

POLS 208: Research Design and Methods

Spring 2019

Emory University

Anthropology 303

Monday and Wednesday 1-2:15pm

Instructor:

Professor Beth Reingold
beth.reingold@emory.edu

Office Hours:

Mondays 3-4pm, or by appointment
331 Tarbutton

Teaching Assistants (TAs):

Sivaram Cheruvu
Braden Dausat
Pearce Edwards

Office Hours in 120C Tarbutton:

Mondays 11am-noon
Mondays 3-4pm
Wednesdays 2:30-3:30pm

Course Description

This course provides an introduction to the theory and method of contemporary political analysis. It prepares students to read, interpret, critique, design, and conduct original, empirical research in political science. Tracing the research process, students will learn how to formulate research questions, theoretical models, and empirical hypotheses; and then how to design a rigorous, detailed plan for collecting or creating data with which to test such hypotheses. The course introduces common research strategies for descriptive and causal inference, which students will use to design an original research project in a group setting.

POLS 208 builds skills that are essential for both understanding the research students encounter in upper-level political science courses and being able to produce high-quality original research of your own. It is, thus, mandatory for majors in Political Science and International Studies at Emory University. The Department strongly encourages all students to take this course during their first two years of coursework.

Prerequisite: QTM 100 Introduction to Statistical Inference (or QTM 220 or ECON 220)

Learning Objectives

- Understand and appreciate the advantages and challenges of applying the scientific method to the study of politics
- Identify and explain the role of theory and hypotheses in addressing research questions
- Appreciate the challenges of defining and measuring abstract political science concepts
- Understand and apply a variety of techniques for testing causal hypotheses
- Evaluate the internal and external validity of different types of research designs – experimental and observational; quantitative and qualitative

- Understand and adopt strategies for collecting a wide variety of primary and secondary data, including: surveys and interviews; archival research; and coding media content, government records, etc.
- Working collaboratively with other students, design a study that can: address an important political science question or puzzle; build upon the strengths and weaknesses of existing research; and make a significant contribution to our knowledge and understanding of politics – past, present, and future

Assignments and Assessments

Your final grade will be a weighted average of the following components:

Class Participation (15%)

You should come to class ready to participate. Participation can mean responding to questions posed by the instructor, but it can also mean posing questions of your own. The best way to prepare to participate is to read the materials assigned for the day thoroughly and carefully. Think while you read: take notes, highlight important passages, jot down ideas, identify sources of confusion, write down your questions. When reading particular research studies (i.e., assigned journal articles) prepare notes that identify the research question, describe the theoretical argument, list the hypotheses tested (including the primary variables and units of analysis), describe the major attributes and components of the research design (including the spatial and temporal scope of the data), and highlight the main findings/results and conclusions.

Participation in the lecture/class-as-a-whole and in the TA-led discussion section will be weighed equally. Regular attendance at class and sections is essential and expected. One cannot participate without being there.

- During lecture-class, all students will have frequent (but unannounced) opportunities to participate in real-time surveys or quizzes. Your participation grade will be based largely on the percentage of surveys/quizzes to which you respond (fully). It does not matter whether your responses are “correct.” Additional points (1-5 per day) will be granted for voluntary participation in class discussion. Five points will be deducted if the instructor calls on you and you are not there.
- During discussion sections, TAs will monitor class participation at their own discretion.

Allowances will be made for *excused* absences only. Absences are excused only by a written request from a College Dean, an academic advisor in the Office of Undergraduate Education, an Emory coach, or another Emory official in charge of school-sponsored activities that require such absences. Observance of religious holidays also will be considered an excused absence. You should notify the instructor and/or TA ahead of time, in writing, if you must miss class or section for this reason. Short-term illness is not an excused absence, unless verified/documented as debilitating or highly contagious by a medical/health professional or Emory official.

Midterm (25%) and Final (30%) Exams

There will be an in-class midterm exam on March 6th. A cumulative final exam will be administered during the regularly scheduled final exam period for this class: Tuesday, May 7th, 3-5:30pm. Both exams will be closed-book, closed-notes, with a mixture of short answer/essay and multiple-choice formats.

Group Research Design Project (30%)

Each student will complete a research design paper as a member of a team. The final draft of the paper will be due on **May 2 by 11:59pm**. This paper will involve original empirical research on a topic of the team's own choosing, addressing a theoretically-grounded research question of interest to political scientists. The team will be expected to design a research project that could be utilized to evaluate the empirical validity of a single hypothesis or set of hypotheses pertaining to the political phenomenon under study. Your research question, theory, and hypothesis should address a *causal* relationship. For example, you might seek to investigate whether a decrease in economic growth causes states to be vulnerable to regime change. Your proposed study should then seek to draw a causal inference about the hypothesis from the data collected (or to be collected). Each team should begin to consider possible research topics as soon as possible. Teams are strongly encouraged to consult with the TAs and/or instructor as they develop their projects.

Specifically, projects will develop in the following stages. Unless otherwise noted, all deadlines are **at midnight (11:59pm)** on the specified due-date.

1. *Team Construction* (**January 29**) Teams are comprised (ideally) of three students. All team members are expected to be familiar with and contribute to the entire project. However, each member will play one of three leading roles: (1) Team Leader, (2) Theoretical Leader, and (3) Design and Data Leader. The Team Leader is primarily responsible for overall organization and planning of group activities as well as communication with the TAs and/or instructor. Team Leaders should work to ensure that all aspects of the group project are implemented according to plan; this includes making sure the paper is written in a coherent fashion and properly documented. The Theoretical Leader is primarily responsible for ensuring that the paper's literature review is coherent and useful. They are also responsible for ensuring that the theoretical argument and empirical hypothesis(es) are clearly articulated and well connected. The Design and Data Leader is primarily responsible for ensuring that the paper's research plan for testing the hypothesis(es) is clearly and thoroughly articulated and methodologically effective. They should work to ensure that all necessary data are (or will be) collected, to the extent feasible. The instructor and TAs will assign students to teams and designate leadership roles. To the extent possible, members of each team will be in the same discussion section or at least have the same TA.

To assist the instructor and TAs in the construction of research teams **you are required** to answer a brief survey no later than **January 23**.

Once constructed, each team will be required to complete a *Team Contract* outlining the group's procedures, expectations, and strategies for implementation. Team Contracts should be submitted via Canvas along with Topic Proposals on **February 11**.

2. *Topic Proposal* (due **February 11**) Teams must propose a research topic in writing and submit it via Canvas. A research topic describes generally the subject of your investigation. For example, topics include concepts or phenomena like violent conflict, terrorism, voting behavior, political participation, legislative behavior, policy adoption, economic development, rights protection, or government formation. Your team's proposal should specify a topic and suggest *at least three* lines of inquiry that might be of interest to team members. So, for example, suppose you are interested in the topic of violent conflict. You might be interested in understanding why very weak states sometimes engage in conflict with very powerful states. You might also be interested in the ways that conflict might influence development or the distribution of wealth. Or you might be interested in whether and how peacekeeping missions are effective in preventing conflict from re-occurring. The instructor and TAs will approve topics or require the team to make a new proposal.
3. *Individual Literature Reviews* (due **March 4**) Each team member must conduct their own preliminary literature review. Your literature review should annotate at least 15 scholarly sources/works on your topic. At least 8 of those must have appeared in a peer-reviewed journal. Each team should annotate at least 27 unique sources. We will discuss the precise format of these preliminary literature reviews in class. Each student should submit his/her individual literature review via Canvas.
4. *Research Question* (due **March 20**) Teams must propose their research questions in writing via Canvas. A research question proposal must offer a precise, researchable question (or set of questions). So, for example, whereas regime survival is a topic, it is not a research question. A research question on the topic of regime survival is: Do large natural resource reserves destabilize democratic regimes? The research question proposal should articulate why this question is important and what implications might be drawn from addressing it effectively.
5. *Theoretical Argument and Hypothesis* (**due April 1**) Teams will submit a brief statement of their proposed theoretical argument and hypothesis via Canvas. The theoretical argument should give a tentative answer to the research question you propose. It also should provide an explanation. So, if you are asking whether natural resources destabilize democratic regimes, then your argument has to explain how or why (or by what mechanism) it does or does not. (The theoretical argument does not need to be an original one. You can "borrow" one from your literature review.) The hypothesis should be an empirical implication of your theoretical argument, which you can test empirically (using observable, quantitative and/or qualitative data).

6. *Preliminary Research Plan* (due **April 15**) Teams will draft and submit a preliminary outline of their strategy or plan for testing their hypothesis via Canvas. In this plan, you should discuss how you will measure your key concepts; the observations or units of analysis you plan to include; key sources of data and/or strategies for collecting data; and how you propose to use that data to draw a causal inference.

In preparation for your Preliminary Research Plan, at least one team member is required to *meet with Dr. Rob O'Reilly* (Head of Data Services, Emory Center for Digital Scholarship) or his staff to help identify any potential sources of secondary data. To schedule an appointment, email Dr. O'Reilly directly at: roreill@emory.edu. Do not wait until the last minute! This consultation should be one of the first steps in developing your research plan.

7. *Final Research Design Paper* (due **May 2**) The final paper, to be submitted by each team via Canvas, should include the following components:
- a. An introduction in which you explain the significance of the topic and specify your research question
 - b. A literature review in which you discuss prior efforts to answer this question (and/or related questions)
 - c. A theoretical argument that addresses the question and offers an explanation or rationale
 - d. A hypothesis or empirical implication of the theoretical argument
 - e. A plan for testing the hypothesis that discusses:
 - i. The conceptualization and measurement of all necessary variables
 - ii. The unit of analysis and the population or sample of observations to be studied
 - iii. Sources of data and/or strategies for collecting data with which to measure all necessary variables
 - iv. A strategy or design for using the data or observations to draw a causal inference
 - f. An evaluation of the inferential strengths and weaknesses of your proposed research plan, in which you discuss: the validity and reliability of your measures; potential threats to causal inference; and the extent to which your proposed research is generalizable
 - g. A brief conclusion summarizing why this proposed research is worthwhile.
 - h. Preliminary dataset, codebook, questionnaire, and/or coding protocol (depending on the nature of your data collection plan)

All written assignments (#2-7 above) should be (1) typed, double-spaced, (2) properly documented in accordance with the APSA Style Manual, (3) proofread for mistakes, and (4) neat and professionally presented. Please include page numbers.

Grades for the Group Project will be allocated as follows:

- Overall paper grade (55%) Each team member receives credit equally for the overall assignment.
- Individual literature review (15%) Each team member receives credit individually for their personal literature review annotations.
- Group assessment (15%) Each team member receives credit individually for the group's evaluation of his/her/their contribution to the group.
- Role assessment (15%) Each team member will receive credit individually for the role they played in the project. This evaluation will be done by the designated TA, in consultation with the instructor. To help the TAs and instructor make this assessment, each team member will submit a self-assessment of their work on the assignment.

Group and Self Assessments are due via Canvas by **11:59pm on May 7**.

Standards for Final Course Grades

Final course letter grades will reflect the Political Science Department's grading standards, detailed below. Clearly, it is impossible for each assessment (class participation, exams, group project components) to reflect the standard exactly. Instead, the assessments, taken as a whole, are designed to produce a final grade that reflects the Department's standards.

A Exceptional Performance

Consistently outstanding work on all course-related tasks at a level that distinguishes the student from other members of the class. A comprehensive and incisive command of the issues, readings, and substantive information relevant to the course. A frequently demonstrated exceptional capacity for original, creative, critical, and logical thinking. The ability to master and integrate large amounts of factual material and abstract theories. An outstanding ability to effectively discuss course subject matter using both written and oral communication skills.

A- Excellent Performance

Consistently strong work on all course-related tasks. A comprehensive command of the issues, literature, and substantive information relevant to the course. A clearly demonstrated capacity for original, creative, critical, and logical thinking. Understands well and can integrate the relevant factual and theoretical material central to the course. A strong ability to effectively discuss course subject matter using both written and oral communication skills.

B+ Very Good Performance

Consistently above average work on all course-related tasks. A very good grasp of the issues, literature, and substantive information relevant to the course. A generally demonstrated capacity for original, creative, critical, and logical thinking. A very good command of factual and theoretical material, and some capacity to integrate the two. A solid ability to effectively discuss course subject matter using both written and oral communication skills.

B Good Performance

Good and generally consistent work on all course-related tasks. A general understanding of the issues, literature, and substantive information relevant to the course. Modest evidence of the capacity for original, creative, critical, and logical thinking. A good understanding of factual and theoretical material, but limited evidence of the capacity to integrate the two. A basic ability to effectively discuss course subject matter using both written and oral communication skills.

B- Satisfactory Performance

Satisfactory work on course-related tasks. A reasonable understanding of the issues, literature, and substantive information relevant to the course. An infrequently demonstrated capacity for original, creative, critical, and logical thinking. Understands at basic level the facts and theories related to the course, but demonstrates weak integration skills. A limited or inconsistent ability to effectively discuss course subject matter using both written and oral communication skills.

C+/C/C- Adequate Performance

Adequate performance on course-related tasks. An understanding of the basic elements of the issues, literature, and substantive information relevant to the course. A rarely demonstrated capacity for original, creative, critical, and logical thinking. An inability to go beyond a recitation of basic factual material related to the class. Demonstrated weaknesses in the ability to effectively discuss course subject matter using both written and oral communication skills.

D+/D Minimal Passing Performance

Barely acceptable work on course-related tasks. A generally superficial and often inconsistent familiarity with the issues, literature, and substantive information relevant to the course. A failure to demonstrate the capacity for original, creative, critical, and logical thinking related to course content. An uneven understanding of basic factual material related to the course; no evidence of fact/theory integration. Demonstrates significant gaps in the ability to discuss effectively course subject matter using both written and oral communication skills.

F Unacceptable Performance

Fails to meet minimum course expectations. Unable to understand even the most basic elements of the issues, literature, and substantive information relevant to the course. Demonstrates an inability to engage in coherent written or oral discussion of course material. Does not satisfy specific course expectations with respect to attendance, deadlines, participation, etc.

Course Policies

Late Assignments

You will be penalized for late assignments or missed exams, unless the delay/absence is due to a documented serious illness or is otherwise excused by the instructor in advance (such as for certain official Emory-sponsored activities). The penalty for unexcused late assignments or exams is one letter-grade “minus” (e.g., from a B to a B-) each day late (including weekends and holidays). For example, an A-worthy individual literature review submitted one day late will be given an A- instead. Penalties for failure to submit Group Project assignments 2 and 4-7 will affect the group’s overall paper grade. For example, suppose your group produces A-level work on your final paper, but you submitted your preliminary research plan one day late. You will all receive an A- (instead of an A) for the overall paper grade component of the Group Project. (Individual-level factors contributing to the delay may also be incorporated into the group and role assessments.)

Extra-Credit Work

Under no circumstances will extra credit work be permitted.

Course related communication

Outside of class, discussion sections, and office hours, the instructor and TAs will communicate with students primarily through Canvas and email – *not* social media (facebook, twitter, etc.). Students are responsible for checking your email and the Canvas site regularly. We will do our best to limit such communication to regular “business” hours (M-F 9-5).

Laptops and other electronic devices

Use of computers and other electronic devices (including tablets and phones) is strictly *prohibited* in class, unless and until explicit permission from the instructor is granted. All such devices must be turned off and put away prior to the start of class. When and only when prompted by the instructor, students will need to use their smartphones or laptops to participate in class surveys or quizzes. Please read this article about why taking notes by hand is better than using a laptop: <http://www.vox.com/2014/6/4/5776804/note-taking-by-hand-versus-laptop>

Academic Integrity

The honor code is in effect throughout the semester. By taking this course, you affirm that it is a violation of the code to cheat on exams, to plagiarize, to deviate from the teacher’s instructions about collaboration on work that is submitted for grades, to give false information to a faculty member, and to undertake any other form of academic misconduct. You agree that the teacher is entitled to move you to another seat during examinations, without explanation. You also affirm that if you witness others violating the code you have a duty to report them to the honor council.

<http://catalog.college.emory.edu/academic/policies-regulations/honor-code.html>

Plagiarism is an Honor Code violation particularly relevant to this course. The Appendix of the Honor Code offers a very helpful guide on the proper use of sources in writing research papers.

Further advice on how to avoid plagiarism and properly document one's sources is available on the course Canvas site (see *APSR Style Manual*; Babbie, "Avoiding Plagiarism," in *The Practice of Social Research*, 10th ed., pp. 488-89) and will be provided by the instructor as needed.

Disability Accommodations

If you have a documented disability and anticipate barriers related to the format or requirements of this course, or presume having a disability (e.g. mental health, attention, learning, vision, hearing, physical or systemic) and are in need of accommodations for this semester, we encourage you to contact the Office of Accessibility Services (OAS) to learn more about the registration process and steps for requesting accommodations. If you are currently registered with OAS and have not received a copy of your accommodation notification letter within the first week of class, please notify OAS immediately. Students who have accommodations in place are encouraged to arrange some time with your professor, during the first week of the semester, to communicate your specific needs for the course as it relates to your approved accommodations. All discussions with OAS and faculty concerning the nature of your disability remain confidential. For additional information regarding OAS, please visit the website: <http://equityandinclusion.emory.edu/access>.

Readings

We will use one primary textbook:

Remler, Dahlia K., and Gregg G. Van Ryzin. 2015. *Research Methods in Practice: Strategies for Description and Causation, 2nd edition*. Los Angeles, Sage Publications.
[hereafter referred to as 'RvR']

The RvR textbook is available at the Emory Barnes and Noble Bookstore for purchase; two copies are on Reserve at Woodruff Library. All other readings listed below are available (free of charge) via *eJournals*, Library Course Reserves, or other online sources as noted.

Please let the instructor know as soon as possible if any of the readings are not available.

Course Outline, Schedule, and Readings

Unless otherwise noted, all readings listed below are *required*. Students should read them prior to scheduled class.

Jan 16 – Introduction

Review the syllabus, course goals, etc. What is “original” or “primary” research? Why do it?

Recommended for further reading:

~Booth, Wayne C., Gregory G. Colomb, and Joseph M. Williams. 2003. *The Craft of Research*, 2nd edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Part 1: “Research, Researchers, and Readers,” pp. 3-5, 9-31 ONLY [Reserves]

~Reiter, Dan. 2015. “Scholars Help Policymakers Know Their Tools.” War on the Rocks (August 27): <https://warontherocks.com/2015/08/scholars-help-policymakers-know-their-tools/>

Jan 21 – NO CLASS (MLK Holiday)

Jan 23 – The Science in Political Science

What does (good) research in the social sciences (really) look like and why do we do it? What does doing scientific research require of us?

~RvR, Chp. 1

~Johnson, Janet Buttolph, H.T. Reynolds, and Jason D. Mycoff. 2016. *Political Science Research Methods*, 8th edition. Los Angeles: Sage/CQ Press.

Chp. 2 (“The Empirical Approach to Political Science”), pp. 46-54(top) ONLY [Reserves]

~King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Chp. 1 (“The Science in Social Science”), pp. 3-12 ONLY [Reserves]

~Johnson, George. 1999. “It’s a Fact: Faith and Theory Collide over Evolution.” *New York Times* (15 August): <http://www.nytimes.com/1999/08/15/weekinreview/ideas-trends-beginning-it-s-fact-faith-theory-collide-over-evolution.html>

Recommended for viewing:

~Oliver, John. 2016. “Scientific Studies.” Last Week Tonight with John Oliver (HBO): <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ORnq1NpHdmw> (note: includes some sexually explicit material)

Group Project Survey due (11:59pm)

Jan 28 – Call and Response: Questions and Theories

What makes for a good research question? What is ‘theory’ in political science? Where does it come from? What makes some theories better than others?

~King, Keohane, and Verba 1994, Chp. 1 (“The *Science* in Social Science”), Section 1.2, pp. 12-28 ONLY [*Reserves*]

~RvR, Chp. 2, pp. 49-52 and 25-30 ONLY

~Ziblatt, Daniel. 2009. “Shaping Democratic Practice and the Causes of Electoral Fraud: The Case of Nineteenth-Century Germany.” *American Political Science Review* 103(1): pp. 1-3(1st column) ONLY [*eJournals*]

Jan 29 – Research teams constructed

Jan 30 – The Literature Review

What is “the literature?” How do we find it? Function of the lit review: How to read and write about “the literature”

Guest Speaker:

Dr. Chris Palazzolo, Head of Collections and Social Sciences Librarian, Woodruff Library

~RvR, Chp. 17, pp. 529-540 ONLY

~(review) Ziblatt 2009, pp. 1-3

~Iyengar, Shanto, Mark D. Peters, and Donald R. Kinder. 1982. “Experimental Demonstrations of the ‘Not-So-Minimal’ Consequences of Television News Programs.” *American Political Science Review* 76(December): pp. 848-849 ONLY [*eJournals*]

Feb 4 – Tools of Theory Building: Hypotheses, Models, Variables, and Units of Analysis

How do we (begin to) specify and test theories? What is a hypothesis, model, variable, unit of analysis and how are they all related?

~RvR, Chp. 2, pp. 30-49 ONLY

~Gerber, Alan S., Donald P. Green, and Christopher W. Larimer. 2008. “Social Pressure and Voter Turnout: Evidence from a Large-Scale Field Experiment.” *American Political Science Review* 102(1): 33-36 ONLY (stop at “Experimental Design” heading) [*eJournals*]

Feb 6 – Qualitative Approaches to Theory Building

How are theories developed? What’s the difference between formulating a theory and testing a theory?

~RvR, Chp. 3 [skim pp. 65-81]

~Gade, Emily K. 2018. "The Built Environment of Conflict: Checkpoints, Connection and Militancy." Working Paper, University of Washington. [Reserves]

Feb 11 – Descriptive Inference: Conceptualization and Measurement

What does it mean to "measure" a concept? How do we measure concepts? What distinguishes a better measure from a worse one? Validity and reliability; nature and sources of measurement error; levels of measurement/precision

~RvR, Chp. 4

~Ziblatt 2009, pp. 3-8 ONLY

Research Topic Proposal and Team Contract due (11:59pm)

Feb 13 – Descriptive Inference: Sampling and Statistical Significance

What/Whom to include and why? How do we use what we can "see" to infer what we cannot? What does 'statistical significance' mean – and not mean?

~RvR, Chp. 5

~RvR, Chp. 9, pp. 291-304 ONLY

Feb 18 – Causal Inference and the Logic of Experimental Design

What does it mean to say that X causes Y? Difference between correlation and causation; criteria for establishing/testing causality. Why are experiments the "gold standard" of causal inference?

~RvR, Chps. 11 and 14

~Iyengar, Peters, and Kinder 1982, pp. 849-858

Feb 20 – Causal Inference and the Logic of Experimental Design (continued)

Feb 25 – Experimental Design Outside the Laboratory: Field Experiments

~Kalla, Joshua L., and David E. Broockman. 2016. "Campaign Contributions Facilitate Access to Congressional Officials: A Randomized Field Experiment." *American Journal of Political Science* 60(3): 545-58. [eJournals].

Feb 27 – Experimental Design Outside the Laboratory: Survey Experiments

~McEntire, Kyla Jo, Michele Leiby, and Matthew Krain. 2015. "Human Rights Organizations as Agents of Change: An Experimental Examination of Framing and Micromobilization." *American Political Science Review* 109(3): 407-426. [*eJournals*]

Mar 4 – Catch up and review

Individual Literature Review due (11:59pm)

Mar 6 – Midterm Exam

Mar 11 & 13 – NO CLASS (Spring Break)

Mar 18 – Gathering Data (Preview): Searching for and accessing secondary sources of quantitative data

Guest Speaker:

Dr. Rob O'Reilly, Head of Data Services, Emory Center for Digital Scholarship

~RvR, Chp. 6

~RvR, Chp. 3, pp. 65-66 ONLY

Mar 20 – Causal Inference in Observational Studies

What are the key challenges to causal inference presented by observational data? What strategies can be used to overcome those challenges? To what extent and how can we use multiple regression to estimate causal effects?

~RvR, Chps. 12 and 13

~Ziblatt 2009, pp. 8-12 ONLY

Recommended for a refresher:

~RvR, Chp. 10

Research Question due (11:59pm)

Mar 25 – Causal Inference in Observational Studies (continued)

Mar 27 – Causal Process Tracing

~Collier, David. 2011. "Understanding Process Tracing." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 44(4): 823-30. [eJournals]

~Brady, Henry E. 2010. "Data-Set Observation versus Causal-Process Observations: The 2000 U.S. Presidential Election." Appendix (pp. 267-271) of *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*, eds. Henry E. Brady and David Collier. New York: Roman & Littlefield. [Reserves]

~Ziblatt 2009, pp. 12-18 ONLY

Apr 1 – Causal Inference in Comparative Case Studies

~Liu, Amy H., and Jacob I. Ricks. 2012. "Coalitions and Language Politics: Policy Shifts in Southeast Asia." *World Politics* 64(3): 476-506. [eJournals]

Theoretical Argument and Hypothesis Statement due (11:59pm)

Apr 3 – Causal Inference in Natural and Quasi Experiments

~RvR, Chp. 15, pp. 466-484 and 492-494 ONLY

~Kolata, Gina. 2011. "First Study of Its Kind Shows Benefits of Providing Medical Insurance to Poor." *New York Times* (7 July):

<http://www.nytimes.com/2011/07/07/health/policy/07medicaid.html>

~Glynn, Adam N., and Maya Sen. 2015. "Identifying Judicial Empathy: Does Having Daughters Cause Judges to Rule for Women's Issues?" *American Journal of Political Science* 59(1): 37-54. [eJournals]

Apr 8 – Natural and Quasi Experiments (continued): Difference-in-Differences Design

~RvR, Chp. 15, pp. 484-490 ONLY

~Lyll, Jason. 2009. "Does Indiscriminate Violence Incite Insurgent Attacks? Evidence from Chechnya." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 53(3): 331-362.

Apr 10 – Natural and Quasi Experiments (continued): Instrumental Variables and Regression Discontinuity Design

~RvR, Chp. 15, pp. 490-492

~Hansford, Thomas G., and Brad T. Gomez. 2010. "Estimating the Electoral Effects of Voter Turnout." *American Political Science Review* 104(2): 268-288. [eJournals]

Apr 15 – Natural and Quasi Experiments (continued)

Preliminary Research Plan due (11:59pm)

Apr 17 – Gathering Data: Secondary Data (quantitative and qualitative)

~(review) RvR, Chp. 6

~(review) RvR, Chp. 3, pp. 65-66

~Waite, Matt. 2013. "Handling Data about Race and Ethnicity" *Source: An OpenNews Project*:
<https://source.opennews.org/en-US/learning/handling-data-about-race-and-ethnicity/>

Apr 22 – Gathering Data: Primary Data (with a focus on surveys and interviews)

~RvR, Chp. 7

~RvR, Chp. 3, pp. 67-79 ONLY

Apr 24 – Gathering Data: Coding and Content Analysis

~RvR, Chp. 3, pp. 79-81 ONLY

~Johnson, Reynolds, and Mycoff 2016, "Content Analysis," pp. 270-275 (plus Figures 9-1 and 9-2 on pp. 276-277) ONLY [*Reserves*]

Apr 29 – Catch up and review

May 2 – Final Paper due (11:59pm)

May 7 – Final Exam (3-5:30pm)

Group and Self Assessments due (11:59pm)