

Fall 2013
PS 235: Introduction to Research Design
706 Barrows Hall

Professor Laura Stoker
102 Moses Hall & 778 Barrows Hall
(510) 798-7449
Office Hours: Wednesday 10-noon, 102 Moses

This course is intended to introduce you to study design and data collection in political science. We will consider both general claims about particular methods and many examples. You should emerge better equipped to undertake your own research and better able to evaluate the work of others.

The course will be run partly as a lecture course and partly as a seminar. I will review basic ideas and arguments relevant to each week's topic, while also encouraging discussion and Q&A. I expect you to come prepared to discuss the assigned readings. The amount of reading ranges from quite heavy to ridiculously heavy. I will preview (and/or provide brief handouts on) the readings each week to help guide you through them and to help you figure out what to read carefully and what to skim or peruse. Two weeks during the semester are set aside for student presentations, one in the early going and the second during the RRR week. Grades will be based on four short (5-page) papers written during the course of the semester and on a final exam. The papers will ask you to develop a mini research proposal or carry out a mini research endeavor, and will enable you to link course material to your own research interests. The paper assignments are described at the end of the syllabus. The final will be a take-home version of an in-class exam, as will be explained in class.

A number of books have been ordered for the course. Rick H. Hoyle, Monica J. Harris, and Charles M. Judd's *Research Methods in Social Relations* (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing; 7th edition, 2001) provides a helpful, textbook-overview of many of the topics we will cover. Donald T. Campbell and Julian C. Stanley's *Experimental and Quasi-experimental Designs for Research* (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963) is a short, dense classic that addresses the strengths and weaknesses of experimental and non-experimental designs. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), by Gary King, Robert Keohane and Sidney Verba, provides an overview of design and analysis issues that are (claimed to be) common to qualitatively-oriented and quantitatively-oriented research. Several other books that we will read large segments of have been ordered as well: Klaus Krippendorff's *Content Analysis* (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1980), Charles Ragin's *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies* (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1987), and John Gerring's *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices*. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007). Another book we will read in draft form is *Field Research in Political Science* by Diana Kapiszewski, Lauren MacLean, and Benjamin Read, which is forthcoming from Cambridge University Press. I have an advance version of the book which will be available on BSpace. For field research Harry Wolcott's *Transforming Qualitative Data* (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage 1994) is a classic, but we are drowning in readings on that topic so I have ordered this book as a "recommended" text and included it on the syllabus as optional. In addition, I have ordered two books on writing: Howard Becker's *Writing for Social Scientists* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1986), on the psychology and practice of academic writing, and Joseph M. Williams' *Style: Toward Clarity and Grace* (University of Chicago Press, 1990), which presents Williams' theory of how to write well. Other readings for the course will be made available on BSpace.

In what follows is the schedule of topics and readings for the semester. For most weeks the readings are ordered in the following manner in the syllabus: (1) readings from the text or ordered books, (2) general discussions of method, and (3) examples. Most of the time it will make sense to read in the order laid out on the syllabus. The week-by-week preview of the readings (and handout) will help guide you in this respect further.

I. Introduction (September 10)

King, Keohane, and Verba. *Designing Social Inquiry*. Ch. 1.

Ragin. *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. Chs. 1-2.

Jervis, Robert. Winter 1997-1998. "Complexity and the Analysis of Political and Social Life." *Political Science Quarterly*.

Almond, Gabriel A. and Stephen J. Genco. 1977. "Clouds, Clocks, and the Study of Politics." *World Politics*, 29: 489-522.

Bailey, Carol A. "The Infrastructure of Qualitative Field Research." Chapter 4 (pp. 49-61) in *A Guide to Qualitative Field Research*. Second Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Schmitter, Phillippe C. 2009. "The Nature and Future of Comparative Politics." *European Political Science Review*, 1: 33-61.

Stoker, Laura. "Triangulation." 2011. *International Encyclopedia in Political Science*, eds. Bertrand Badie, Dirk Berg-Schlosser, and Leonardo Morlino. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gerber, Alan S. and Donald P. Green. 2012. "Causal Inference and Experimentation." Chapter 2 (pp. 21-50) in *Field Experiments*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Converse, Philip E. 1986. "Generalization and the Social Psychology of 'Other Worlds'." In *Metatheory in Social Science*, eds. Donald W. Fiske and Richard A. Shweder. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 42-60.

Hexter, J. H. 1979. *On Historians*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Introduction and Ch. 5.

Smith, Dorothy E. 1987. *The Everyday World as Problematic: A Feminist Sociology*. Boston: Northeastern University Press. Ch. 5.

II. Issues of Measurement (September 17)

Judd, Smith, and Kidder. *Research Methods in Social Relations*. Chs. 3, 7; or Hoyle, Harris, and Judd (7th edition.) Chs. 4, 7.

King, Keohane and Verba. *Designing Social Inquiry*. Section 5.1

Carmines, Edward J. and Richard A. Zeller. 1979. *Reliability and Validity Assessment*. Beverly Hills: Sage. 17-27, 37-51.

Shively, W. Phillips. 1998. *The Craft of Political Research*. Chs. 4-5. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Adcock, Robert and David Collier. 2001. "Measurement Validity: A Shared Standard for Qualitative and Quantitative Research." *American Political Science Review*, 95: 529-546.

Podsakoff, Philip M., Scott B. MacKenzie, Jeong-Yeon Lee, and Nathan P. Podsakoff. 2003. "Common Method Biases in Behavioral Research: A Critical Review of the Literature and Recommended Remedies." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88: 879-903

Gerring, John. 1999. "What Makes a Concept Good? A Criterial Framework for Understanding Concept Formation in the Social Sciences." *Polity*, 31: 357-393.

Elkins, Zachary. 2000. "Gradations of Democracy? Empirical Tests of Alternative Conceptualizations." *American Journal of Political Science*, 44: 298-300.

DeVellis. Robert F. 2012. "Guidelines in Scale Development." Chapter 5 (pp. 73-114) in *Scale Development: Theory and Applications*. Third Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Webb, Eugene J., Donald T. Campbell, Richard D. Schwartz, Lee Sechrest, and Janet Belew Grove. 1981. *Nonreactive Measures in the Social Sciences*. 2nd edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. 275-287.

Rosenstone, Steven J., John Mark Hanson, and Donald R. Kinder. 1986. "Measuring Change in Personal Economic Well-Being." *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 50: 176-192.

Johnston, Richard. 1992. "Party Identification Measures in the Anglo-American Democracies: A National Survey Experiment." *American Journal of Political Science*, 36: 542-559.

III. Experimental Designs (September 24)

Judd, Smith, and Kidder. *Research Methods in Social Relations*. Chs. 2, 4, 8; or Hoyle, Harris, and Judd (7th edition.) Chs. 2, 11, 12.

Campbell and Stanley. *Experimental and Quasi-experimental Designs for Research*. 5-27, 31-34.

Carlsmith, J. Merrill, Phoebe C. Ellsworth, and Elliot Aronson. 1976. *Methods of Research in Social Psychology*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley. Introduction and Chs. 2, 5.

Shadish, William R. 2010. "Campbell and Rubin: A Primer and Comparison of Their Approaches to Causal Inference in Field Settings." *Psychological Methods*, 15: 3-17.

West, Stephen G. and Felix Thoemmes. 2010. "Campbell's and Rubin's Perspectives on Causal Inference." *Psychological Methods*, 15: 18-37.

Rubin, Donald B. 2010. "Reflections Stimulated by the Comments of Shadish (2010) and West and Thoemmes (2010)." *Psychological Methods*, 15: 38-46.

Druckman, James N., Donald P. Green, James H. Kuklinski, and Arthur Lupia. 2006. "The Growth and Development of Experimental Research in Political Science." *American Political Science Review*, 100: 627-635.

Druckman, James N., Donald P. Green, James H. Kuklinski, and Arthur Lupia (eds.). 2011. *Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science*, chapter 2 ("Experiments: An Introduction to Core Concepts" by Druckman, Green, Kuklinski, and Lupia), chapter 6 ("Laboratory Experiments in Political Science" by Shanto Iyengar), and chapter 9 ("Field Experiments in Political Science" by Alan S. Gerber). Read or skim other chapters as interested.

Gaines, Brian J. and James H. Kuklinski. 2007. "The Logic of the Survey Experiment Reexamined." *Political Analysis*, 15: 1-20.

Berinsky, Adam J., Gregory A. Huber, and Gabriel S. Lenz. 2012. "Evaluating Online Labor Markets for Experimental Research: Amazon.com's Mechanical Turk." *Political Analysis*, 20: 351-368.

Samuels, David and Cesar Zucco. 2013. "Using Facebook as a Subject Recruitment Tool for Survey-Experimental Research." Mimeograph.

Iyengar, Shanto, Mark D. Peters, and Donald R. Kinder. 1982. "Experimental Demonstrations of the 'Not So

Minimal' Consequences of Television News." *American Political Science Review*, 76: 848-858. And "Comments" by David Blomquist in the March 1984 *APSR*, 78: 201-202.

Brader, Ted. 2005. "Striking a Responsive Chord: How Political Ads Motivate and Persuade Voters by Appealing to Emotions." *American Journal of Political Science*, 49: 388-405.

Hyde, Susan D. 2010. "Experimenting in Democracy Promotion: International Observers and the 2004 Presidential Elections in Indonesia." *Perspectives on Politics*, 8: 511-527.

IV. Quasi-Experimental Designs (October 1)

Judd, Smith, and Kidder. *Research Methods in Social Relations*. Chs. 5, 14; or Hoyle, Harris, and Judd (7th edition.) Chs. 13, 14.

Cambell and Stanley. *Experimental and Quasi-experimental Designs for Research*. 34-57, 64-71.

Campbell, Donald T. 1969. "Reforms as Experiments." *The American Psychologist*, 24: 409-429.

Glass, Gene V. "Interrupted Time Series Quasi-Experiments." Reprinted from Jaeger, R. M. (1997). *Complementary methods for research in education*. 2nd Edition. Pp.589-608. Washington D. C.: American Educational Research Association.

Imbens, Guido W. and Thomas Lemieux. 2008. "Regression Discontinuity Designs: A Guide to Practice." *Journal of Econometrics*, 142: 615-635.

Angrist, Joshua D. and Jörn-Steffen Pischke. 2008. *Mostly Harmless Econometrics*. Princeton University Press. Just pages 165-190 (on fixed effects estimation and difference in differences).

Dunning, Thad. 2012. Chapters 1, 2, 4 (pp. 1-38, 41-61, 87-102) in *Natural Experiments in the Social Sciences: A Design-Based Approach*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lewis-Beck, Michael and John R. Alford. 1980. "Can Government Regulate Safety? The Coal Mine Example." *American Political Science Review*, 74: 745-756.

Caughy, Devin M. and Sekhan, Jas S. 2011. "Regression-Discontinuity Designs and Popular Elections: Implications of Pro-Incumbent Bias in Close U.S. House Races." Mimeograph.

Mannheim, Jarol B. and Robert B. Albritton. 1984. "Changing National Images: International Public Relations and Media Agenda Setting." *American Political Science Review*, 78: 641-657.

Stoker, Laura and M. Kent Jennings. 1995. "Life-Cycle Transitions and Political Participation: The Case of Marriage." *American Political Science Review*, 89: 421-433.

V. Student Presentations (October 8)

VI. Sampling/Case Selection (October 15)

Judd, Smith, and Kidder. *Research Methods in Social Relations*. Chs. 6, 9; or Hoyle, Harris, and Judd (7th edition.) Chs. 8, 9, 10

King, Keohane, and Verba. *Designing Social Inquiry*. Ch. 4.

Henry, Gary T. 1990. *Practical Sampling*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. Ch. 2.

Sudman, Seymour. 1983. "Applied Sampling." In *Handbook of Survey Research*, eds. Peter Rossi, James Wright, and Andy Anderson. New York: Academic Press. 145-194.

Patton, Michael Quinn. 1990. *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. 162-186.

Biernacki, Patrick and Dan Waldorf. 1981. "Snowball Sampling." *Sociological Methods and Research*, 10: 141-164.

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

Babbie, Earl R. 1973. *Survey Research Methods*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth. Ch. 6.

Schlozman, Kay Lehman and John T. Tierney. 1986. *Organized Interests and American Democracy*. New York: Harper & Row. Preface and Appendix A.

Kingdon, John. 1973. *Congressmen's Voting Decisions*. New York: Harper & Row. Appendix A.

VII. Survey Research (October 22)

Modes and Designs

Judd, Smith, and Kidder. *Research Methods in Social Relations*. Ch. 10; or Hoyle, Harris, and Judd (7th edition.) Ch.5.

Fowler, Floyd J. Jr. 1988. *Survey Research Methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. Ch. 4.

Yeager, David S., Jon A. Krosnick, Linchiat Chang, Harold S. Javitz, Matthew S. Levendusky, Alberto Simpser, and Rui Wang. 2011. "Comparing the Accuracy of RDD Telephone Surveys and Internet Surveys Conducted with Probability and Non-Probability Samples." *Public Opinion Quarterly*, advance publication published 10/5/2011.

Piazza, Thomas, Paul M. Sniderman, and Philip E. Tetlock. 1989. "Analysis of the Dynamics of Political Reasoning: A General-Purpose Computer-Assisted Methodology." In *Quantitative Political Analysis*, edition. James A. Stimson, vol. 1. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. 99-119.

Menard, Scott. *Longitudinal Research*. 1991. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. 3-49.

Don. A Dillman and John Tarnai. 1988. "Administrative Issues in Mixed Mode Surveys." In *Telephone Survey Methodology*, eds. Robert M. Groves, Paul P. Biemer, Lars E. Lyberg, James T. Massey, William L. Nicholls II, and Joseph Waksberg. New York: John Wiley & Sons. 509-528.

Freedman, Deborah S., Arland Thornton, and Donald Camburn. 1980. "Maintaining Response Rates in Longitudinal Studies." *Sociological Methods and Research*, 9: 87-98.

Kenyon, Anne, Lynn Newman, Suzanne Triplett, Anne-Marie Knokey, Kathryn Valdes, and Helen Smith. 2010. "Testing Prepaid Incentives and a Mail Questionnaire to Increase Response to a Multi-Wave Telephone Survey." *Survey Practice*, April 2010.

Welch, Susan and John G. Peters. 1977. "Some Problems of Stimulating Responses to Mail Questionnaires: Controllable and Non-Controllable Aspects." *Political Methodology*, 4: 139-151.

Rosen, Jeffrey, Joe Murphy, Andy Petchev, Sarah Riley, and Mark Lindblad. 2011. "The Effects of Differential

Interviewer Incentives on a Field Data Collection Effort." *Field Methods*, 23: 24-36.

Lipps, Oliver, and Alexandre Pollien. 2011. "Effects of Interviewer Experience on Components of Nonresponse in the European Social Survey." *Field Methods*, 23: 156-172.

Heerweigh, Dirk. 2006. "An Investigation of the Effect of Lotteries on Web Survey Response Rates." *Field Methods*, 18: 205-220.

Also see the website of the NSF "national treasures:"

General Social Survey (GSS): <http://www3.norc.org/GSS+Website/>

American National Election Studies (ANES): <http://www.electionstudies.org/>

Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID): <http://psidonline.isr.umich.edu/>

Interviewing Practice, Question Wording and Sequencing

Judd, Smith, and Kidder. *Research Methods in Social Relations*. Ch. 11; or Hoyle, Harris, and Judd (7th edition.) Ch. 6.

Converse, Jean M. and Howard Schuman. 1974. *Conversations at Random: Survey Research as Interviewers See It*. New York: Wiley. Chs. 2, 5.

Interviewer's Manual. 1976. Ann Arbor, MI: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan. Table of Contents, Chs. 3-4.

Krosnick, Jon A. and Stanley Presser. 2009. "Question and Questionnaire Design." In *Handbook of Survey Research* (2nd edition), eds. James D. Wright and Peter V. Marsden. San Diego: Elsevier.

Pasek, Josh and Jon A. Krosnick. 2010. "Optimizing Survey Questionnaire Design in Political Science: Insights from Psychology." In *Oxford Handbook of American Elections and Political Behavior*, eds. J. E. Leighley and J. C. Edwards. New York: Oxford University Press.

Fowler, Floyd J. 1988. *Survey Research Methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. Ch. 6.

Fowler, Floyd J., Jr. 1995. "Some General Rules for Designing Good Survey Instruments." Chapter 4 (pp. 78-103) in *Improving Survey Questions: Design and Evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Weisberg, Herbert F., Jon A. Krosnick, and Bruce D. Bowen. 1996. *An Introduction to Survey Research, Polling, and Data Analysis* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Chs. 4, 6.

Theiss-Morse, Elizabeth, Amy Fried, John L. Sullivan, and Mary Dietz. 1991. "Mixing Methods: A Multistage Strategy for Studying Patriotism and Citizen Participation." *Political Analysis*, 3: 89-121.

Bishop, George F., Robert W. Oldendick, Alfred J. Tuchfarber, and Stephen E. Bennett. 1989. "Pseudo-Opinions on Public Affairs." In *Survey Research Methods*, eds. Eleanor Singer and Stanley Presser. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 425-436.

Bradburn, Norman M., Lance J. Rips, and Steven K. Shevell. 1987. "Answering Autobiographical Questions: the Impact of Memory and Inference on Surveys." *Science*, 235: 157-161.

Schuman, Howard, Graham Kalton, and Jacob Ludwig. 1989. "Context and Contiguity in Survey Questionnaires." In *Survey Research Methods*, eds. Eleanor Singer and Stanley Presser. University of Chicago Press. 151-154.

VIII. In-depth Interviewing (October 29)

de Volo, Lorraine Bayard and Edward Schatz. 2004. "From the Inside Out: Ethnographic Methods in Political Research." *PS*, April: 267-271.

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

Patton, Michael Quinn. 1990. *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. 277-290.

Herbert J. Rubin and Irene S. Rubin. 1995. *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. Thousand Oaks, Sage. Chs. 4, 6-7, 10.

Kvale, Steiner. 1996. *InterViews*. Thousand Oaks, Sage. Chs. 10-12, 14.

Aberbach, Joel D., James D. Chesney, and Bert A. Rockman. 1975. "Exploring Elite Political Attitudes: Some Methodological Lessons." *Political Methodology*, 2: 1-27.

Hochschild, Jennifer L. 1981. *What's Fair? American Beliefs about Distributive Justice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 17-26, 228-237, Appendices A and B.

Luker, Kristin. 1984. *Abortion and the Politics of Motherhood*. Berkeley: University of California Press. Appendix 1.

IX. Field Studies (November 5)

Judd, Smith, and Kidder. *Research Methods in Social Relations*. 270-286, Ch. 13; or Hoyle, Harris, and Judd (7th edition.) 361-381, 412-421.

Kapiszewski, Diana, Lauren M. MacLean, and Benjamin L. Read. 2013. *Field Research in Political Science*, forthcoming from Cambridge University Press.

Wolcott. *Transforming Qualitative Data*. Chs. 1-2, 5, Introduction to Part II. Read/skim *only* if this is your thing.

Wolcott, Harry F. *The Art of Fieldwork*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Ch. 7.

Schutt, Russell K. 1996. *Investigating the Social World*. Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press. Ch. 9.

Patton, Michael Quinn. 1990. *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. Ch. 6, 186-198, and Ch. 9.

"Symposium: Field Research." 2003. *Qualitative Methods*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pages 2-14; contributions by Lieberman, Howard, and Lynch.

Bouchard, Thomas J., Jr. 1976. "Unobtrusive Measures: An Inventory of Uses." *Sociological Methods and Research*, 4: 276-399.

Geertz, Clifford. 1979. "From the Native's Point of View: On the Nature of Anthropological Investigation." In *Interpretive Social Science*, eds. Paul Rabinow and William M. Sullivan. Berkeley: University of California Press. 225-241.

Barner-Barry, Carol. 1977. "An Observational Study of Authority in a Pre-School Peer Group." *Political Methodology*, 4: 276-300.

Fenno, Richard. *Home-Style: House Members in their Districts*. Boston: Little Brown. Appendix.

X. Aggregate Data and Linkage Designs (November 12)

Judd, Smith, and Kidder. *Research Methods in Social Relations*. 287-296; or Hoyle, Harris, and Judd (7th edition.) 381-393.

Jacob, Herbert. *Using Published Data*. 9-33.

Mannheim, Jarol and Richard C. Rich. 1991. *Empirical Political Analysis*, 3rd ed. New York: Longman. Ch. 13.

Stewart, David W. 1984. *Secondary Research: Information Sources and Methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage. 111-120.

Doggan, Mattei and Stein Rokkan. 1969. "Introduction." In *Quantitative Ecological Analysis in the Social Sciences*, eds. Mattei Dogan and Stein Rokkan. Cambridge: MIT Press. 1-9 only.

Stoker, Laura and Jacob Bowers. 2002. "Designing Multi-level Studies: Sampling Voters and Electoral Contexts." *Electoral Studies*, 21: 235-267.

Capoccia, Giovanni and Laura Stoker. 2013. "Selecting Units in Political Research." Paper presented at the 2013 American Political Science Association Meeting, Chicago.

Norrander, Barbara. 1989. "Explaining Cross-State Variation in Independent Identification." *American Journal of Political Science*, 33: 516-536.

Powell, Bingham G., Jr. 1986. "Extremist Parties and Political Turmoil: Two Puzzles." *American Journal of Political Science*, 30: 357-378.

Rosenstone, Steven J. and Raymond E. Wolfinger. 1978. "The Effect of Registration Laws on Voter Turnout." *American Political Science Review*, 72: 22-45.

Miller, Warren E. and Donald E. Stokes. 1963. "Constituency Influence in Congress." *American Political Science Review*, 57: 45-56.

XI. Content Analysis (November 19)

Hoyle, Harris, and Judd (7th edition.). *Research Methods in Social Relations*. 394-401

Krippendorff. *Content Analysis*. Foreword, Chs. 1-2, 4-7, 14.

Johnson, Janet Buttolph and Richard A. Joslyn. 1991. *Political Science Research Methods*. Second edition. Washington, DC: CQ Press. Ch. 9.

Woodrun, Eric. 1984. "'Mainstreaming' Content Analysis in Social Science." *Social Science Research*, 13: 1-19.

"Symposium: Discourse and Content Analysis" *Qualitative Methods*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pages 15-39; contributions by Herrera and Braumoeller; Hardy, Harley, and Phillips; Crawford; Lowe; Laffey and Weldes; Hopf; Neuendorf; and Fierke.

Neuendorf, Kimberly A. 2002. *The Content Analysis Guidebook*. Resources 1 ("Message Archives" by Paul D. Skalski), 2 ("Using NEXIS for Text Acquisition for Content Analysis"), and 3 ("Computer Content Analysis Software" by Paul D. Skalski), pp. 215-239. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Krippendorff, Klaus and Mary Angela Bock (eds.). 2009. *The Content Analysis Reader*. An assortment of selections. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Silver, Beverly J. 2003. *Forces of Labor: Worker's Movement and Globalization since 1870*. Appendix A ("The World Labor Group Database: Conceptualization, Measurement, and Data Collection Procedures") and Appendix B ("Instructions for Recording Data from Indexes"), pp. 181-203. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bilu, Yoram. 1989. "The Other as a Nightmare: The Israeli Encounter as Reflected in Children's Dreams in Israel and the West Bank." *Political Psychology*, 10: 365-390.

Humphrey, Ronald and Howard Schuman. 1984. "The Portrayal of Blacks in Magazine Advertisements: 1950-1982." *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 48: 551-563.

XII. Case Studies (November 26)

King, Keohane and Verba. *Designing Social Inquiry*. Chs. 2-3, 5 (except 5.1), 6. Re-read section 4.4.

Gerring, John. *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices*. New York: Cambridge University Press. 2007.

Symposium (skim as interested): "The Qualitative-Quantitative Disputation: Gary King, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba's *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*." *American Political Science Review*, 89:454-481. Essays by David D. Laitin, David Collier, Ronald Rogowski, Sidney Tarrow, and response by King, Keohane, and Verba.

Collier, David, Henry E. Brady, and Jason Seawright. 2004. "Critiques, Responses, and Trade-offs: Drawing Together the Debate" and "Sources of Leverage in Causal Inference: Toward an Alternative View of Methodology" in Henry E. Brady and David Collier (eds.) *Rethinking Social Inquiry*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

(skim) Eckstein, Harry. 1975. "Case Study and Theory in Political Science." In *Handbook of Political Science*, Vol. 7, eds. Fred I Greenstein and Nelson W. Polsby. Reading MA: Addison-Wesley. 79-137.

Campbell, Donald T. 1975. "'Degrees of Freedom' and the Case Study." *Comparative Political Studies*, 8: 178-193.

George, Alexander L. and Timothy McKeown. 1985. "Case Studies and Theories of Organizational Decision Making." In Robert Coulam and Richard Smith, eds., *Advances in Information Processing in Organizations*. Greenwich, CT.: JAI Press. 43-68.

Bennet, Andrew and Colin Elman. 2006. "Qualitative Research: New Developments in Case Study Methods." *Annual Review of Political Science*, 9: 455-76.

Mahoney, James. "Strategies of Causal Inference in Small-N Analysis" *Sociological Methods & Research*, 28: 387-424.

Bennet, Andrew and Colin Elman. 2006. "Complex Causal Relations and Case Study Methods: The Example of Path Dependence." *Political Analysis*, 14: 250-267.

Collier, David. 2011. "Understanding Process Tracing." *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 44: 823-830. Also, the associated online exercises ("Teaching Process Tracing: Examples and Exercises").

Haydu, Jeffrey. 1998. "Making Use of the Past: Time Periods as Cases to Compare and as Sequences of

Problem Solving." *The American Journal of Sociology*, 104: 339-371.

Büthe, Tim. 2002. "Taking Temporality Seriously: Modeling History and the Use of Narratives as Evidence." *American Political Science Review*, 96: 481-493.

Lustick, Ian S. 1996. "History, Historiography, and Political Science: Multiple Historical Records and the Problem of Selection Bias." *American Political Science Review*, 90: 605-618.

Lieberson, Stanley. 1991. "Small N's and Big Conclusions: An Examination of the Reasoning in Comparative Studies Based on a Small Number of Cases." *Social Forces*, 70: 307-320.

Savolainen, Jukka. 1994. "The Rationality of Drawing Big Conclusions Based on Small Samples: In Defense of Mill's Methods." *Social Forces*, 72: 1217-1224.

Jean Dreze and Amartya Sen. "China and India." Chapter 11, in *Hunger and Public Action*. Oxford University Press. Pages 204-225.

Nichols, Elizabeth. 1986. "Skocpol on Revolution: Comparative Analysis vs. Historical Conjuncture." *Comparative Social Research*, 9: 163-186, and rebuttal by Theda Skocpol: "Analyzing Causal Configurations in History: A Rejoinder to Nichols," pp. 187-194 in same volume.

For further reference, see: "Books Frequently Assigned in Qualitative Methods Courses" (from *Qualitative Methods* Vol. 1, No. 1, 2003) and "Addendum: More Books and Articles Assigned in Qualitative Methods Courses," both compiled by David Yang. Available at <http://www.asu.edu/clas/polisci/cqrm/Newsletter.html>

XIII. Cross-Cultural Research Strategies and Problems (December 3)

Ragin. *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. Chs. 3-5.

Mahoney, James and Gary Goertz. 2006. "A Tale of Two Cultures: Contrasting Quantitative and Qualitative Research." *Political Analysis*, 14: 227-249.

Jackman, Robert W. 1985. "Cross-National Statistical Research and the Study of Comparative Politics." *American Journal of Political Science*, 29: 161-182.

Back and Forth and Back and Forth on Causal Process Observations (mostly): Beck, Nathaniel. 2006. "Is Causal Process Observation an Oxymoron?" *Political Analysis*, 14, 347-352. Brady, Henry E., David Collier, and Jason Seawright. 2006. "Toward a Pluralistic Vision of Methodology." *Political Analysis*, 14: 353-368. Beck, Nathaniel. 2010. "Causal Process "Observation": Oxymoron or (Fine) Old Wine?" *Political Analysis*, 18: 499-505. Collier, David, Henry E. Brady, and Jason Seawright. 2010. "Outdated Views of Qualitative Methods: Time to Move On." *Political Analysis*, 18: 506-513.

Lieberman, Evan S. 2005. "Nested Analysis as a Mixed-Method Strategy for Comparative Research." *American Political Science Review*, 99: 435-452.

Wolf, Frieder. 2010. "Enlightened Eclecticism or Hazardous Hotchpotch? Mixed Methods and Triangulation Strategies in Comparative Public Policy Research." *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*. 4: 144-167.

"Symposium: Multi-Method Work, Dispatches from the Front Lines." 2007. *Qualitative Methods*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pages 9-28.

Bloemraad, Irene. 2007. "Of Puzzles and Serendipity: Doing Research with Cross-National Comparisons and Mixed Methods." In *Researching Migration: Stories from the Field*, (Eds.) Louis DeSipio, Manuel Garcia y Griego, and Sherrie Kossoudji. New York: Social Science Research Council.

Ebbinghaus, Bernhard. 2005. "When Less is More: Selection Problems in Large-N and Small-N Cross-National Comparisons." *International Sociology*, 20: 133-152.

Goldthorpe, John H. 1997. "Current Issues in Comparative Macrosociology." *Comparative Social Research*. 16: 121-132.

Goldstone, Jack A. 1997. "Methodological Issues in Comparative Macrosociology." *Comparative Social Research*. 16: 107-120.

Fearon, James D. 1991. "Counterfactuals and Hypothesis Testing in Political Science." *World Politics*, 43: 169-195.

Tetlock, Philip and Aaron Belkins, eds. 1996. *Counterfactual Thought Experiments in World Politics: Logical, Methodological, and Psychological Perspectives*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Chapter 1.

Collier, Ruth Berins and David Collier. 1991. *Shaping the Political Arena: Critical Junctures, The Labor Movement, and Regime Dynamics in Latin America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Overview and Ch. 1.

Achen, Christopher H. and Duncan Snidal. 1989. "Rational Deterrence Theory and Comparative Case Studies." *World Politics*. 41: 144-169.

XIV. Student Presentations (December 10)

Political Science 235
Introduction to Research Methods
Professor Stoker
Fall 2013

Overview of Paper Assignments

In what follows is a set of paper topics, falling under the following headings:

1. From Ideas to Measurement
2. Designing an Experiment
3. Designing a Quasi-experiment
4. Selecting a Sample
5. Asking Questions
6. Observing
7. Analyzing Content
8. Using Secondary Sources
9. Designing Cross-National Research

Everyone must write four short (5-page) papers during the course of the semester, though you will have some choice about which papers you write:

- (1) Everyone must write paper 1 and paper 4.
- (2) One of your papers must be on topic 2, 3, or 9.
- (3) One of your papers must be on topic 5, 6, 7, or 8.

I will address the due date for these papers in class.

As I will also explain in class, students may propose modifications to any paper assignment, but they must be cleared with me in advance. The paper descriptions below should be thought of as general templates.

Paper 1: From Ideas to Measurement

Measurement reliability and validity are fundamental to sound research. Brilliant ideas can founder because of poor measures. For this paper you are to develop first in a few paragraphs an idea, a question, or a hypothesis which you would like to explore. This does not have to be based on some grand theory, but it should at least be about something political. Your "objects" of interest might be individuals, nation-states, institutions, newspapers . . . anything. Then, hone in on two concepts, one "dependent" and one "independent" if appropriate in the context of your idea, and indicate how you would go about measuring them. Make sure you provide both conceptual and operational definitions, and clearly identify the units of observation/analysis. In addition, describe ways by which you could assess the reliability and validity of each of the measures. You need not worry about such matters as design and sampling. Here I am interested in seeing you move from ideas to measurement.

Paper 2: Designing Experiments

For a variety of reasons, experimental studies are on the rise in political science. We need to understand the power and limits of such designs, and to think creatively about how we might use such designs in examining the political world. For this paper you are to first formulate a problem or topic that could be investigated through experimentation. Then set out two different experimental designs (make use of the X and O notation in doing so). Remember that experimental designs are not confined to individuals as the unit of observation. Carefully describe the experimental setting and experimental conditions. Identify your dependent variable and pertinent moderating variables. Describe manipulation checks, if relevant. Discuss the strengths and weaknesses of each of your designs. Note: Go ahead and be creative and imaginative; just don't invent an

experiment that you are utterly incapable of carrying out.

Paper 3: Designing a Quasi-Experiment

Quasi-experiments are often more well suited to political research than are true experiments, and ordinarily superior to non-experimental designs. That said, comparisons among designs are often most illuminating when made in the context of a particular research problem. For this paper, first briefly lay out a research problem, and then carefully lay out a quasi-experimental design for addressing it. Then compare that design to two alternatives that you will inevitably have to present somewhat more sketchily: one non-experimental (or, possibly, a different quasi-experiment), and one experimental. Obviously, the research problem you choose for this paper must be amenable to testing in a variety of ways. When developing the comparison between designs, don't just list threats to internal or external validity; show how they apply in your particular case. Develop some overall conclusion as to the relative merit of your quasi-experimental design.

Paper 4: Selecting a Sample

Sampling enters into whatever kind of research we do, and usually at more than one point. We sample units of observation when deciding what set of people to interview, for example, or which nation-states to study. We sample time frames (e.g., gathering information for "1940-1950 and 1980-1990," or "10 a.m. to noon," or "the 101st Congress"). And we often sample in some way when devising measurement strategies (e.g., deciding which votes to analyze, which questions to ask, and so on). In this paper you are to begin by *briefly* laying out some research problem and a non-experimental or quasi-experimental design for addressing it. Then describe two alternative sampling plans for selecting your cases, and discuss their relative merits within the context of your particular topic. Be explicit. If at all plausible, use one probability and one non-probability sampling plan. Remember that both animate and inanimate populations can be sampled. Then give some attention to other kinds of sampling decisions you would need to confront in conducting your research.

Paper 5: Asking Questions

The design and sequencing of questions is more difficult than it may appear to be at first glance. Some problems are by now well known and can be avoided from the start (e.g., opening an interview with sensitive questions or asking "double-barreled" questions). Other problems with seemingly acceptable questions or sequences, however, will only be revealed as they are pilot-tested, or much later at the analysis stage. Moreover, the researcher must not only strive to avoid evident "problems," but also to make a variety of reasoned decisions about wording and sequence in light of his or her own research objectives (e.g., whether to offer a middle alternative). This mini-mini project is designed to give you a bit of experience in confronting such issues. Begin by specifying three concepts of interest to you, which can be operationalized through survey research methodology. For each concept develop two indicators, one based on open-ended questioning and the other based on closed-ended questioning. The latter should be multi-item in nature. Although you can use question formats employed by others, the questions themselves are to be original. (Examples of a variety of question formats can be found by consulting the codebooks for the National Election Studies or other surveys, which can be found in the SRC Library at Channing and Bowditch). Then create two different mini-interview forms with your questions: one might include all of the open-ended variants and one the closed-ended variants, or each might have open and closed variants. [You may want to pad the actual interview with a few other questions just for the experience]. Enlist a set of your friends and interview them. If they are inappropriate subjects for your inquiry, try to get them to "play along." Try to get at least three interviews using each form. Then, making reference to your interviewing experience (though going beyond this as well), write a paper that first introduces your concepts, indicators, and interview forms, and that then discusses the strengths and weaknesses of your questions. (i.e., Defend your questions in terms of their virtues and the pitfalls you have avoided; make comparisons between the open and closed versions. In doing so, you will have to give some attention to you how you would "code" the open-ended responses.) In addition, discuss any problems (with your question design or sequencing) that you discovered or encountered in the interviews.

Paper 6: Observing

Much of the data that we work with are "second hand" in the sense that the data are contrived, collected by others, based on individual self-reports, and/or refer to the activities of organizations and institutions that are not directly observable. At times, however, we want to observe directly the political phenomena of interest to

us. Some things learned in this way are impossible or difficult to learn in other ways. In this mini-mini project you are to make some simple observations in a systematic, potentially quantifiable fashion. The number of observations will depend upon your topic, but you will probably want at least 25-30 if you are coding several aspects of the behavior, and many more than that if you are picking up just one or two aspects. Just to trigger your imagination, here are some topics: compliance with traffic laws, littering behavior, gender and age-differentiated behavior, patterns of group segregation, use of idle time, newsstand/book shop behavior, posters and bumper stickers, consumer behavior, and so on. Try to develop a topic with at least some political relevance. In the paper, describe your basic hypothesis or hypotheses, the procedures you used (including the sampling, however crude), and the results (in simple form). Say something about the "so what" question. Address problems you encountered and ways you would change the project the next time around.

Paper 7: Analyzing Content

Recorded images—whether in word, picture, or sound—provide a ready source of political content and often comprise the bulk of evidence relevant to particular topics. For this mini-mini project, develop a modest research question that lends itself to content analysis and then go through the actual exercise. Any content medium is acceptable (speeches, newspapers, photos, cartoons, lyrics, TV, movies, graffiti, and so on). Although it is possible to develop quite sophisticated and complex coding schemes for content analysis, I will settle for something less ambitious here. Then write a short paper describing your efforts. Make sure to specify your operational definitions, sampling procedures, recording units, and problems encountered. A summary report of the results should conclude the paper. This means you should make enough observations to generate a few descriptive statistics (e.g., percentages, averages if appropriate).

Paper 8: Using Secondary Sources

Quantitative research frequently involves the use of data that have been collected and compiled by others, often for purposes other than the ones for which we want to use them. Traditionally, these materials have been in published, "hard copy" versions. Increasingly, however, the secondary sources are machine readable data files. Both types of secondary sources provide relative inexpensive opportunities for research, but they also raise a number of potential problems. These problems have mainly to do with questions of reliability, validity, and coverage (regarding the population of interest). For this mini-mini project, you are to build and analyze an original dataset developed from secondary sources. Specifically, you should consult two or more secondary source for the purposes of extracting data on at least three variables associated with some particular set of observational units (e.g., civil units, political groups, elites, events, and so on). The key here is that you should build the dataset, yourself, from data on two or more sources, rather than simply using a ready-made dataset someone else build. You will probably need at least 20-25 cases in order to perform a little analysis of the relationships among these three variables. You may also want to include a longitudinal component into your design by gathering information on the variables at two or more time points, but this is not necessary (it may not be feasible or pertinent given your research question). In your paper, first briefly describe your research question. (This will be a more interesting exercise if you are testing some sort of hypothesis, or trying to determine if your three variables tap into the same underlying dimension). Your subsequent discussion should: describe the sampling procedure *you* used in order to select your units; identify and comment briefly on any problems of measurement reliability and validity or of population coverage involved in the variables you use; indicate something about the nature of your results.

Paper 9: Designing Cross-National Research

In this paper you are to propose a cross-national study that consists of gathering information on at least two countries (and probably more). Other than this, there are no other constraints on the design. Make clear the basis for the selection of your countries and your various data gathering plans. Clearly identify your plans for within-case analysis and address how they, along with your between-case analysis, help answer your research question. Describe any problems you foresee in carrying out the research. Then, and in brief, sketch out a *second* research project that compensates for some of the limitations of the first (such that the two projects together would form a sensible program of research). Note: For some students the cases they care most about may not be countries but, rather, other large entities (e.g., U.S. States, political parties). Substituting these entities for countries is OK but clear it with me first.