork**

Isabelle Côté, "Fieldwork in the Era of Social Media: Opportunities and Challenges." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 46(3): 615-619.

Jensenius, Francesca. 2014. "The Fieldwork of Quantitative Data Collection." *PS: Political Science and Politics*, pp. 402-404.

Mosley, Layna. Ed. 2013. *Interview Research in Political Science*, Introduction.

POMEPS, 2014. "The Ethics of Research in the Middle East." Symposium.

Wedeen, Lisa. 2010. "Reflections on Ethnographic Work in Political Science." *Annual Reviews of Political Science* 13: 255-272.

Wood, Elisabeth Jean. 2007. "Field Research." Chapter 5, pp. 123-146, in Carles Boix and Susan C. Stokes, eds., *Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

\*Monroe, Kristen Renwick, Jenny Choi, Emily Howell, Chloe Lampros-Monroe, Crystal Trejo and Valentina Perez. 2014. "Gender Equality in the Ivory Tower and How Best to Achieve It." *PS: Political Science and Politics* (April), 418-426.

\*Monroe, Kristen Renwick and William F. Chiu. 2010. "Gender Equality in the Academy: The Pipeline Problem." *PS: Political Science and Politics* (April): 303-308.

### **Week 16: December 3**

### **Research Frontiers in Political Science**

#### **Discussion of Research Designs**

Boix, Carles and Frances Rosenbluth. 2014. "Bones of Contention: The Political Economy of Height Inequality." *American Political Science Review* 108(1): 1-22.

Jha, Saumitra. 2013. "Trade, Institutions and Ethnic Intolerance: Evidence from South Asia." *American Political Science Review* 107(4).

Gerber, Alan and Neil Malhotra. 2008. "Do Statistical Reporting Standards Affect What Is Published? Publication Bias in Two Leading Political Science Journals", *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 3(3): 313- 326.

Nuzzo, Regina. 2014. "Statistical Errors." *Nature* 506: 150-152.

\*McLaughlin Mitchell, Sara and Vicki L. Hesli. 2013. "Women Don't Ask? Women Don't Say No? Bargaining and Service in the Political Science Profession." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 46 (2): 355 – 369.

**Note: Final Version of Entire Research Design due Monday, December 8, at noon**