
GOV 391K: Scope and Methods, Fall 2018**1 Instructor Information**

Professor Michael Findley
Phone: 512.232.7208
Email: mikefindley@utexas.edu

Office: BAT 3.108
Office Hrs: T 12:30–3:30 & by appt
Class Location: GAR 3.116

2 Course Overview

Scope and Methods is a core, foundational course in the department. The material in this course is crucial for development as a scholar-teacher in political science. In beginning a PhD program, you are embarking on a new phase in which it is vital that you shift away from being a consumer of knowledge towards becoming a producer, indeed connoisseur, of knowledge. To arrive, you need to become conversant in the full range of political science theoretical and methodological approaches, and then master at least some subset of these approaches. In other words, even if you envision yourself becoming a “quantitative” or “qualitative” expert, you should still be able to speak the other languages.

We will cover a lot of material in this course. And it is extremely important you take yourself well beyond familiarity and much closer to mastery. If you did not take a “Political Inquiry”, “Research Design”, or “Scope and Methods” course prior to beginning the PhD program, you may need to devote extra attention to mastering the material for the course. In general, you will need to engage deeply with the assigned readings, participate actively in discussion, and otherwise seek to master the scope and methods of political science.

3 Requirements**3.1 Required Readings**

The following books are required:

- Angrist, Joshua D., Jorn-Steffen and Prischke. 2015. *Mastering 'Metrics: The Path from Cause to Effect*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Brady, Henry, and David Collier. Eds. 2010. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. 2nd ed. Lanham, Md: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Gerring, John. 2012. *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- King, Gary, Robert Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- O’Hear, Anthony. 1991. *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Science*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine, and Dvora Yanow. 2012. *Interpretive Research Design: Concepts and Processes*. New York: Routledge.

Some journal articles and other readings are also required and can be obtained through the library or Canvas. Specific reading assignments subject to change as needed during the semester, though no new books will be required beyond those listed above.

I also encourage you to purchase and read the following books, though these readings are not strictly required.

Bernard, H. Russell. 2006. *Research Methods in Anthropology: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. 4th Edition. Lanham, Md: Altamira Press.

Box-Steffensmeier, Janet M., Henry E. Brady, and David Collier. Eds. 2008. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. In the Oxford Handbooks of Political Science Series. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kellstedt, Paul M., and Guy D. Whitten. 2009. *The Fundamentals of Political Science Research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Moore, Will H., and David A. Siegel. 2013. *A Mathematics Course for Political and Social Research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. (Including video supplements: [Here])

Pollock, Philip H., III. 2012. *The Essentials of Political Analysis*. 4th Ed. Los Angeles: Sage.

Trochim, William, and James Donnelly. 2008. *The Research Methods Knowledge Base*. Mason, OH: Cengage Learning.

3.2 Participation

Attendance and participation are worth 25% of your grade. Each of you needs to participate actively in weekly discussions. We should have lively, engaging discussion that explore the state of knowledge on the topics as well as creative frontiers. To accomplish this, you need to attend class very well-prepared. I expect each of you to participate *at bare minimum* once every session, but on average you should be speaking substantially more than that. If you are not comfortable speaking in class, then you should talk to me before the second week of class so we can help you become comfortable or work out other arrangements. Should participation not be satisfactory, I may institute a “reading response” requirement, which would entail weekly submissions of summaries of all assigned readings. In addition to our regular discussions of scope and methods, at the end of each class session we will set aside time for “professionalization” discussions.

3.3 Assignments

All assignments should be 3 double-spaced pages in length (before tables/figures) and tentative due dates are listed below. Please complete 5 of the 7 assignments. Each assignment is worth 15% of your grade for a total of 75%.

3.3.1 Concepts and Measurement

Choose a political science concept of interest to you. Begin with a concept of value to your subfield such as “representation”, “terrorism”, “corruption”, etc. Feel free to check with me before proceeding.

Discuss how the concept is defined, operationalized, and validated. The reading material for the week on conceptualization and measurement discusses all three of these processes, and we will also discuss them more in class. This exercise is a foundational task that sometimes we take for granted. But it is terribly important that we learn how to define, operationalize, and validate our concepts.

After finding the concept in at least two data sets, examine the way the concept is operationalized for empirical analysis and then come up with a plan for improved operationalization and validation. In other words, critique how others are using the concept in practice and, as part of your critique, offer some suggestions for how the concept could be employed to greater effect.

Due: October 16

3.3.2 Causal Analysis

Identify a scholarly article of interest and critique it with an emphasis on threats to valid causal inference. The article can be any one of your choosing, so long as it explicitly identifies a causal research question and conducts empirical analysis to test that question.

In your assignment, please begin with the full citation to the article so that I can find it easily. You should begin by summarizing the article (1–2 paragraphs), explicitly discussing the research question, what concept is to be explained, what concept provides the primary explanation, causal mechanisms, research design, and results.

After the citation and summary, you may structure the critique in any way that you would like so long as you discuss which aspects of the article promote valid causal inference and which aspects of the design may suffer from threats to valid causal inference.

Due: October 30

3.3.3 Experimental Analysis

Identify a well-known political science theory, derive a concrete testable hypothesis, and design the outline of an experiment that will test the hypothesis. Note that you should feel free, and I encourage you, to use the question you’ve been developing off and on in class.

Once you have the question, in about a page go through the exercise of explaining the concepts, discussing the theoretical links between the two, and then operationalizing the concepts. Then discuss sampling, assignment, manipulation of an intervention, outcome, etc, in ways that will allow you to provide a test of the question/theory identified in the first page.

Be sure to think about what the experiment gets you in terms of ability to explain. Also think about threats to valid inference and discuss how the experiment would fall short. Also think about and very briefly discuss whether a different method would get you a better answer. Part of this discussion should explicitly focus on how the other method would fix problems inherent in the experiment without introducing new problems.

Due: November 6

3.3.4 Replication

Identify a published article that has publicly available replication data. Replicate the statistical work and extend the argument to a new domain. For the assignment, first identify replication data for a published article. Many journals now require replication data to be posted on the author's website which most comply with (e.g., mine www.michael-findley.com) or on a journal website (e.g., see AJPS dataverse).

Once you download and open the data, you should use the authors' command script (e.g., Stata .do file) file to replicate the exact results reported in the paper. In your memo, please comment on how easy it is to replicate those results. If you run the models and you do not get the same results, then please report on that too. Regardless, please include with your paper whatever results you get (in tables/figures) when you try to replicate what is in the published paper.

Once you have replicated (or not) what is in the published paper, then you should next try to extend the analysis in some way. That might include adding a new variable, adding some new years, using a different statistical method, etc. You should motivate the extension theoretically or empirically, and discuss what you learn from the exercise, and include relevant tables/figures.

Due: November 13

3.3.5 Qualitative Analysis

Identify a well-developed research question and create a qualitative case selection strategy, or case analysis strategy. Qualitative research design strategies vary widely and so you need to justify well why you choose the specific strategy you do. Begin with a research question, preferably the one you are working with in class, and develop some testable hypotheses. This should take a maximum of one page and probably less.

Then discuss the logic of an overall qualitative strategy relative to a quantitative strategy justifying how the qualitative strategy will be more useful for your particular question. To be clear, you don't need to defend a particular qualitative approach in this more general comparison with quantitative methods. But following the general comparison, identify a particular qualitative method and justify it relative to other qualitative approaches. The measure of how strong the particular case selection/analysis strategy is depends crucially on the research question at hand and you should discuss with an eye towards providing the most defensible substantive answer to the research question.

Due: November 27

3.3.6 Qualitative Normative Design

Pick a concept of interest that can be connected to a normative ideal, such as equality, freedom, justice, democracy, legitimacy, etc. Next, choose one methodology in political theory, such as normative analytic political theory, critical theory, the history of political thought (and maybe an even more specific school, such as the Cambridge School or the Straussian approach). First, briefly discuss how the specific methodology you chose approaches and analyzes various different concepts (this is a rather broad discussion about the application of the methodology you chose to a wide variety of concepts). Next, discuss how this methodological approach is suited to explaining your specific concept. You also need to briefly discuss

how other political theory methodologies have addressed (or would address) your concept, in addition to your discussion on how the specific methodology you chose have addressed the concept.

Due: December 11

3.3.7 Data Generation

With a carefully selected research question, generate data that could be used to test the question. Note you will not provide a comprehensive test but rather begin the data collection process. You might visit an archive, interview a political actor, code up a survey and administer it, etc. In your assignment discuss the strengths of your data generation strategy, but also the weaknesses.

As with other assignments, you need to justify the data generation approach with an eye towards which type of data will enable you to answer your question best. You should also pay close attention to other important issues we've discussed during the semester such as conceptualization and operationalization. Finally, apply the principles we read and discuss for the class on data collection and standards in that you should document your data collection in the best possible way, where you'll define best in relation to those principles we discuss in class.

Due: December 11

4 University and Course Policies

4.1 Academic Integrity

UT students should seek to be completely honest in their dealings with others. They should complete their own work and be evaluated based upon that work. They should avoid academic dishonesty and misconduct in all its forms, including plagiarism, fabrication or falsification, cheating, and other academic misconduct. Students are expected not only to be honest but also to assist other students in fulfilling their commitment to be honest.

While students should make a general commitment to proper academic conduct, there are still specific skills most students need to master over time in order to correctly cite sources, especially in the age of the internet, as well as deal with the stress and strain of college life without resorting to cheating. Please know that as your professor I will notice instances of cheating on exams or plagiarizing on papers.

Writing submitted for credit at UT must consist of the student's own ideas presented in sentences and paragraphs of his or her own construction. The work of other writers or speakers may be included when appropriate (as in a research paper or book review), but such material must support the student's own work (not substitute for it) and must be clearly identified by appropriate introduction and punctuation and by footnoting or other standard referencing.

The substitution of another person's work for the student's own or the inclusion of another person's work without adequate acknowledgment (whether done intentionally or not) is known as plagiarism. It is a violation of academic, ethical, and legal standards and can result in a failing grade not only for the paper but also for the course in which the paper is written. In extreme cases, it can justify expulsion from the University. Because of the seriousness of the

possible consequences, students who wonder if their papers are within these guidelines should visit a writing lab or consult a faculty member who specializes in the teaching of writing or who specializes in the subject discussed in the paper. Useful books to consult on the topic include the current *Harbrace College Handbook*, the *MLA Handbook*, and James D. Lester's *Writing Research Papers*.

Please also see the University Honor Code site for more information at:
<http://registrar.utexas.edu/catalogs/gi09-10/ch01/index.html>.

4.2 Access

The University of Texas at Austin is committed to providing a working and learning atmosphere that reasonably accommodates qualified persons with disabilities. If you have any disability which may impair your ability to complete this course successfully, please contact the Division of Diversity and Community Engagement, Services for Students with Disabilities, 512-471-6259, <http://www.utexas.edu/diversity/ddce/ssd/>.

4.3 Religious Holidays

By UT Austin policy, you must notify me of your pending absence at least fourteen days prior to the date of observance of a religious holy day. If you must miss a class, an examination, a work assignment, or a project in order to observe a religious holy day, you will be given an opportunity to complete the missed work within a reasonable time after the absence.

4.4 Emergencies

Please also see the following recommendations regarding emergency evacuation from the Office of Campus Safety and Security, 512-471-5767, <http://www.utexas.edu/safety/>. 1. Occupants of buildings on The University of Texas at Austin campus are required to evacuate buildings when a fire alarm is activated. Alarm activation or announcement requires exiting and assembling outside. 2. Familiarize yourself with all exit doors of each classroom and building you may occupy. Remember that the nearest exit door may not be the one you used when entering the building. 3. Students requiring assistance in evacuation shall inform their instructor in writing during the first week of class. 4. In the event of an evacuation, follow the instruction of faculty or class instructors. 5. Do not re-enter a building unless given instructions by the following: Austin Fire Department, The University of Texas at Austin Police Department, or Fire Prevention Services office. 6. Behavior Concerns Advice Line (BCAL): 512-232-5050. 7. Link to information regarding emergency evacuation routes and emergency procedures can be found at: www.utexas.edu/emergency.

5 Tentative Course and Reading Schedule

5.1 September 4: Syllabus and Introduction

- Almond, "Separate Tables: Schools and Sects in Political Science."

- Monroe, et al., “The Nature of Contemporary Political Science: A Roundtable Discussion.”
- Grant, “What Divides Us? The Image and Organization of Political Science.”
- Harris-Perry, “An Interview with Melissa Harris-Perry.”

5.2 September 11: What are the Fundamentals of Political (Social) Science Research?

Required readings

- King, Keohane, & Verba, DSI: Chp. 1, “The Science in Social Science”
- Gerring, SSM: Preface; Chp. 1, “A unified framework”
- Kellstedt and Witten, FPSR: Chp. 1: “The Scientific Study of Politics” P. 1–18.
- Angrist and Pischke, “Introduction” and “Chapter 1: Randomized Trials”
- Box-Steffensmeier, Brady, & Collier: Chp. 1: “Political Science Methodology”
- *Professionalization Discussion: Making the Most of your TA/RA Assignment*
 - Webb, Derek. 2005. “Twelve Easy Steps to Becoming an Effective Teaching Assistant.” *PS: Political Science and Politics*
 - Burmila, Edward M. 2010. “Graduate Students as Independent Instructors: Seven Things to Know about Teaching Your Own Course While in Graduate School.” *PS: Political Science and Politics*

Recommended:

- Dixit, “My System of Work (Not!)”

5.3 September 18: Methods of Observation and Inference

Required readings

- O’Hear, AIPS: Chps. 1–4 & 9
- Schwartz-Shea and Yanow, IRD: Introduction
- Popper 1953: [Link \[Here\]](#)
- Lakatos, 1978. *The methodology of Scientific Research Programmes Philosophical Papers, Volume I*. Read Pp. 8–101.
- Clarke & Primo, “Modernizing Political Science:”
- Wedeen, “Conceptualizing Culture...”
- *Professionalization Discussion: How to Write a Literature Review*

- Golash-Boza, Tanya. “Writing a Literature Review: Six Steps to Get You from Start to Finish.” <https://hub.wiley.com/community/exchanges/discover/blog/2015/07/02/writing-a-literature-review-six-steps-to-get-you-from-start-to-finish>
- Knopf, Jeffrey. 2006. “Doing a Literature Review.” *PS: Political Science and Politics*

Recommended:

- Clarke and Primo. *A Model Discipline*.
- Diesing. *How Does Social Science Work?*
- Martin & McIntyre, *Readings in the Philosophy of Social Science*.
- Little. *Varieties of Social Explanation*.
- Rosenberg. *Philosophy of Science*.
- Anderson, 2011: “Democracy, Public Policy, and Lay Assessments of Scientific Testimony.”

5.4 September 25: Research Questions

Required readings

- Gerring, SSM: Chp. 2, “Beginnings”
- Garfinkel, *Forms of Explanation*: Introduction and Chp. 1
- Geddes, *Paradigms and Sand Castles*. Chp 2: “Big Questions, Little Answers.”
- Schwartz-Shea and Yanow, IRD: Chps. 1–2
- Eidlin, “The Method of Problems...”
- Nisbett, “The Anticreativity Letters” (Online [Here])
- *Professionalization Discussion: How to Build an Effective Presentation*
 - Salmond and Smith. 2011. “Cheating Death-by-PowerPoint: Effective Use of Visual Aids at Professional Conferences.” *PS: Political Science and Politics*
 - Smith and Salmond. 2011. “Verbal Sticks and Rhetorical Stones: Improving Conference Presentations in Political Science.” *PS: Political Science and Politics*

Recommended:

- Varian, “How to Build an Economic Model in Your Spare Time.”
- Loehle, “A Guide to Increased Creativity in Research.”
- Gans and Shepherd, “How Are the Mighty Fallen...”
- Yanow and Schwartz-Shea, *Interpretation and Method*.

5.5 October 2: Theory & Modeling

Required readings

- Gerring, SSM, Chp. 3: “Arguments”
- Kellstedt and Witten, Chp. 2: “The Art of Theory Building” P. 22–43.
- Wagner, “Who’s Afraid of ‘Rational Choice Theory’?”
- Wolford, “Chapter 2: The Theory of War I: Commitment Problems.”
- de Marchi & Page. “Agent-Based Modeling.” P. 1–20.
- *Professionalization Discussion: Early Steps for Preparing for Prelims*
 - Mitchell. “A Guide to Preparing for and Taking Comprehensive Examinations.” University of Oregon. https://rmitchel.uoregon.edu/tip/comp_take
 - Lampe and Kesgin. “Hazing in the Discipline: The Comprehensive Examination in Political Science.” University of Iowa. <http://myweb.uiowa.edu/bhlai/workshop/lampe.pdf>
 - GradHacker. 2012. “Surviving Studying for Comprehensive Exams.” <http://www.gradhacker.org/2012/01/20/studying-for-comprehensive-exams/>

Recommended:

- de Marchi, *Computational and Mathematical Modeling in the Social Sciences*.
- Garfinkel, *Forms of Explanation*. Remaining Chapters.
- Hodgson and Knudsen, “Introduction: The Challenge of Darwinism for the Social Sciences”
- Lieberson, *Making It Count*. Chp 5.
- Osborne, *An Introduction to Game Theory*.
- Macy & Willer “From Factors to Actors: Computational Sociology and Agent-Based Modeling.”
- Miller & Page, *Complex Adaptive Systems*.
- Shepsle & Bonchek, *Analyzing Politics*.

5.6 October 9: Concepts & Measurement

Required readings

- Gerring, SSM, Chps. 5 & 7: “Concepts” & “Measurements”
- Elkins, “Gradations of Democracy?”
- Seawright and Collier, “Rival Strategies of Validation”

- Munck and Verkuilen, “Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy...”
- Schwartz-Shea & Yanow. IRD: Chp 6.
- *Professionalization Discussion: Gender in the Discipline*
 - Clayton et al., “All Male Panels...”
 - Dion et al., “Gendered Citation Patterns...”
 - Mitchell and Martin, “Gender Bias in Student Evaluations.”
 - Pyke, “Service and Gender Inequity...”

Recommended:

- Carmines & Zeller. *Reliability and Validity Assessment*.
- Goertz, *Social Science Concepts*.
- Collier, Laporte, and Seawright. “Typologies: Forming Concepts and Creating Categorical Variables.”
- Sartori, “Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics”

5.7 October 16: Sampling & Inference

Required readings

- King, Keohane, Verba, DSI, Chp 2: “Descriptive Inference”
- Trochim & Donnelly, RMKB, Chp. 2, “Sampling”
- Gerring, SSM, Chps. 4 & 6: “Analyses” & “Descriptive Arguments”
- Findley, et al “Elite and Mass Support...”
- *Professionalization Discussion: How to Best Approach Your Dissertation Project*
 - Cochrane, John H. 2005. “Writing Tips for Ph.D. Students.” Graduate School of Business. University of Chicago.
 - Bertucci, Mariano E. 2015. “Why, and How, to Bridge the ‘Gap’ Before Tenure.” *PS: Political Science and Politics*.

Recommended:

5.8 October 23: Causal Analysis

Required readings

- King, Keohane, Verba, DSI, Chp 3: “Causality and Causal Inference”
- Gerring, SSM, Chps. 6, 8, & 9: “Descriptive Arguments”, “Causal Arguments”, & “Causal Analyses”
- Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, IRD, Chps 3–5: “Starting from Meaning”, “Rhythms of Interpretive Research I”, & “Rhythms of Interpretive Research II”
- Fearon, “Counterfactuals and Hypothesis Testing in Political Science”
- Holland, “Statistics and Causal Inference”
- Falleti and Lynch, “Context and Causal Mechanisms...”
- Cho and Manski, “Cross-Level/Ecological Inference.”
- Angrist and Pischke, Review “Chapter 1: Randomized Trials” from Week 2
- *Professionalization Discussion: Early Steps to the Job Market and Life after Graduate School*
 - Drezner, Daniel. 1998. “So You Want to Get a Tenure-Track Job...” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 31: 609–614.
 - Miller, William J., and Bobbi Gentry. 2011. “Navigating the Academic Job Market in Treacherous Times.” *PS: Political Science and Politics*.
 - Fuerstman, Daniel, and Stephan Lavertu. 2005. “The Academic Hiring Process: A Survey of Department Chairs.” *PS: Political Science and Politics*
 - Murakami, Michael H. 2012. “The Broad Value of a PhD in Political Science.” *PS: Political Science and Politics*
 - Marshall, Bryan W. and John M. Rothgeb, Jr. 2011. “So You Want Tenure? Factors Affecting Tenure Decisions in Political Science Departments.” *PS: Political Science and Politics*
 - Gadarian, Shana. 2017. “The Academic Job Market.”
 - Kosar, Kevin R. 2016. “Preparing for Unforeseen Opportunities Outside Academia.” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 49(3).
 - Becker, Megan, and Kelebogile Zvobgo. 2018. “Smoothing the Pipeline: A Strategy to Match Graduate Training with the Professional Demands of Professorship.” Unpublished Paper: University of Southern California.

Recommended:

- Lewis, “Causation”, [Link here](#)
- Leamer, “Let’s Take the Con Out of Econometrics.”

- Hempel, *Aspects of Scientific Explanation and Other Essays in the Philosophy of Science*.
- Salmon, *Scientific Explanation and the Causal Structure of the World*.
- Scriven, “Causation as Explanation.”
- Morgan & Winship, *Counterfactuals and Causal Inference*.

5.9 October 30: Experiments & Quasi-Experiments

Required readings

- Gerring, SSM, Chps. 10 & 11: “Causal Strategies: X and Y” & “Causal Strategies: Beyond X and Y”
- McDermott: “Experimental Methods in Political Science.”
- Dunning: “Transparency, Replication, and Cumulative Learning.”
- Cartwright and Deaton, “Understanding and Misunderstanding Randomized Controlled Trials.”
- Angrist and Pischke, Chapters 2–3, “Regression” and “Instrumental Variables”
- Albertson, “Dog Whistle Politics”
- Findley et al, “Causes of Non-Compliance with International Law”
- Hyde, “The Observer Effect in International Politics”
- *Professionalization Discussion: Publishing Your Research*
 - Rich, Timothy S. 2013. “Publishing as a Graduate Student: A Quick and (Hopefully) Painless Guide to Establishing Yourself as a Scholar.” *PS: Political Science and Politics*
 - Polsky, Andrew. 2007. “Seeing Your Name in Print: Unpacking the Mysteries of the Review Process at Political Science Scholarly Journals.” *PS: Political Science and Politics*
 - Giles, Micheal W., and James C. Garand. 2007. “Ranking Political Science Journals: Reputational and Citational Approaches.” *PS: Political Science and Politics*
 - Garand, James C., and Micheal W. Giles. 2011. “Ranking Scholarly Publishers in Political Science: An Alternative Approach.” *PS: Political Science and Politics*

Recommended:

- Gerber & Green, *Field Experiments: Design, Analysis, and Interpretation*.
- Green & Gerber, “Reclaiming the Experimental Tradition in Political Science.”
- Morton & Williams, *Experimental Political Science and the Study of Causality*.

- Shadish, Cook, and Campbell, *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs*
- Findley et al: “Using Field Experiments in International Relations”
- Lieberson, Chps 2–4

5.10 November 6: Quantitative observational designs

Required readings

- Angrist and Pischke, Chapters 4–5, “Regression Discontinuity Designs” and “Differences-in-Differences”
- Achen, “Let’s Put Garbage Can Regressions...”
- Jensenius, “The Fieldwork of Quantitative Data Collection”
- Schrodt, “Seven Deadly Sins”
- King, Keohane, Verba, DSI, Chps 4–5: “Determining What to Observe” & “Understanding What to Avoid”
- Hainmueller, et al, “How Much Should we Trust Estimates from Multiplicative Interaction Models?”
- *Professionalization Discussion: Effective Computing Practices for Data Analysis*
 - Clinton, Josh. “Advice on Computing Issues.”
 - King, Gary. 1995. “Replication, Replication.” *PS: Political Science and Politics*
 - Bowers, Jake. 2011. “Six Steps to a Better Relationship with your Future Self.” *The Political Methodologist* http://www.jakebowers.org/PAPERS/tpm_v18_n2.pdf

Recommended:

- Stock & Watson, *Introduction to Econometrics*.
- Wooldridge, *Introductory Econometrics*.
- Achen, “Toward a New Political Methodology”
- Green, Kim, & Yoon, “Dirty Pool”

5.11 November 13: Qualitative observational designs

Required readings

- Ricks and Liu, “Process Tracing Research Designs”
- Collier, “Understanding Process Tracing”
- King, Keohane, and Verba, Chp. 6: “Increasing the Number of Observations.”

- Brady & Collier, RSI, Chps. 1, 3, 4, & 8: “Refocusing the Discussion of Methodology”, “Doing Good and Doing Better”, “Some Unfulfilled Promises”, & “Critiques, Responses, and Trade-Offs”
- Brady & Collier, RSI, Chps. 9–12: “Sources of Leverage”, “Process Tracing”, “On Types of Scientific Inquiry”, & “Data-Set Observations versus Causal-Process Observations”
- Gerring, “What is a Case Study and What is it Good for?”
- Mahoney and Goertz, “A Tale of Two Cultures...”
- Geddes, Chp 4: “How the Evidence You Use...”
- Scoggins, “Navigating Fieldwork as an Outsider”
- Leech, “Asking Questions.”
- Loyle and Simoni. 2017. “Researching Under Fire.”
- *Professionalization Discussion: Grant Writing in Political Science*
– Readings TBA

Recommended:

- Rathbun, “Interviewing and Qualitative Field Methods”
- Beach & Pedersen, *Process-Tracing Methods: Foundations and Guidelines*.
- George and Bennett, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*.
- Sparrow, “Political Science and Biography”
- Gerring, “What is a Case Study and What Is It Good for?”
- Hunter, “The Normalization of an Anomaly”
- Trachtenberg, *The Craft of International History*.
- Nielsen, “Case Selection via Matching.”
- Weeden, “Reflections on Ethnographic Work in Political Science.”
- Yin, *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*.

5.12 November 20: Mixed-method designs

Required readings

- Collier and Elman, “Qualitative and Multimethod Research”
- Fearon & Laitin. “Integrating Qualitative and Quantitative Methods”
- Lieberman “Nested Analysis as a Mixed-Method Strategy”
- Paluck, “The Promising Integration of Qualitative Methods and Field Experimentation”
- Seawright and Gerring, “Case Selection Techniques in Case Study Research”
- Johns and Wellhausen, “Under One Roof”
- *Professionalization Discussion: Managing your Time: Life and Work Balance*
 - No Readings

Recommended:

- Bennett and Braumoeller, “Where the Model Frequently Meets the Road”
- Ahmed and Sil, “When Multi-Method Research Subverts Methodological Pluralism”

5.13 November 27: Design, Data Collection, & Scientific Standards

Required readings

- Miguel, et al, “Promoting Transparency in Social Science Research”
- Schwartz-Shea & Yanow. IRD, Chp. 7: “Design in Context”
- Nosek, et al, “Promoting an Open Research Culture”
- Fujii, “Research Ethics 101”
- McMurtie, “Secrets from Belfast”
- Science Transparency and Openness Guidelines (<http://centerforopenscience.org/top/>)
- Findley et al. 2016: “Can Results-Free Review Reduce Publication Bias?”
- Belmont Report: Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research. [Link \[Here\]](#)
- Code of Federal Regulations, Section 46, Protection of Human Subjects. [Link \[Here\]](#)
- Sides, “The Political Scientist as a Blogger.”
- Gerber and Malhotra, “Do Statistical Reporting Standards Affect What is Published”

- http://www.nature.com/news/how-scientists-fool-themselves-and-how-they-can-stop-1.18517?WT.mc_id=scientists-fool-themselves-and-how-they-can-stop-1.18517?WT.mc_id=FBK_NatureNews
- *Professionalization Discussion: Reviewing Articles, Discussing Papers: How to Be Constructive*
 - Miller, Beth, et al. 2013. “How to Be a Peer Reviewer: A Guide for Recent and Soon-to-be PhDs” *PS: Political Science and Politics*

Recommended:

- Barrett, Christopher B., and Jeffrey W. Cason. 2010. *Overseas Research: A Practical Guide*. London: Routledge Press.
- Gerring, SSM, Chp. 13: “Unity and Plurality”
- Paluck, “Methods and ethics...”

5.14 December 4: Normative dimensions

Required readings

- T. L. Pangle and T. W. Burns. 2015. *The Key Texts of Political Philosophy: An Introduction*. Cambridge University Press. Chps 1 (Pp. 1–9), 12, 13, and 14.
- Guest speaker: Tom Pangle.

6 References

- Achen, Christopher H. 2002. “Toward a New Political Methodology: Microfoundations and ART.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 5: 423–450.
- Achen, Christopher H. 2005. “Let’s Put Garbage-Can Regressions and Garbage-Can Probits Where They Belong.” *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 22: 327–339.
- Ahmed, Amel, and Rudra Sil. 2012. “When Multi-Method Research Subverts Methodological Pluralism—or, Why We Still Need Single-Method Research.” *Perspectives on Politics* 10(4): 935–953.
- Albertson, Bethany. 2015. “Dog Whistle Politics: Multivocal Communication and Religious Appeals.” *Political Behavior* 37: 3–26.
- Almond, G.A., 1988. “Separate tables: schools and sects in political science.” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 21(4): 828–842.
- Anderson, Elizabeth. 2011. “Democracy, Public Policy, and Lay Assessments of Scientific Testimony.” *Episteme*. 8(2): 144–164.
- Angrist, Joshua D., Jorn-Steffen and Prischke. 2015. *Mastering ‘Metrics: The Path from Cause to Effect*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Barrett, Christopher B., and Jeffrey W. Cason. 2010. *Overseas Research: A Practical Guide*. London: Routledge Press.
- Beach, Derek, and Rasmus Brun Pedersen. 2013. *Process-Tracing Methods: Foundations and Guidelines*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Bennett, Andrew, and Bear Braumoeller. 2005. "Where the Model Frequently Meets the Road: Combining Statistical, Formal, and Case Study Methods." Unpublished Manuscript: Georgetown University.
- Bernard, H. Russell. 2006. *Research Methods in Anthropology: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. 4th Edition. Lanham, Md: Altamira Press.
- Box-Steffensmeier, Janet M., Henry E. Brady, and David Collier. Eds. 2008. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. In the Oxford Handbooks of Political Science Series. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brady, Henry, and David Collier. Eds. 2010. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. 2nd ed. Lanham, Md: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Brintnall, Michael, Tony Affigne, and Dianne Pinderhughes. 2008. "Political Science in the United States: Noes on the Discipline." Paper prepared for the IPSA Conference on International Political Science: New Theoretical and Regional Perspectives. Concordia University, Montreal, Canada, April 30 - May 2, 2008.
- Carmines, Edward, and Richard Zeller. 1979. *Reliability and Validity Assessment*. In Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences Series. Sage University Paper #17.
- Deaton, A. and Cartwright, N., 2018. "Understanding and misunderstanding randomized controlled trials." *Social Science & Medicine* 210: 2–21.
- Cho, W.T. and Manski, C.F., 2008. "Cross-Level/Ecological Inference." In *The Oxford handbook of political methodology*.
- Clarke, Kevin A., and David M. Primo. 2007. "Modernizing Political Science: A Model-Based Approach." *Perspectives on Politics* 5(4): 741–753.
- Clarke, Kevin A., and David M. Primo. 2012. *A Model Discipline: Political Science and the Logic of Representations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Collier, David, and Colin Elman. 2008. "Qualitative and Multimethod Research: Organizations, Publication, and Reflections on Integration." In Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier, Henry E. Brady, and David Collier. Eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Collier, David, Jody Laporte, and Jason Seawright. 2008. "Typologies: Forming Concepts and Creating Categorical Variables." In Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier, Henry E. Brady, and David Collier. Eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Pp. 152–173.

- de Marchi, Scott. 2005. *Computational and Mathematical Modeling in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- de Marchi, Scott, and Scott E. Page. 2014. “Agent-Based Models.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 17: 1–20.
- Diesing, Paul. 1991. *How Does Social Science Work? Reflections on Practice*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Dixit, Avinash. 1998. “My System of Work (Not!)” In Michael Szenberg (Ed.) *Passion and Craft* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. Pp. 69–81.
- Dunning, Thad. 2012. “The Central Role of Qualitative Evidence.” In *Natural Experiments in the Social Sciences: A Design-Based Approach*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Pp. 208–232.
- Dunning, Thad. 2016. “Transparency, Replication, and Cumulative Learning: What Experiments Alone Cannot Achieve.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 19: 541–563.
- Eidlin, Fred. 2011. “The Method of Problems versus the Method of Topics.” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 44(4): 758–761.
- Elkins, Zachary. 2000. “Gradations of Democracy? Empirical Tests of Alternative Conceptualizations.” *American Journal of Political Science* 44(2): 293–300.
- Falleti, T.G. and Lynch, J.F., 2009. “Context and causal mechanisms in political analysis.” *Comparative political studies* 42(9): 1143–1166.
- Fearon, James D. 1991. “Counterfactuals and Hypothesis Testing in Political Science.” *World Politics* 43: 169–195.
- Fearon, James D. 1995. “Rationalist Explanations for War.” *International Organization* 49(3): 379–414.
- Fearon, James D. and David D. Laitin. 2008. “Integrating Qualitative and Quantitative Methods.” In Janet Box-Steffensmeier, Henry E. Brady, and David Collier, eds., *Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press.)
- Findley, Michael G., Adam S. Harris, Helen V. Milner, and Daniel L. Nielson. 2016. “Elite and Mass Support for Foreign Aid vs. Government Programs: Experimental Evidence from Uganda.” Working paper.
- Findley, Michael G., Nathan M. Jensen, Edmund J. Malesky, and Thomas B. Pepinsky. 2016. “Can Results-Free Review Reduce Publication Bias? The Results and Implications of a Pilot Study.” *Comparative Political Studies*.
- Findley, Michael G., Daniel L. Nielson, and J.C. Sharman. 2013. “Using Field Experiments in International Relations: A Randomized Study of Anonymous Incorporation.” *International Organization* 67(4): 657–693.

- Findley, Michael G., Daniel L. Nielson, and J.C. Sharman. 2014. “Causes of Non-Compliance with International Law: Evidence from a Field Experiment on Financial Transparency.” *American Journal of Political Science*
- Fujii, Lee Ann. 2012. “Research Ethics 101: Dilemmas and Responsibilities.” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 45(4): 717–723.
- Gans, Joshua, and George Shepherd. 1994. “How Are the Mighty Fallen: Rejected Classic Articles by Leading Economists.” *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 8(1): 165–179.
- Garfinkel, Alan. 1981. *Forms of Explanation: Rethinking the Questions in Social Theory*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Geddes, Barbara. 2010. *Paradigms and Sand Castles: Theory Building and Research Design in Comparative Politics*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- George, Alexander L., and Andrew Bennett. 2005. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Gerber, Alan S., and Donald P. Green. 2012. *Field Experiments: Design, Analysis, and Interpretation*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- 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): 33–48.
- Gerber, Alan S., 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.
- Gerring, John. 2004. “What is a Case Study and What Is It Good for?” *American Political Science Review* 98(2): 341–354.
- Gerring, John. 2012. *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goertz, Gary. 2006. *Social Science Concepts: A User’s Guide*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Goertz, Gary, and James Mahoney. 2012. *A Tale of Two Cultures: Qualitative and Quantitative Research in the Social Sciences*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Grant, J.T., 2005. “What divides us? the image and organization of political science.” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 38(3): 379–386.
- Green, Donald P., Soo Yeon Kim, and David H. Yoon. 2001. “Dirty Pool.” *International Organization* 55(2): 441–468.
- Green, Donald, and Alan Gerber. 2002. “Reclaiming the Experimental Tradition in Political Science.” In Ira Katznelson and Helen Milner (Eds.) *Political Science: State of the Discipline*. New York: W.W. Norton. Pp 805–832.

- Hainmueller, J., Mummolo, J. and Xu, Y., 2018. “How much should we trust estimates from multiplicative interaction models? Simple tools to improve empirical practice.” Unpublished Manuscript, Stanford University.
- Harris-Perry, M. and Friess, S., 2015. “An Interview with Melissa Harris-Perry.” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 48(S1): 26–30.
- Hempel, Carl G. 1965. *Aspects of Scientific Explanation and Other Essays in the Philosophy of Science*. New York: Free Press.
- Hodgson, Geoffrey M., and Thorbjorn Knudsen. 2010. *Darwin’s Conjecture: The Search for General Principles of Social and Economic Evolution*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Holland, Paul W. 1986. “Statistics and Causal Inference.” *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 81(396): 945–960.
- Hunter, Wendy. 2007. “The Normalization of an Anomaly: The Worker’s Party in Brazil.” *World Politics* 59(3): 440–475.
- Hyde, Susan. 2007. “The Observer Effect in International Politics: Evidence from a Natural Experiment.” *World Politics* 60: 37–63.
- Jensenius, Francesca Refsum. 2014. “The Fieldwork of Quantitative Data Collection.” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 47(2): 402–404.
- Johns, Leslie, and Rachel Wellhausen. Forthcoming. “Under One Roof: Supply Chains and the Protection of Foreign Investment.” *American Political Science Review* .
- Kellstedt, Paul M., and Guy D. Whitten. 2009. *The Fundamentals of Political Science Research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- King, Gary. 1995. “Replication, Replication.” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 28: 443–452.
- King, Gary, Robert Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Lakatos, I., 1978. *The methodology of scientific research programmes, vol. 1. Philosophical Papers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lave, Charles A., and James G. March. 1975. *An Introduction to Models in the Social Sciences*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Leamer, Edward. 1983. “Let’s Take the Con Out of Econometrics.” *American Economic Review* 73: 31–43.
- Leech, Beth. 2002. “Asking Questions: Techniques for Semistructured Interviews.” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 35(4): 665–668.
- Lewis, David. 1973. “Causation.” *The Journal of Philosophy* 70(17): 556–567.

- Lieberman, Evan (2005). “Nested Analysis as a Mixed-Method Strategy for Comparative Research.” *American Political Science Review* 99(3): 435–452.
- Lieberman, Stanley. 1985. *Making it Count: The Improvement of Social Research and Theory*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Little, Daniel. 1991. *Varieties of Social Explanation: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Social Science*. Boulder, Co: Westview Press.
- Liu, Amy H., and Jacob L. Ricks. 2012. “Coalitions and Language Politics: Policy Shifts in Southeast Asia.” *World Politics* 64(3): 476–506.
- Loehle, Craig. 1990. “A Guide to Increased Creativity in Research—Inspiration or Perspiration?” *Bioscience* 40(2): 123–129.
- Loyle, Cyanne E. and Alicia Simoni. 2017. “Researching Under Fire.” *PS: Political Science and Politics*
- Macy, Michael W., and Robert Willer. 2002. “From Factors to Actors: Computational Sociology and Agent-Based Modeling.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 28: 143–166.
- Mahoney, James. 2010. “After KKV: The New Methodology of Qualitative Research.” *World Politics* 62(1): 120–147.
- Mahoney, James, and Gary Goertz. 2006. “A Tale of Two Cultures: Contrasting Quantitative and Qualitative Research.” *Political Analysis* 14(3): 227–249.
- Martin, Michael, and Lee McIntyre. 1995. *Readings in the Philosophy of Social Science*. Cambridge MA: The MIT Press.
- McDermott, Rose. 2002. “Experimental Methods in Political Science.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 5: 31–61.
- McMurtrie, Beth. 2014. “Secrets from Belfast: How Boston College’s oral history of the Troubles fell victim to an international murder investigation.” *Chronicle of Higher Education*. 26 January 2014. <http://chronicle.com/article/Secrets-from-Belfast/144059/>
- Miguel, Edward, et al. 2014. “Promoting Transparency in Social Science Research.” *Science* 343: 30–31.
- Miller, Beth, Jon Pevehouse, Ron Rogowski, Dustin Tingley, Rick Wilson. 2013. “How to Be a Peer Reviewer: A Guide for Recent and Soon-to-Be PhDs.” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 46(1): 120–123.
- Miller, John H., and Scott E. Page. 2007. *Complex Adaptive Systems: An Introduction to Computational Models of Social Life*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Monroe, K., Almond, G., Gunnell, J., Shapiro, I., Graham, G., Barber, B., Shepsle, K. and Cropsey, J., 1990. “The nature of contemporary Political Science: a roundtable discussion.” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 23(1): 34–43.

- Moore, Will H., and David A. Siegel. 2013. *A Mathematics Course for Political and Social Research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. (Including video supplements: [Here])
- Morgan, Stephen, and Christopher Winship. 2007. *Counterfactuals and Causal Inference: Methods and Principles for Social Research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Morton, Rebecca B. and Kenneth C. Williams. 2010. *Experimental Political Science and the Study of Causality: From Nature to the Lab*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Munck, G.L. and Verkuilen, J., 2002. “Conceptualizing and measuring democracy: Evaluating alternative indices.” *Comparative political studies* 35(1): 5–34.
- Nielsen, Richard A. 2014. “Case Selection via Matching.” *Sociological Research and Methods* (Here)
- Nisbett, Richard, E. 2002. “The Anticreativity Letters: Advice from a Senior Tempter to a Junior Tempter.” Unpublished Manuscript: University of Michigan.
- Nosek, Brian, et al. 2015. “Promoting an Open Research Culture: Author Guidelines for Journals Could Help to Promote Transparency, Openness, and Reproducibility.’’ *Science* 348(6242): 1422–1425.
- O’Hear, Anthony. 1991. *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Science*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Osborne, Martin J. 2004. *An Introduction to Game Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Paluck, Elizabeth Levy. 2009. “Methods and Ethics with Research Teams and NGOs: Comparing Experiences Across the Border of Rwanda and Democratic Republic of Congo.” In C. Sriram et al. (Eds.), *Surviving Research: Working in Violent and Difficult Situations*. Routledge.
- Paluck, Elizabeth Levy. 2010. “The Promising Integration of Qualitative Methods and Field Experimentation.” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 628(1): 59–71.
- Parkinson, Sarah Elizabeth. 2013. “Organizing Rebellion: Rethinking High-Risk Mobilization and Social Networks in War.” *American Political Science Review* 107(3): 418–432.
- Pollock, Philip H., III. 2012. *The Essentials of Political Analysis*. 4th Ed. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Popper, Karl. 1953. “Science: Conjectures and Refutations.” Link [Here]

- Rathbun, Brian C. 2008. "Interviewing and Qualitative Field Methods: Pragmatism and Practicalities." In Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier, Henry E. Brady, and David Collier. (Eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. In the Oxford Handbooks of Political Science Series. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 685–701.
- Ricks, J.I. and Liu, A.H., 2018. "Process-tracing research designs: A practical guide." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 1–5.
- Rosenberg, Alex. 2000. *Philosophy of Science: A Contemporary Introduction*. London: Routledge.
- Salmon, Wesley C. 1984. *Scientific Explanation and the Causal Structure of the World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Sartori, Giovanni. 1970. "Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics." *American Political Science Review* 64(4): 1033–1053.
- Schrodt, Philip A. 2014. "Seven Deadly Sins of Contemporary Quantitative Political Analysis." *Journal of Peace Research* 51(2): 287–300.
- Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine, and Dvora Yanow. 2012. *Interpretive Research Design: Concepts and Processes*. New York: Routledge.
- Scoggins, Suzanne E. 2014. "Navigating Fieldwork as an Outsider: Observations from Interviewing Police Officers in China." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 47(2): 394–397.
- Scriven, Michael. 1975. "Causation as Explanation." *Nous* 9:3–10. *Methods and Research* 20(4): 428–455.
- Seawright, Jason, and John Gerring. 2008. "Case Selection Techniques in Case Study Research: A Menu of Qualitative and Quantitative Options." *Political Research Quarterly* 61:2: 294–308.
- Seawright, Jason, and David Collier. 2014. "Rival Strategies of Validation: Tools for Evaluating Measures of Democracy." *Comparative Political Studies* 47(1): 111–138.
- Shadish, William R., Thomas D. Cook, and Donald T. Campbell. 2002. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*. Belmont, CA: Cengage Learning.
- Shepsle, Kenneth A., and Mark S. Bonchek. 1997. *Analyzing Politics: Rationality, Behavior, and Institutions*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Sides, John. 2011. "The Political Scientist as a Blogger." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 44(2): 267–271.
- Simmons, Beth, and Zachary Elkins. 2004. "The Globalization of Liberalization: Policy Diffusion in the International Political Economy." *American Political Science Review* 98(1): 171–189.

- Sparrow, Bartholomew. 2015. “Political Science and Biography.” Working Paper. University of Texas.
- Stock, James H., and Mark W. Watson. 2010. *Introduction to Econometrics*. 3rd Edition. Addison Wesley Longman.
- Trachtenberg, Marc. 2006. *The Craft of International History: A Guide to Method*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Trochim, William, and James Donnelly. 2008. *The Research Methods Knowledge Base*. Mason, OH: Cengage Learning.
- Varian, Hal. 1997. “How to Build and Economic Model in Your Spare Time.” In Michael Szenberg (Ed.) *Passion and Craft: Economists at Work*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Wagner, R.H., 2001. “Who’s afraid of ‘rational choice theory’.” Typescript, Department of Government, University of Texas, Austin.
- Wedeen, Lisa. 2002. “Conceptualizing Culture: Possibilities for Political Science.” *American Political Science Review* 96(4): 713–728.
- Wedeen, Lisa. 2010. “Reflections on Ethnographic Work in Political Science,” *Annual Review of Political Science* 13: 255–272.
- Wilson, Sven E., and Daniel M. Butler. 2007. “A Lot More to Do: The Sensitivity of Time-Series Cross-Section Analyses to Simple Alternative Specifications.” *Political Analysis* 15(2): 101–123.
- Wolford, Scott. 2018. “The Theory of War I: Commitment Problems.” In *The Politics of the First World War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 2.
- Wooldridge, Jeffrey M. 2012. *Introductory Econometrics: A Modern Approach*. 5th Edition. Belmont, CA: Cengage Learning.
- Wylie, Alison. 1992. “Reasoning about Ourselves: Feminist Methodology in the Social Sciences.” In *Women and Reason*, eds. Elizabeth D. Harvey and Kathleen Okruhlik. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Yanow, Dvora, and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea. 2006. *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Yin, Robert K. 2014. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. 5th Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage University Press.

7 Resources

- Excellent introductions to statistics, including software assistance:
-Link: [UCLA Statistics and Software](#)

- Link: Statistics at Square One
- Link: HyperStat Online Statistics Textbook
- Link: Princeton Stata Resources
- Link: An Introduction to R
- Link: Try R
- \LaTeX typesetting package, including Beamer presentation software:
 - Link: Not So Short Introduction to \LaTeX 2e
 - Link: \LaTeX Wikibook
 - Link: The \LaTeX Companion
- Other useful resources:
 - Link: Sweave integration of R and \LaTeX
 - Link: Makefile source code compiler
 - Link: NVivo platform for analyzing unstructured data
 - Link: Github collaboration and code compiler
 - Link: ZTree experimental economics software
 - Link: Qualtrics survey and experimental software (University has site license)
 - Link: Matlab computing software (University has site license)
- Scientific standards:
 - Link: Berkeley Institute for Transparency in the Social Sciences
 - Link: EGAP research registry
 - Link: Dataverse replication data repository
 - Link: AEA economics research registry
 - Link: CONSORT Reporting Standards
 - Link: Syracuse Qualitative data repository
- Methods workshops and associations:
 - Link: The Society for Political Methodology
 - Link: Experiments in Governance and Politics
 - Link: ICPSR Summer Methods Program
 - Link: Institute for Qualitative and Multi-Method Research
 - Link: Berkeley Institute for Transparency in the Social Sciences
 - Link: Computational Social Science Summer School
 - Link: Empirical Implications of Theoretical Models