

GOV 391K: Scope and Methods, Fall 2024

Last updated: November 4, 2024

1 Instructor Information

Professor Mike Findley
Phone: 512.749.3815
Email: mikefindley@utexas.edu
Office: BAT 3.102
Office Hrs: Wed. 9–12 & by appt
Book office hours here: [\[Link here\]](#)
Zoom: [\[Link here\]](#)
Class Location: RLP 4.616

Professor Dan Nielson
Phone: 801.885.3401
Email: dan.nielson@utexas.edu
Office: BAT 3.134
Office Hrs: XX
Zoom: [\[Link here\]](#)

2 Course Overview

Scope and Methods is a foundational course in the Government Department. The material in this course is crucial for your 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 even a connoisseur, of knowledge. To arrive, you need to become conversant in the full range of political science theoretical and empirical approaches, and then master at least some subset of these approaches. For example, even if you envision yourself becoming a “quantitative” or “qualitative” specialist, you should still be able to speak the other languages.

In the reading schedule below, we articulate weekly objectives along with discussion questions. Seminar sessions will generally proceed with some lecture in which we provide broader context for the week’s materials, both relative to overall course material as well as other possible material for the topic of that week. We will then engage in seminar-style discussion of key topics, emphasizing synthetic engagement with key approaches and challenges. Following, we will turn to an application paper, typically written by one of the Government Department faculty who will then join for about 20 minutes to discuss their paper. The goal is for you to gain exposure to outstanding research, get to know some of our faculty, and for them to get to know you. Finally, we will spend 10 minutes each class session discussing various professionalization topics.

3 Requirements**3.1 Required Readings**

Gerring, John, and Dino Christenson. 2017. *Applied Social Science Methodology: An Introductory Guide*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

McIntyre, Lee. 2019. *The Scientific Attitude: Defending Science from Denial, Fraud, and Pseudoscience*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

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

3.2 Recommended Readings

We also encourage you to read a number of other books and articles. In the weekly schedule below, we include many subject-specific recommendations. And at the back of the syllabus, we include a lengthy list of additional books and other resources.

3.3 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 discussions that examine the state of knowledge and explore creative frontiers. To accomplish this, you need to attend class very well-prepared. We expect each of you to participate *at minimum* once every session, but on average you should be speaking substantially more than that. At times we will ask for students to comment voluntarily. At other times we will simply call on students to comment. Please be prepared.

Additionally, each of you needs to submit a reading response by Monday 11:00 am, commenting on the readings for the upcoming class. You will submit those reading responses on Canvas under the Assignments link. Each reading response should be no longer than 500 words and include:

- A *synthetic* summary of the readings (except for the professionalization reading).
- Identification of two parts of the readings that are unclear, with relevant contextualization and rationale.

3.4 Assignments

The assignments in the seminar are cumulative: you will complete an original research study in stages, culminating with an original research manuscript intended for eventual publication. We encourage you to plan and execute a study that fundamentally interests you and that you can later refine for publication. You will work on the assignments in small teams (of 2–4 collaborators), but each of you will need to complete portions of some component assignments as individuals, as described below. Tentative due dates are listed below. Each component assignment ranges from 5–15% of your grade. Together, these assignments are worth 40% of your final grade and specific directions on content and length appear below.

As the semester progresses, each assignment will draw on earlier material, but require extensive revision, and the final original research paper will be worth 30% of the final grade (written in two stages as an earlier draft and a final draft). We emphasize that the combined version should not simply be a collation of the component assignments, and in many cases it may require substantial rewriting of the other sections. You will also need to aggregate, trim, and smooth the portions of each assignment that you will complete as individuals. The final research paper should be 30–35 pages (not including title page, abstract, or appendix), which is the typical length of a manuscript prepared for submission to an academic journal.

Assignment	Date	% of Grade
Research question / puzzle	Sep 12 (Thurs)	5%
Argument and design	Oct 3 (Thurs)	15%
First peer review	Oct 10 (Thurs)	2.5%
Earlier draft of final paper	Nov 21 (Thurs)	20%
Second peer review	Nov 26 (Tues)	2.5%
Final paper	Dec 13 (Fri)	30%
Participation	Ongoing	25%

Table 1: Summary of Assignments.

The component assignments plus both drafts of the paper constitute 70% of your final grade in the seminar. Seminar participation is 25%. Peer reviews of your fellow students' work are the remaining 5%. Table 1 summarizes the assignments, due dates, and contribution to the final grade.

3.4.1 Research Question / Puzzle Statement (5%)

Please identify a *causal* research question that is of interest to you and that will make a contribution in political science. The puzzle statement should identify a cause or explanatory variable (sometimes referred to as an independent variable), an effect or outcome variable (sometimes referred to as a dependent variable), and a causal mechanism (the logic that connects your explanatory and outcome variables). Ideally, you should draw out why the question is worth answering, which could entail the identification of a “puzzle” or some other justification.

We strongly encourage you to pick a question (1) that matters in the real world and (2) that you care about personally. We are advocates for social science that promises to make a meaningful difference in improving the world. You can study what you want, of course, but questions with practical application that interest you deeply are likely to sustain your attention better and produce findings with greater potential impact.

To take an example from our own joint research, in 2010 we grew interested in the features of potential clients (their countries of origin and what they revealed in an email inquiry) that might cause incorporation services around the world—the firms whose business is to form companies for others—to apply or ignore global corporate transparency standards, especially the Know Your Customer (KYC) rule. Failure to apply KYC enables anonymous incorporation that facilitates money laundering, tax evasion, terrorist financing, and many other crimes. This led us to successive large global field experiments over a dozen years. The research produced policy insights that countries and international organizations have used to reform their laws and regulations. Because the question both mattered practically and interested us, it was able to sustain many studies over many years. Of course we do not expect you to launch a major research program in this seminar (though we would not at all object if you do), but pursuing questions you find genuinely interesting and that matter to others practically will likely energize you as scholars in this seminar and beyond.

There is no set structure for the assignment, but you should make very clear what the

effect or outcome of interest is, what the cause or explanatory variable is, and how the cause logically leads to the effect, thereby detailing the causal mechanism(s). Both the effect/outcome of interest and the cause/explanatory variable need to be variables that can take on different values, say, 0 or 1, high or low, or multiple values on a scale that is readily measurable. You will worry about actual measurement in the future assignments. But you should select conceptual variables that can be reasonably operationalized/measured in a repeatable way. You will keep this paper focused on concepts, though we encourage you to motivate with a short, real-world example. You should also think ahead to the overall project design and the upcoming assignments even though you do not need to include many specifics here. We welcome consultation with us in our offices to work with you on identifying promising questions and arguments.

You will complete this assignment as a small group of 2–4 collaborators. We will provide time in the opening seminar to get to know each other better and to discuss your interests and possible collaborations. You will form your own groups. This paper should be no more than 3 pages double-spaced.

Due: September 12 (Thurs; 11:59 pm)

3.4.2 Argument and Design (15%)

The primary objective of the *Argument and Design* is to carefully articulate the research question and theoretical argument and develop initial ideas for an empirical design that can evaluate your argument. A brief review of the literature is also useful to refine your thinking about the contribution that you are making.

Theoretical Argument and Literature. Begin with your causal research question, connecting your explanatory and outcome variables. Develop a valid and coherent argument about *why* they may be connected. This will require that you elaborate upon your causal mechanisms. Note that you should provide a *theoretical* argument, not an empirical analysis. The empirics will come later.

After introducing the question and previewing the argument and causal logic, briefly (less than 2 pages) review the relevant literature that discusses your outcome of interest and your explanatory variable. Some questions will have robust literatures that consider both together. Other literatures may address either your outcome or your explanatory variable—one or the other but not both—independently. This will be the case if you are the first to connect them.

Your literature review should avoid serial killing, or treating reviewed articles one-by-one in succession. Instead, the review should synthesize and judiciously group like-minded authors and works together in paragraphs that cover significant conceptual ground. You may paraphrase the insights from a collection of authors and then cite them all in a single in-text citation at the end of the paragraph. Or you may group them in subsets and compare and contrast them within the summary paragraph. It is important that however you approach the discussion of relevant scholarship, you demonstrate that you have internalized and synthesized the key contributions without treating them serially. You can find examples of such “synthetic” literature reviews in the sections of articles immediately after the introductions in virtually any recent issue of a top political science journal (e.g. *American Political Science Review*, *American Journal of Political Science*, *Journal of Politics*, *International Organization*, *World Politics*, *Comparative Political Studies*, etc.)

Although there is no single formula for a theoretical argument, you should explicitly

address the assumptions you are making, the political actors or forces responsible, the strategies they have at their disposal, the outcomes that their behavior influences, their preferences over the outcomes, and the available information. Building out these components, be clear about how the occurrence of the explanatory factor translates into the outcome of interest. Critically, how do different values of the explanatory variable cause different values of the dependent variable? For example, in our incorporation study, we hypothesized that higher-risk customers from countries viewed as corrupt, such as Equatorial Guinea and Uzbekistan, would cause incorporation services to demand ID documents at higher rates than from customers from low-risk countries, such as Norway and Australia. (Interestingly, the evidence from the experiment showed no effect of corrupt jurisdictions on customer identification—a precisely estimated null result.)

Remember that your goal is to provide a compelling argument that can then be tested to determine whether empirical evidence is consistent. This means that your argument should make a case, but in a way that allows for an empirical investigation that could result in consistent, inconsistent, or indeterminate findings. If a research question is properly argued and designed, it is perfectly acceptable to reach any of these conclusions.

Design Approach. This can be any research design that credibly estimates causal effects, including a randomized experiment, a natural experiment, a regression discontinuity design, a synthetic control model, a difference-in-differences study, a statistical matching model, etc. If the list above is new to you, don't panic. You are in graduate school to learn such methods. If the statistically challenging designs are unfamiliar, you may want to focus on a randomized experiment for now, as it does not require advanced statistical proficiency.

Experiments are simple in concept. The method should be known to you from randomized control trials in medicine, such as those to test the Covid-19 vaccines, but they can be employed in any domain in which an intervention can be randomly assigned and compared to a randomized control condition. Randomized experiments can be done in surveys, in the laboratory, or in the field. Although we have used multiple natural- and quasi-experimental methods in our own research, we have the most experience with randomized experiments, especially in the field. So our coaching of your projects will likely be strongest for experimental designs. Still, some research questions cannot be practically or ethically answered with experiments, so you are free to select the most appropriate method for your topic, as long as effects can be credibly identified causally. In practice, most other methods establish experiments as a benchmark and justify design and analysis decisions based on their ability to address deviations.

Data. Next, discuss your subject pool if you are designing an experiment or your sample if a natural or quasi-experiment, or an observational design. This is where your data will come from. If you are performing an experiment, these subjects may be human or institutional—firms, government offices, non-governmental organizations, etc. If a natural or quasi-experiment, they may be other types of units—countries, interest groups, political-party chapters, square-mile land parcels, voting precincts, etc. Many types of units of measurement are studied in political science experimentally and observationally (“observational” is the catch-all term for non-experimental analysis), so the lists following the dashes above are far from exhaustive. Discuss your plan for sampling from the targeted units, as the sampling is a key determinant of the credibility of external validity inferences.

Identification. Next, describe your method of random assignment for experiments or

your causal identification strategy for natural or quasi-experiments. How will the experimental intervention be used to manipulate the outcome of interest? Or how will your natural or quasi-experimental design credibly identify the causal effect in the observational data? In other words, how is this a defensible test of your hypothesis?

Analysis. Additionally, briefly discuss your planned method of statistical and qualitative analysis of the results. All studies in the seminar will need to perform *both* quantitative and qualitative analysis. So, you should be actively planning how to collect both quantitative and qualitative data from your subject pool or sample. We are very happy to assist in coming up with ideas for this. If you are performing an experiment, a simple difference-in-means test will suffice for statistical analysis, though more advanced regression or randomization inference analysis is welcome but not required. Natural and quasi-experiments will clearly demand more advanced statistical methods, for which a prior background in statistics will likely help (though there is no better way of learning than by doing).

Qualitative Methods. At this stage you should plan to collect qualitative data in your experiment either by observation or by open-ended questions of subjects, or both. For natural and quasi-experiments, qualitative analysis can be performed in multiple ways, but most qualitative data facilitates the construction of coherent narratives that illustrate the causal logic. These often take the form of case studies, interviews, focus groups, or archival research, though there are many alternative qualitative techniques.

Limitations. Finally, consider carefully the limitations of your proposed study. What can the research project explain and what will remain unexplained? Carefully consider threats to valid inference and discuss the ways in which the proposed study may fall short. Also, consider 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 your proposed study without introducing new problems or sources of bias.

Institutional Review Board. It is likely you will want to try to publish the results of this project in a peer-reviewed journal. You will probably need to extend the research to publish, either through additional rounds of the experiment or through further analysis of the observational data. But, if we do our jobs right and work hard, this project should be publishable. That is the explicit objective here. If you are doing an experiment, you will need to fill out and submit an application to the Institutional Review Board's Human Subjects Committee. UT-Austin has an online system for this, and one of us as faculty will need to serve as the "principal investigator" on the study, though we do not expect to be co-authors of the published research.

The elements in this research design assignment can be repurposed and recycled into the IRB application, and we are happy to coach you. But you should plan to submit the IRB application shortly after this assignment is due in order to have time for the IRB to review the application, request clarifications, get revisions from you, and approve. Without IRB approval, no data from this study can be published. If you are doing an experiment, we require that you submit an IRB application. Natural and quasi-experiments typically do not require IRB approval.

You will complete this assignment as a group. This paper should be no more than 7 pages double-spaced.

Due: October 3 (Thurs; 11:59 pm)

3.4.3 Peer Review of Argument and Design (2.5%)

Twice during the semester you will be required to produce a peer review of a fellow student's project. This assignment will be done as individuals, not groups. You will complete the first peer review after the research design assignment has been submitted. The second will be done on the earlier draft of the research paper. See below. You will review the research design of a project produced in the seminar on which you are not a co-author. You are responsible for contacting the authors and receiving a copy of the research design.

Your peer review should: (1) Restate the the research question, argument, and planned design of the project. (2) Praise the project's strengths. Be specific about elements of the design that are particularly strong or laudatory. No generic praise. (3) Analyze and constructively critique the research design, which might cover the hypotheses, outcome measures, interventions, and research plan. (Additional points of critique and analysis could include the paper's scope, quality of research question, clarity of ideas and expression, depth of inquiry, appropriateness to target audience, etc.) Importantly, for every point of criticism you raise, make a concrete suggestion through which the authors can fruitfully address the point. No flaming or torpedoing. Only constructive criticism. (4) Check the sources and recommend additions. (5) Suggest corrections of style errors. Authors should be able to use these reviews to make significant revisions of their work.

The peer review must be completed by you individually, independent of your group. It should be no longer than 2 pages, double-spaced. We will make peer review assignments when the two assignments are due.

Due: October 10 (Thurs; 11:59 pm)

3.4.4 Perform Study & Collect Data

After receiving feedback on the Revised Research Design from faculty and peers, it is time to field the study. If an experiment, this will entail executing all of the elements of the design. If a survey experiment, you will need to construct the survey, build in and thoroughly test the randomization of the experimental items, recruit subjects, and have them actually take the survey.

If a field experiment, you will need to develop all of the elements of the study, including all subject recruitment materials, experimental items, and outcome measurement. For example, if you are using different versions of Facebook ads to drive users to a specific website, you will need to create the different advertisements to use in the A/B testing platform and actually run the ads on Facebook. If a correspondence experiment, you will need to write all of the text for any emails to be sent, gather email addresses of subjects, send the emails and follow-ups, and code correspondence.

If a natural or quasi-experiment, you will need to design the estimation strategy, collect the data, clean the data, configure it for estimation, and execute the estimation procedures. You will also need to design and execute robustness checks to assess the stability of results to alternative model specifications.

For all types of studies, you will also need to collect qualitative data to analyze alongside the quantitative results. In survey experiments, asking subjects relevant open-ended questions and then analyzing the text of their written answers is one useful qualitative technique, but there are others. For field experiments, you may be able to qualitatively observe features of

subjects' behavior that can be analyzed for patterns and for evidence of causal mechanisms. With Facebook ads, there are often extensive comments that users leave in response that might be analyzed. With correspondence studies, the texts of the reply emails have rich potential for qualitative analysis. For quasi-experiments, case studies of relevant observations are common. For most qualitative analysis, the objective is to assess the qualitative results for systematic evidence of the presence or absence of the posited causal mechanisms.

You should be executing the studies and gathering data from early October through early November. We strongly urge you to start as soon as you can, with the caveat that the IRB may require additional back-and-forth. Our experience is that unforeseen circumstances nearly always arise that cause delays and require additional effort. More time to resolve these issues is nearly always necessary.

3.4.5 Earlier Draft of Research Paper (20%)

You will bring all of the elements completed so far in the seminar together into the research paper. You should combine the relevant material from the prior assignments, but you should not simply collate them. This assignment will require substantial synthetic effort, combining, adapting, editing, and synthesizing the material. It should include the following:

1. **Abstract.** An abstract is a terse, one-paragraph summary of the paper's: 1. Research question, 2. Hypothesis, 3. Intervention/treatment and control conditions, and 4. Research design, which mentions briefly: a. Method of sampling and random assignment or identification strategy, b. Method of administering the treatment and control conditions or capturing causal identification, c. Measurement of the outcome of interest, and d. Strategy for statistical analysis of the quantitative data and analysis of qualitative data. 5. Results of the study. Your abstract should not be longer than 200 words. It is short but very important.
2. **Introduction.** The introduction should hook the reader with a very short compelling anecdote, real-world example, or important phenomenon in the social or political spheres that makes the research topic salient. It should then develop the problem area with a discussion of why readers should care about the study. Finally, it should preview the research question, hypotheses, treatment/control/identification strategy, research design, and results.
3. **Literature Review.** A literature review situates your research in the broader context of similar writings. It should be roughly 1,000 words in length. The literature review should cover the main arguments related to (both supporting and attacking) the hypotheses you are testing. If your argument is unique, no one will have addressed your specific approach directly, but many analysts will have developed and commented on related approaches—either addressing the independent or dependent variable in some way. It is this literature you should cover in the review. To reiterate, your review should be analytical and critical and it should avoid serial killing, or treating reviewed articles one-by-one in succession.
4. **Research Question, Argument & Hypothesis.** Drawing on the literature review and the gaps you identified, and building on additional relevant literature, this short

section should state the research question clearly and make a falsifiable argument connecting a causal mechanism to a causal effect. Designate the research question you addressed with your experiment or quasi-experiment.

This section should then answer the question with theory and logic. It should detail the critical steps in the causal chain linking changes or differences in the explanatory variable to the outcome. This section should be founded on logic, describing why the outcome under study ought to be significantly affected by the causal mechanism. It should set up the research design and lead directly to a discussion of the outcome of interest and the intervention in the experiment or identification strategy in the quasi-experiment.

5. **Describe the outcome measure.** Designate the outcome(s) of interest or dependent variable. This is the result you have studied. You will want to describe it very simply in a way that other researchers can readily replicate.
6. **Describe the Treatment and Control Conditions or Explanatory Variable.** It is best to provide an explanation of the treatment/control or explanatory variable that is as simple as possible. For experiments, note the specific language you used with subjects in each condition or any other actions taken to execute the conditions, making it very clear how they differed in practice. For quasi-experiments, describe the measurement of the independent variable and how it enables the identification strategy.
7. **Describe the Subject Pool or Sample.** Who are your subjects or what units constitute your sample? How many subjects or units of analysis are there? How was the sample obtained? How representative is the subject pool or sample of the general population of interest?
8. **Discuss the Randomization Procedure or Identification Strategy.** For experiments, describe how you randomly assigned your subjects to the treatment and control conditions. For natural and quasi-experiments, detail or how the identification strategy estimates causal effects. Be specific in what was done and how it qualifies as random or as if random (where each unit had a roughly equal probability of being assigned to any given condition). Describe any blocking or stratification procedures. Discuss the randomization checks performed or robustness analysis executed.
9. **Outline the Protocol.** While you do not need to thoroughly describe each step you took with executing the experiment or quasi-experiment in fine detail, you should briefly discuss the procedures you followed both to administer the intervention or estimate causality and to measure the outcome(s).
10. **Empirical Results & Analysis.**
 - (a) **Quantitative Results & Analysis.**

After you have gathered the numerical data, you need to analyze it statistically. If you are conducting an experiment, you should feel free to analyze it with simple models (the kind you are learning in your stats sequence). All analysis should be done in R or Stata using saved scripts or .do files that can be run repeatedly

without stalling or throwing errors. You will submit the script or .do file with the writeup of the analysis.

You will complete this section as individuals, not as groups. You can coordinate with and receive coaching from your collaborators, but on your own you must perform the statistical analysis, write an R script or Stata .do file, create graphs and tables, write your interpretation of the results, and add a discussion. You will need to explain the steps in the analysis code to one of us during office hours and answer questions so that we are satisfied that the work was your own and that your understanding of statistical analysis is sound. Include the analysis code as an item in the appendix to the assignment.

Review how the theoretical concepts were operationalized empirically. Describe how the data was gathered and how it was prepared for analysis (cleaned and configured).

Include a screenshot of the first page of your data from the R or Stata interface so that we can see how your data are configured. Make sure your variables are labeled in a clear and intuitive way. You may want to provide a short codebook to make variables even clearer. Include the screenshot as an item in the appendix.

Create a summary table showing the means, standard deviations, and upper and lower 95% confidence intervals for each experimental condition, the outcome(s), and any covariates. Discuss the balance for the control variables across the experimental conditions and note if there are any detectable randomization imbalances.

Create a graphical representation of the data that is easy for the reader to interpret. For experiments, this is often done with simple bar charts showing the average outcome for the treatment group(s) compared to the control group and including 95% confidence intervals on the bars. For natural or quasi-experiments, select a graphical representation appropriate to the analysis.

Next, you should perform a difference-in-means test comparing the treatment and control groups. For some of you new to statistical analysis, this may be sufficient. Others may wish to perform regression analysis employing covariates as control variables or using different estimation strategies. Whatever test or tests you perform, they must be different than those done by any other member of your group. This may entail analyzing a different treatment arm or independent variable, a different dependent variable or operationalization of the outcome, or performing a regression analysis with a different array of covariates as controls. Or an additional permutation, as long it is distinct from the analyses done by all of the rest of your collaborators. If you are undertaking a quasi-experiment, the statistical analysis needs to be appropriate to your chosen identification strategy and will necessarily be more involved than a simple difference-in-means.

Create and include a table displaying the results of the statistical test(s). You should report statistical significance with asterisks according to the common convention: * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < .05$, *** $p < .01$. With each collaborator performing a different test, together the separate analyses will function as robustness tests

checking that the results are consistent across alternative specifications.

Write 2–3 paragraphs interpreting the results of your statistical test. Discuss the sign of the difference between the treatment and control means and what that signifies for the treatment effects. Discuss the size of the difference and assess its substantive significance or how meaningful the treatment effect is in practical terms. Discuss the statistical significance of the results and assess the confidence that the results were not produced by random chance.

Discuss the findings in terms of the expectations derived from your argument/hypothesis. What does the evidence say in support of or against the hypothesis? If the results are null (not significant statistically), discuss the precision with which the null results are estimated. In other words, what can the 95% confidence intervals say about how large the effect might be with greater statistical power by adding more observations? If the results are positive and significant, discuss the confidence with which the inference can be made and what the results cannot say about the hypothesis. If the results are negative and significant, provide reasoned speculation about why you obtained the surprising findings. Discuss what additional tests or studies might be conducted in the future that might resolve ambiguities or probe the robustness of the findings.

(b) **Qualitative Results & Analysis.**

Done well, qualitative work can often provide evidence reflecting on the causal mechanism(s) linking the explanatory variable to the outcome. Like the quantitative section above, you will be producing this qualitative section on your own. You may, of course, coordinate with your group. But you must perform a different qualitative analysis than any other member of your group, either examining the evidence for a different causal mechanism, providing a different case study, examining answers to a different open-ended question, etc. We are happy to brainstorm the possibilities with you.

Arguably the most important qualitative technique is process tracing. Process tracing closely examines case studies or other qualitative data to determine if there is evidence that the hypothesized causal mechanisms actually seem to be working as expected.

For example, your hypothesized causal mechanisms may suggest that an offensive-minded military leads to exaggeration of foreign threats, which causes greater commitment to rapid mobilization for war, which in turn engenders greater perception of threat by enemies, and thus increases the likelihood of war. Process tracing would therefore examine evidence through systematically selected case studies of archives and prior scholarship to learn if more offensive-minded military leaders indeed led to more exaggeration of foreign threats, that such exaggeration made war planners more likely to commit to rapid mobilization strategies, and that such strategies led to enemies seeing the country as a greater threat. The ability of qualitative analysis to examine the sequencing of causal chains is a particular strength. If you find through tracing the process that each of these steps

indeed occurred, then you have found compelling evidence in support of your argument. An absence of evidence for any of these links—or in favor of alternative mechanisms—would undermine the argument.

In this section, very briefly review your argument and hypotheses, highlighting drawing out the causal mechanisms. Apply the hypothesized causal mechanisms to the type of qualitative data you have gathered and will analyze.

Provide qualitative operational definitions of each variable or concept that you are assessing. These operationalizations should be tightly aligned with your quantitative measures, but necessarily adapted for qualitative data. Discuss any reliability or validity problems that your definitions might have. Your operational definitions should meet the criteria given in seminar sessions and in readings and, again, should apply to your qualitative data.

Case selection / data gathering: Specifically identify (not by name, to follow IRB regulations) the research subjects, survey item responses, or case studies you have selected to test your hypotheses qualitatively and justify your selection of these cases/items. It is paramount that the qualitative evidence be representative of the sample, not “cherry picked” to be the most supportive.

Discuss your grounds for qualitative inference, or how you will use the qualitative data to gather evidence reflecting on the hypothesized causal mechanisms. What will you accept as sufficient evidence either to support or contradict the argument? What might constitute null qualitative results?

Write two pages that systematically analyze the qualitative data in light of the argument’s causal mechanisms. This means you will execute the qualitative research design for your open-ended survey answers/selected cases/observation of individual subjects/other qualitative data. Trace the causal processes connecting the explanatory variable to the outcome. You will specifically assess the evidence in favor of or against your hypothesized causal mechanisms found in the qualitative data you are analyzing. Draw conclusions from the analysis about the preponderance of the evidence. Again, when combined with the qualitative results and analysis of your collaborators, the joint analysis will explore the range of the qualitative data and the robustness of the conclusions to the different contexts.

11. **Conclusion.** Summarize the main findings of the study. Review the problem (perhaps discussed in the hook, intro. and lit. review) that motivated the research. Provide a final synopsis of the research design and the findings. Summarize the findings again. Then, in a few paragraphs, lay out a research agenda for the next steps in the program going forward. What are the additional studies that should be performed? What questions remain to be answered? Finish with a paragraph that ties together the study and future directions.

You will complete this assignment as a group, but the quantitative and qualitative results and analysis sections will be done as individuals. So each of you will submit an individual

and unique draft containing jointly written/shared sections for items 1-9 and 11 but unique, independent sections for item 10, Empirical Results & Analysis. The earlier draft of the research paper should be at least 25 double-spaced pages but may be no more than 35 double-spaced pages. The page count should include graphs, tables, and references but should not include the title page, abstract, or appendix.

Due: November 21 (Thurs; 11:59 pm)

3.4.6 Peer Review of Earlier Draft (2.5%)

You will review the earlier draft of a project produced in the seminar on which you are not a co-author. You are responsible for contacting the authors and receiving a copy of the earlier draft. You will complete this assignment as individuals, not groups.

Your peer review should: (1) Restate the the research question, argument, design, and results. (2) Praise the project's strengths. Be specific about elements of the project that are particularly strong or laudatory. No generic praise. (3) Analyze and constructively critique the paper, which might cover the framing, hypotheses, outcome measures, interventions, research design, data analysis, and conclusions. (Additional points of critique and analysis could include the paper's scope, quality of research question, clarity of ideas and expression, depth of inquiry, appropriateness to target audience, etc.) Critically, for every point of criticism you raise, make a concrete suggestion through which the authors can fruitfully address the point. No flaming or torpedoing. Only constructive criticism. (4) Check the sources and recommend additions. (5) Suggest corrections of style errors. Authors should be able to use these reviews to make significant revisions of their work.

The peer review must be completed by you individually, independent of your group. It should be no longer than 2 pages, double-spaced.

Due: November 26 (Tues; 11:59 pm)

3.4.7 Final Draft of Research Paper (30%)

Based on comments from your professors and peers, you will revise the paper thoroughly and resubmit it as the final paper. You should include all of the elements required for the Earlier Draft of the paper and detailed above, but the new draft should reflect substantial rethinking, reanalysis, and rewriting.

In particular, you will revise the earlier draft to integrate the results sections reporting your findings and analysis with responses to comments and feedback you received. You will incorporate new and updated findings, analysis, and discussion.

Again you will complete this assignment as a group. The final draft of the research paper should be at least 30 double-spaced pages but may be no more than 35 double-spaced pages. The page count should include graphs, tables, and references but should not include the title page, abstract, or appendix.

Due: December 13 (Friday; 11:59 pm)

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 professors we will notice instances of plagiarizing on papers.

Writing submitted for credit at UT must consist of the students' own ideas presented in sentences and paragraphs of their 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 Personal Pronoun and Name Preferences

Professional courtesy and sensitivity are especially important with respect to individuals and topics dealing with differences of race, culture, religion, politics, sexual orientation, gender, gender variance, and nationalities. Class rosters are provided to the instructors with the student's legal name. We will gladly honor your request to address you by an alternate name

or pronoun. Please advise us of this preference early in the semester so that we may make appropriate changes to our records.

4.4 Religious Holidays

By UT Austin policy, you must notify us 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, 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.

4.5 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.

4.6 Sharing of Course Materials is Prohibited

No materials used in this class, including, but not limited to, lecture hand-outs, videos, assessments (quizzes, exams, papers, projects, homework assignments), in-class materials, review sheets, and additional problem sets, may be shared online or with anyone outside of the class unless you have my explicit, written permission. Unauthorized sharing of materials promotes cheating. It is a violation of the University's Student Honor Code and an act of academic dishonesty. We are well aware of the sites used for sharing materials, and any materials found online that are associated with you, or any suspected unauthorized sharing of materials, will be reported to Student Conduct and Academic Integrity in the Office of the Dean of Students. These reports can result in sanctions, including failure in the course.

4.7 Class Recordings

Some classes could be recorded on Zoom. Class recordings are reserved only for students in this class for educational purposes and are protected under FERPA. The recordings may not be shared outside the class in any form. Violation of this restriction by a student could lead to Student Misconduct proceedings.

4.8 Family

We are not aware of an official university policy on children in the classroom. The following is an attempt to insure family friendliness while also maintaining a proper learning environment. [We borrowed heavily and adapted these policies from Melissa Cheyney’s syllabus. [Link here.](#)]

1. All breastfeeding babies are welcome in class as often as is necessary.
2. For older children and babies, unforeseen disruptions in childcare often put parents in the position of having to miss class to stay home with a child. If needed, these incidents will be an excused absence and we will work with you to insure you learn the material. Alternatively, while this is not meant to be a long-term childcare solution, occasionally bringing a child to class in order to cover gaps in care is perfectly acceptable.
3. We ask that all students work to create a welcoming environment that is respectful of all forms of diversity, including diversity in parenting status.
4. In all cases where babies and children come to class, please sit close to the door so that if your little one needs special attention and is disrupting learning for others’ students, you may step outside until their need has been met. For our part, we will work with you should you need to step out so that you can remain caught up.
5. Finally, often the largest barrier to completing your coursework once you become a parent is the tiredness many parents feel in the evening once children have finally gone to sleep. While we maintain the same high expectations for all students in our class regardless of parenting status, we are happy to problem-solve with you in a way that helps you feel supported as you strive for school-parenting balance.

5 Tentative Course and Reading Schedule

5.1 August 26: On Being Wrong

Required readings and plans

- Approach
 - McIntyre 2019, Scientific Attitude, Introduction
 - McIntyre 2019, Scientific Attitude, Chapter 1–2
- Challenge
 - Wicherts 2017, The Weak Spots in Contemporary Science (Canvas)
- Application
 - Buyalskaya Et Al 2021, The Golden Age of Social Science (Canvas)
- Professionalization: The science-policy nexus
 - Shah 2020, “Global Problems Need Social Science” (Canvas)

- Objectives:
 - Understand what science *is* and *is not*, and what are the hallmarks of a social scientific approach
 - Develop a “scientific attitude” rooted in a commitment to evidence, learning, updating, and advancing.
 - Reflect on the role of social scientific research in direct intervention in public policy.
 - Understand that being wrong is central to the scientific approach.
 - Articulate reasons why it is ignored or avoided, and how that could change.
- Discussion Questions:
 - Is there a general pattern by which scientists conduct their work?
 - Is the world too complex for social scientists truly to understand?
 - Does scientific knowledge accrue in a way that leads scientists closer and closer to “the truth”? How would we know?
 - In what ways have scientists been wrong and how has this set back scientific understanding? Or advanced scientific understanding?
 - Is human bias in scientific research an advantage, disadvantage, or both, and why?
 - Many contrast science and religion; are they really as different as many suppose, or is faith at work in both arenas?
- Guest:
 - NA for first session

Recommended:

- Elman, Gerring, Mahoney (Eds.): *The Production of Knowledge*
- Bueno de Mesquita & Fowler, *Thinking Clearly with Data*
- Box-Steffensmeier, Brady, & Collier: Chp. 1: “Political Science Methodology”
- Link: Accepted papers submitted again
- King, Keohane, & Verba, DSI: Chp. 1, “The Science in Social Science”
- Trochim & Donnelly, RMKB: Chp. 1, “Foundations”
- Kellstedt and Witten, FPSR: Chp. 1: “The Scientific Study of Politics” P. 1–18.
- Angrist and Pischke, “Introduction” and “Chapter 1: Randomized Trials”
- Laudan, Larry. 1977. *Progress and Its Problems: Towards a Theory of Scientific Growth*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- 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.”
- Wedeen 2010, “Reflections on Ethnographic...”
- Ioannidis, “Why Most Published Research Findings are False”
- Clarke & Primo, “Modernizing Political Science:”
- Popper 1953: [Link \[Here\]](#)
- Lakatos short synopsis, Canvas
- O’Hear, AIPS: Chps. 1–4 & 9
- 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.”
- Lakatos, 1978. *The methodology of Scientific Research Programmes Philosophical Papers, Volume I*. Read Pp. 8–101.

5.2 September 2: No class; Labor Day

5.3 September 9: Scientific Standards, Publishing / Peer Review, Ethics

Required readings and plans

- Approach
 - McIntyre 2019, *Scientific Attitude*, Chapter 3–5
 - Christensen & Miguel 2018, “Transparency, Reproducibility...” (Canvas)
 - APSA Ethics Principles and Guidelines 2020 (Canvas)
- Challenge
 - Elman Et Al 2018, “Transparent Social Inquiry...” (Canvas)
 - Findley et al 2024, “Vulnerability in Research Ethics...” (Canvas)

- Application
 - Findley et al. 2016: “Can Results-Free Review Reduce Publication Bias?” (Canvas)
- Professionalization: Data management and preservation
 - Gerring & Christenson 2017, Chp. 11, “Reading and Reviewing”
 - Bowers, Jake. 2011. “Six Steps to a Better Relationship with your Future Self.” (Canvas)
- Objectives:
 - Identify key approaches for improving transparency and understand their potential consequences for science
 - Familiarize with various initiatives to alter scientific practices
 - Understand the unique ethical challenges that social science research faces
- Discussion Questions:
 - Is transparency always desirable?
 - In what practical ways can science reduce fraud, bias, and negligence?
 - To what extent does the public trust science, and does it matter?
 - In what ways are medical standards from medicine appropriate/inappropriate?
- Guest:
 - XX (confirmed?)

Recommended:

- Ritchie, *Science Fictions*
- Blair et al., *Research Design in the Social Sciences*
- Sides, “The Political Scientist as a Blogger.”
- Christensen, Freese, & Miguel, *Transparent and Reproducible Social Science Research* book, all
- Fujii, “Research Ethics 101”
- 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 \[Here\]](#)
- 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=here]

- McMurtie, “Secrets from Belfast”
- Science Transparency and Openness Guidelines (<http://centerforopenscience.org/top/>)
- Miguel, et al, “Promoting Transparency in Social Science Research”
- Nosek, et al, “Promoting an Open Research Culture”
- Barrett, Christopher B., and Jeffrey W. Cason. 2010. *Overseas Research: A Practical Guide*. London: Routledge Press.
- McDermott and Hatemi, 2020, “Ethics in Field Experimentation...”
- Phillips, Trisha, 2021, “Ethics of Field Experiments...”
- Desposato 2016, *Ethics and Experiments...*
- Franco, Malhotra, and Simonovits 2014, “Publication Bias...”
- Paluck, “Methods and ethics...”

5.4 September 16: Asking Useful Research Questions

Required readings and plans

- Approach
 - Gerring & Seawright, *Finding your Social Science Project*, Chapters 4–5, “Strategies” & “Heuristics” (Canvas)
- Challenge
 - Garfinkel, *Forms of Explanation* Introduction and Chapter 1 “Explanatory Relativity” (Canvas)
- Application
 - Savun 2021, “Welcoming the Unwelcome...”
- Professionalization: Creativity
 - Nisbett, “The Anticreativity Letters” (Canvas)
- Objectives:
 - Understand different types of research questions, including descriptive and causal questions
 - Practice developing causal questions that are comprehensive, logical, and puzzling
- Discussion Questions:
 - Is causal research inherently superior to descriptive research?
 - Why are puzzles typically not very puzzling?

- Why are most published research questions indeterminate, and what can be done?
- How can we bring greater “wonder” into our scientific inquiry?
- Guest:
 - XX (confirmed?)

Recommended:

- Varian, “How to Build an Economic Model in Your Spare Time.”
- Loehle, “A Guide to Increased Creativity in Research.”
- Dixit, “My System of Work (Not!)”
- de Bono, *Lateral Thinking*
- Gans and Shepherd, “How Are the Mighty Fallen...”
- Gerring, “Mere Description”
- Munger, “Quantitative Description”
- Yanow and Schwartz-Shea, *Interpretation and Method*.
- Geddes, *Paradigms and Sand Castles*. Chp 2: “Big Questions, Little Answers.”
- Schwartz-Shea and Yanow, IRD: Chps. 1–2
- Eidlin, “The Method of Problems...”

5.5 September 23: Making Valid Arguments

Required readings and plans

- Approach
 - Gerring & Christenson, Chapters 1–2, “A Unified Framework” and “Arguments”
 - Wolford 2022, “Game Theory”
- Challenge
 - Wagner, “Who’s Afraid of Rational Choice Theory?” (Canvas)
- Application
 - Wu & Wolford 2018, “Leaders, States, and Reputations”
- Professionalization: Being an Effective TA
 - Webb 2005, “Twelve Easy Steps...” (Canvas)
- Objectives:

- Identify the core dimensions of arguments, and what it means to construct good arguments.
- Understand the purpose of theory in the overall scientific enterprise, both for explanation and prediction.
- Practice making valid theoretical arguments that form the basis of empirical investigations.
- Discussion Questions:
 - What does it mean to explain something about society? Should we be more concerned with prediction?
 - What are some concrete examples of particularly bad arguments? Particularly good arguments?
 - Will drawing on theoretical traditions insure valid arguments? What are the promise and pitfalls to tying into grand theoretical traditions?
 - What does it mean to simplify complex processes into models?
- Guest:
 - XX (confirmed?)

Recommended:

- Cartwright, *How the Laws of Physics Lie*
- Cartwright, *The Dappled World*
- Wolford, “Chapter 2: The Theory of War I: Commitment Problems.”
- Kellstedt and Witten, Chp. 2: “The Art of Theory Building” P. 22–43.
- Lave & March. *An Introduction to Models in the Social Sciences*. P. 1–84.
- Snidal, “The Game Theory of International Politics”
- de Marchi & Page. “Agent-Based Modeling.” P. 1–20.
- Geddes, *Paradigms and Sand Castles*. Chp 5: “How the Approach You Choose Affects the Answers You Get.”
- 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”
- Lieberman, *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 September 30: Construct Validity

Required readings and plans

- Approach
 - Gerring & Christenson, Chapters 3–4, & Chapter 13
- Challenge/Measurement
 - Trochim & Donnelly, RMKB, Chps. 3: “Theory of Measurement”
- Application
 - Liu & Pizzi, 2016, “Linguistic Heterogeneity” (Canvas)
- Professionalization: Gender diversity
 - Monkey Cage gender gap 10-part series. Each sign up for one to read and discuss. (Canvas)
- Objectives:
 - Understand concept formation and its relationship to empirical measurements.
 - Apply validity and reliability assessments in practice.
- Discussion Questions:
 - To what extent do concepts and measurements need to be carefully matched?
 - What are the consequences of mismatching concepts and methods?
- Guest:
 - XX (confirmed?)

Recommended:

- Elkins, “Gradations of Democracy?”
- Seawright and Collier, “Rival Strategies of Validation”
- Trochim & Donnelly, RMKB, Chps. 3: “Theory of Measurement”
- Carmines & Zeller. *Reliability and Validity Assessment*.
- Munck and Verkuilen, “Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy...”

- Goertz, *Social Science Concepts and Measurement: Revised and Expanded*.
- Collier, Laporte, and Seawright. “Typologies: Forming Concepts and Creating Categorical Variables.”
- Sartori, “Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics”
- Wedeen 2002, “Conceptualizing Culture”

5.7 October 7: Internal Validity

Required readings and plans

- Approach
 - Gerring & Christenson, Chapters 5–6, “Causal Frameworks” & “Causal Hypotheses and Analyses”
- Challenge
 - Russo and Williamson, 2007 “Interpreting Causality...”
- Application
 - Apfeld, Coman, Gerring, and Jessee 2023, “Higher education and cultural liberalism: Regression discontinuity evidence from Romania,” *Journal of Politics* (Canvas)
- Professionalization: Writing and publishing
 - Weingast 2010, “Caltech Rules for Writing Papers...”
- Objectives:
 - Understand the centrality of internal validity in political science, including its core dimensions
 - Articulate the fundamental problem of causal inference and its implications for research
 - Familiarize with different approaches to causality
- Discussion Questions:
 - What is the role of comparison in causal identification?
 - Can confounding ever be overcome in practice?
 - Can causality be identified without reference to causal mechanisms?
- Guest:
 - Stephen Jessee

Recommended:

- Pearl & Mackenzie, *The Book of Why*
- Pearl, *Causal Inference in Statistics*
- Rosenbaum, *Observation and Experiment*
- Cunningham, *Causal Inference: The Mixtape*
- King, Keohane, Verba, DSI, Chp 3: “Causality and Causal Inference”
- 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
- 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*.

5.8 October 14: Pre-analysis Presentations, or The Calm Before the (Data Collection) Storm

5.9 October 21: External Validity I

Required readings and plans

- Approach
 - Findley Et Al 2021, “External Validity” Chapters 1–6. (Canvas)
- Objectives:
 - Understand why external validity is an indispensable scientific objective.
 - Articulate reasons why external validity has been neglected relative to other scientific goals.

- Develop ideas about how external validity could be more effectively included in current research, including your own.
- Discussion Questions:
 - Without external validity, is the study of political science any different than the study of history? Does it matter?
 - Should the external validity of research be held to similarly high standards as internal validity?
- Guest: NA

Recommended readings:

- Cartwright and Hardie, *Evidence-Based Policy*
- King, Keohane, Verba, DSI, Chp 2: “Descriptive Inference”
- Dunning, Natural Experiments book, Chp 10
- Trochim & Donnelly, RMKB, Chp. 2, “Sampling”

5.10 October 28: External Validity II

Required readings and plans

- Approach
 - Findley Et Al 2021, “External Validity” Chapters 7–9 & 11. (Canvas)
- Challenge
 - Barabas and Jerit 2010, “Are Survey Experiments Externally...”
- Application
 - Findley Et Al 2017, “External Validity in Parallel...” (Canvas)
- Professionalization: Conferencing
 - Rutherford 2015, “Conquering the ‘Lumbering Dinosaur’...” (Canvas)
- Objectives:
 - Understand why external validity is an indispensable scientific objective.
 - Articulate reasons why external validity has been neglected relative to other scientific goals.
 - Develop ideas about how external validity could be more effectively included in current research, including your own.
- Discussion Questions:

- Without external validity, is the study of political science any different than the study of history? Does it matter?
- Should the external validity of research be held to similarly high standards as internal validity?
- Guest: NA

Recommended readings:

- Cartwright and Hardie, *Evidence-Based Policy*
- King, Keohane, Verba, DSI, Chp 2: “Descriptive Inference”
- Dunning, Natural Experiments book, Chp 10
- Trochim & Donnelly, RMKB, Chp. 2, “Sampling”

5.11 November 4: Randomized Experiments

Required readings and plans

- Approach
 - Gerring & Christenson, Chapter 7, “Experimental Designs”
- Challenge
 - Deaton & Cartwright 2018, “Misunderstanding RCTs” (Canvas)
- Application
 - Albertson 2015, “Dog Whistle Politics” (Canvas)
- Professionalization: Comprehensive exams
 - Lampe and Kesgin on comprehensive exams (Canvas)
- Objectives:
 - Understand the role of random assignment within experiments and within overall internal validity
 - Evaluate when randomization helps and when it does not, based on a research question of interest.
- Discussion Questions:
 - What are some particularly insightful examples of experimental research? How credible are the conclusions?
 - What exactly do randomized experiments tell us, and what do they not?
 - What happens when the integrity of random assignment is compromised?

- How do the results of experiments contribute to generalized knowledge?
- Guest:
 - Bethany Albertson

Recommended:

- Gerber & Green, *Field Experiments: Design, Analysis, and Interpretation*.
- Dunning, Natural Experiments book, Chp 1
- Dunning, “Transparency, Replication, and Cumulative Learning”
- McDermott: “Experimental Methods in Political Science.”
- Angrist and Pischke, Chapters 2–3, “Regression” and “Instrumental Variables”
- Findley et al, “Causes of Non-Compliance with International Law”
- 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*
- Gerber, Green, and Larimer 2008, “Social Pressure and Voter Turnout...”
- Stokes, Susan. 2014. “A Defense of Observational Research.”
- Findley et al: “Using Field Experiments in International Relations”
- Lieberson, Chps 2–4

5.12 November 11: Natural and Quasi-Experiments

Required readings and plans

- Approach
 - Dunning 2012, Chapter 1, “Introduction: Why Natural Experiments?” (Canvas)
 - Gerring & Christenson, Chapter 8, only pages 132–137
- Challenge
 - Sekhon and Titiunik 2012, “When natural experiments are neither...” (Canvas)
- Application
 - Blasingame, Elise N., Christina L. Boyd, Roberto F. Carlos, and Joseph T. Ornstein. 2023. “How the Trump Administration’s Quota Policy Transformed Immigration Judging.” *American Political Science Review*: 1-16. (Canvas)
 - Hyde 2007, “The Observer Effect” (Canvas)

- Professionalization: Racial and Ethnic Diversity
 - Michelson & Lavariega Monforti 2021, “Elusive Inclusion” (Canvas)
- Objectives:
 - Understand the role of as-if random assignment in natural experiments.
 - Evaluate when when as-if randomization helps and when it does not, based on a research question of interest.
- Discussion Questions:
 - What are some particularly insightful examples of natural experiments research? How credible are the conclusions?
- Guest:
 - Roberto Carlos

Recommended:

- McCauley & Posner, 2015, “African Borders”
- Dunning, Natural Experiments book, Chps 2–6, 8–9
- Angrist and Pischke, Chapters 2–3, “Regression” and “Instrumental Variables”
- Shadish, Cook, and Campbell, *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs*
- Sovey & Green 2011, “Instrumental Variable Estimation...”

5.13 November 18: Quantitative observational designs

Required readings and plans

- Approach
 - Gerring & Christenson, Chapter 8 (only pages 118–132)
 - Gerring & Christenson, Chapters 18–20 (read strategically)
 - Gerring & Christenson, Chapters 21–23 (read closely)
- Challenge
 - Rosenbaum 1999, “Choice as an Alternative...”
 - Schrodt 2014, “Seven Deadly Sins” (Canvas)
- Application
 - Walker, 2020, “Targeted: The mobilizing effect of perceptions of unfair policing practices,” *The Journal of Politics*.

- Professionalization: The job market
 - Gadarian 2017 on the job market (Canvas)
 - Drezner 1998 on the job market (Canvas)
- Objectives:
 - Understand the strengths and weaknesses of observational research in the quantitative tradition.
 - Articulate the purposes of sampling, including when sampling (random or not) helps or does not help answer a research question.
 - Identify specifically how quantitative observational research contributes to internal and external validity
- Discussion Questions:
 - What are some particularly insightful examples of quantitative observational research? How credible are the conclusions?
 - Do we suffer from an “illusion” that we are learning in quantitative observational research?
 - What are some alternatives to standard control variable approaches? And what are the advantages/disadvantages?
- Guest:
 - Hannah Walker

Recommended:

- Wooldridge, Chps 1 & 2 (Pgs 1–36): “Nature of Econometrics...” & “Simple Regression Model”
- Gerber, Green, Kaplan, “The Illusion of Learning...”
- Angrist and Pischke, Chapter 2, “Regression”
- Wilson & Butler. “A Lot More to Do: The Sensitivity of TSCS...”
- Achen, “Let’s Put Garbage Can Regressions...”
- Simmons and Elkins, “The Globalization of Liberalization”
- Jensenius, “The Fieldwork of Quantitative Data Collection”
- 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?”

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

5.14 November 25: No class; Thanksgiving

5.15 December 2: Qualitative observational designs

Required readings and plans

- Approach
 - Gerring & Christenson, Chapter 9, “Case Study Designs”
 - Paluck 2010, “The Promising Integration...” (Canvas)
 - Leech 2002, “Asking Questions” (Canvas)
- Challenge
 - Fairfield & Charman 2019, “A Dialogue With the Data” (Canvas)
- Application
 - Hunter and Borges Sugiyama, 2014, “Transforming subjects into citizens: Insights from Brazil’s Bolsa Família,” *Perspectives on Politics*.
- Professionalization: Fieldwork and Researcher Trauma
 - Loyle and Simoni. 2017, “Researching Under Fire.” (Canvas)
- Objectives:
 - Understand the strengths and weaknesses of observational research in the qualitative tradition.
 - Articulate the purposes of sampling, including when case-based sampling helps or does not help answer a research question.
 - Identify specifically how qualitative observational research contributes to internal and external validity
- Discussion Questions:
 - What are some particularly insightful examples of qualitative observational research? How credible are the conclusions?
 - Do we suffer from an “illusion” that we are learning in qualitative observational research?
 - What are some alternatives to standard single or dual-case qualitative methodologies? And what are the advantages/disadvantages?

- Guest:
 - Wendy Hunter

Recommended:

- Weller and Barnes, Finding Pathways
- Humphreys and Jacobs, Integrated Inferences
- Seawright, Multi-Method Social Science
- Goertz 2017, Multimethod Research, entire book
- Dunning, Natural Experiments book, Chp 11
- Dunning, “The Central Role of Qualitative Evidence”
- Lieberman “Nested Analysis as a Mixed-Method Strategy”
- Bennett and Braumoeller, “Where the Model Frequently Meets the Road”
- Ahmed and Sil, “When Multi-Method Research Subverts Methodological Pluralism”
- Collier and Elman, “Qualitative and Multimethod Research”
- Fearon & Laitin. “Integrating Qualitative and Quantitative Methods”
- Seawright and Gerring, “Case Selection Techniques in Case Study Research”
- Cyr, *Focus Groups for the Social Science Researcher*
- Collier, “Understanding Process Tracing”
- Ricks and Liu, “Process Tracing Research Designs”
- Gerring and Cojocaru, “Selecting Cases for Intensive Analysis: A Diversity of Goals and Methods”
- King, Keohane, and Verba, Chp. 6: “Increasing the Number of Observations.”
- Dunning, Natural Experiments book, Chp 7
- Brady & Collier, RSI, Pages 49–63 and 22–27
- 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, 2006, “A Tale of Two Cultures...”
- Geddes, Chp 4: “How the Evidence You Use...”
- Scoggins, “Navigating Fieldwork as an Outsider”
- Rathbun, “Interviewing and Qualitative Field Methods”
- Beach & Pedersen, *Process-Tracing Methods: Foundations and Guidelines*.
- Trochim & Donnelly, RMKB, Chp. 8 “Qualitative and Mixed-Methods Designs”
- George and Bennett, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*.
- Sparrow, “Political Science and Biography”
- 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*.

5.16 December 9: Research Project Presentations

Required readings and plans

- Research Project Presentations
- Professionalization: Professional Speaking
 - Gerring & Christenson, Chapter 15, “Speaking”
 - Salmond and Smith 2011, “Cheating Death-by-PowerPoint”
- Guest:
 - XX (confirmed?)

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.
- Altman, Micah. 2009. “Funding, Funding.” *PS: Political Science and Politics*.
- 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.
- Ashworth, Scott, Christopher Berry, and Ethan Bueno de Mesquita. 2021. *Theory and Credibility: Integrating Theoretical and Empirical Social Science*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Barabas, Jason, and Jennifer Jerit. 2010. “Are Survey Experiments Externally Valid.” *American Political Science Review*
- 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.
- Blair, Graeme, Alexander Coppock, and Macartan Humphreys: 2023. *Research Design in the Social Sciences: Declaration, Diagnosis, and Redesign*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bowers, Jake. 2011. “Six Steps to a Better Relationship with your Future Self.” *The Political Methodologist*.
- 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.
- Bueno de Mesquita, Ethan, and Anthony Fowler. 2021. *Thinking Clearly With Data: A Guide to Quantitative Reasoning and Analysis*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Buyalskaya, Anastasia, Marcos Gallo, and Colin F. Camerer. 2021. “The Golden Age of Social Science.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of the Sciences* 118(5).
- Carmines, Edward, and Richard Zeller. 1979. *Reliability and Validity Assessment*. In Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences Series. Sage University Paper #17.
- Cartwright, Nancy. 1983. *How the Laws of Physics Lie*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Cartwright, Nancy. 1999. *The Dappled World: A Study of the Boundaries of Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cartwright, Nancy, and Jeremy Hardie. 2012. *Evidence-Based Policy: A Practical Guide to Doing it Better*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cunningham, Scott. 2021. *Causal Inference: The Mixtape*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- 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*.
- Christensen, Garret, Jeremy Freese, and Edward Miguel. 2019. *Transparent and Reproducible Social Science Research: How to Do Open Science*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Clark, Cory, Nathan Honeycutt, and Lee Jussim. 2022. “Replicability and the Psychology of Science.” In S. Lilienfeld, A. Masuda, and W. O’Donahue (Eds.) *Questionable Research Practices in Psychology*. New York: Springer.
- 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.
- Cyr, Jennifer. 2019. *Focus Groups for the Social Science Researcher*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- de Bono, Edward. 2015. *Lateral Thinking: Creativity Step by Step*. New York: Harper Perennial.
- de la Cuesta, Brandon, Lucy Martin, Helen V. Milner, and Daniel L. Nielson. 2021. “Foreign Aid, Oil Revenues, and Political Accountability: Evidence from Six Experiments in Ghana and Uganda.” *Review of International Organizations* 16: 521–548.
- 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.
- Drezner, Daniel. 1998. “So You Want to Get a Tenure-Track Job...” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 31: 609–614.
- 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.
- Elman, Colin, Diana Kapiszewski, and Arthur Lupia. 2018. “Transparent Social Inquiry: Implications for Social Science.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 21: 29–47.
- Elman, Colin, John Gerring, and James Mahoney (Eds.). 2020. *The Production of Knowledge: Enhancing Progress in Social Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fairfield, Tasha, and Andrew Charman. 2019. “A Dialogue with the Data: The Bayesian Foundations of Iterative Research in Qualitative Social Science.” *Perspectives on Politics* 17(10): 154–167.
- Falletti, 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. 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., 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., Kyosuke Kikuta, and Michael Denly. 2021. "External Validity." *Annual Review of Political Science* 24: 365–393.
- 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*
- Findley, Michael G., Daniel L. Nielson, and J.C. Sharman. 2017. "External Validity in Global Field and Survey Experiments." *Journal of Politics*
- Findley, Michael G., Faten Ghosn, and Sara Lowe. 2024. "Vulnerability in Research Ethics: A Call for Assessment and Implementation of Protections." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 121(34).
- Franco, Annie, Neil Malhotra, and Gabor Simonovits. 2014. "Publication Bias in the Social Sciences: Unlocking the File Drawer." *Science* 345(6203): 1502–1505.
- Fujii, Lee Ann. 2012. "Research Ethics 101: Dilemmas and Responsibilities." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 45(4): 717–723.
- Gadarian, Shana. 2017. "The Academic Job Market." Unpublished presentation: Syracuse University.
- 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.
- Gerring, John, and Dino Christenson. 2017. *Applied Social Science Methodology: An Introductory Guide*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Gerring, John, and Jason Seawright. 2021. *Finding Your Social Science Project: The Research Sandbox*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goertz, Gary. 2017. *Multimethod Research, Causal Mechanisms, and Case Studies: An Integrated Approach*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Goertz, Gary. 2020. *Social Science Concepts and Measurement*. 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.
- Healy, Kieran. 2019. *Data Visualization: A Practical Introduction*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- 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.
- Humphreys, Macartan, and Alan Jacobs. 2023. *Integrated Inferences: Causal Models for Qualitative and Mixed-Method Research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hunter, Wendy. 2007. "The Normalization of an Anomaly: The Worker's Party in Brazil." *World Politics* 59(3): 440–475.
- Hunter, Wendy, and Natasha Sugiyama. 2014. "Transforming Subjects into Citizens: Insights from Brazil's Bolsa Familia." *Perspectives on Politics* 12(4): 829–844.
- Huntington-Klein, Nick. 2022. *The Effect: An Introduction to Research Design and Causality*. Chapman and Hall.
- Hyde, Susan. 2007. "The Observer Effect in International Politics: Evidence from a Natural Experiment." *World Politics* 60: 37–63.
- Imai, Kosuke. 2017. *Quantitative Social Science: An Introduction*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Imai, Kosuke, and Nora Webb Williams. 2022. *Quantitative Social Science: An Introduction in tidyverse*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Ioannidis, John P.A. 2005. "Why Most Published Research Findings Are False." *PLoS Medicine* 2(8): 696–701.
- Jensenius, Francesca. 2014. "The Fieldwork of Quantitative Data Collection." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 47(2): 402–404.
- Johns, Leslie, and Rachel Wellhausen. 2016. "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.
- Lampe, Benjamin, and Baris Kesgin. N.d. "Hazing in the Discipline: The Comprehensive Examination in Political Science." University of Iowa. <http://myweb.uiowa.edu/bhlai/workshop/lampe>

- Laudan, Larry. 1977. *Progress and Its Problems: Towards a Theory of Scientific Growth*. Berkeley, CA: University of California 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, and Elise Pizzi. 2016. "The Language of Economic Growth: A New Measure of Linguistic Heterogeneity." *British Journal of Political Science* 48: 953–980.
- Llaudet, Elena, and Kosuke Imai. 2023. *Data Analysis for Social Science: A Friendly and Practical Introduction*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- 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.
- McIntyre, Lee. 2019. *The Scientific Attitude: Defending Science from Denial, Fraud, and Pseudoscience*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- 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/>
- Michelson, Melissa R., and Jessica L. Lavariega Monforti. 2021. “Elusive Inclusion: Persistent Challenges Facing Women of Color in Political Science.” *PS: Political Science and Politics*.
- 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.
- Pearl, Judea. 2017. *Causal Inference in Statistics: A Primer*. John Wiley and Sons.
- Pearl, Judea, and Dana Mackenzie. 2018. *The Book of Why: The New Science of Cause and Effect*. New York: Basic Books.
- 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.
- Ritchie, Stuart. 2020. *Science Fictions: How FRAUD, BIAS, NEGLIGENCE, and HYPE Undermine the Search for Truth*. New York: Metropolitan Press.
- Rosenbaum, Paul R. 1999. “Choice as an Alternative to Control in Observational Studies.” *Statistical Science* 14(3): 259–304.
- Rosenbaum, Paul R. 2017. *Observation and Experiment: An Introduction to Casual Inference*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rosenberg, Alex. 2000. *Philosophy of Science: A Contemporary Introduction*. London: Routledge.
- Russo, Federica, and Jon Williamson. 2007. “Interpreting Causality in the Health Sciences.” *International Studies in the Philosophy of Science* 21(2): 157–170.
- Rutherford, Amanda. 2015. “Conquering the ‘Lumbering Dinosaur’: Graduate Student Experiences at Political Science Conferences.” *PS: Political Science and Politics*.

- Salmon, Wesley C. 1984. *Scientific Explanation and the Causal Structure of the World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Salmond, Rob, and David T. Smith. 2011. "Cheating Death by Powerpoint: Effective Use of Visual Aids at Professional Conferences." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 44(3): 589–596.
- Sartori, Giovanni. 1970. "Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics." *American Political Science Review* 64(4): 1033–1053.
- Savun, Burcu. 2021. "Welcoming the Unwelcome: Refugee Flows, Refugee Rights, and Political Violence." *International Studies Quarterly*.
- 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. 2016. *Multi-method Social Science: Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Tools*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 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.
- Sekhon, Jasjeet, and Rocio Titiunik. 2012. "When Natural Experiments Are Neither Natural nor Experiments." *American Political Science Review* 106(1): 35–57.
- Shadish, William R., Thomas D. Cook, and Donald T. Campbell. 2002. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*. Belmont, CA: Cengage Learning.
- Shah, Hetan. 2020. "Global Problems Need Social Science." *Proceedings of the National Academy of the Sciences* 577: 295–296.
- 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.
- Stokes, Susan. 2014. “A Defense of Observational Research.” In Dawn Langan Teele (Ed.) *Field Experiments and their Critics*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- 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.
- Walker, Hannah. 2019. “Targeted: The Mobilizing Effect of Perceptions of Unfair Policing Practices.” *The Journal of Politics*
- Webb, Derek. 2005. “Twelve Easy Steps to Becoming an Effective Teaching Assistant.” *PS: Political Science and Politics*
- 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: 255–72.
- Weingast, Barry. 2010/1995. “Caltech Rules for Writing Papers: How to Structure Your Paper and Write an Introduction.” Unpublished Memo: Stanford University.
- Weller, Nicholas, and Jeb Barnes. 2014. *Finding Pathways: Mixed-Method Research for Studying Causal Mechanisms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wicherts, Jelte M. 2017. “The Weak Spots in Contemporary Science (and How to Fix Them).” *Animals* 7(12): 90–.
- 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.
- Wolford, Scott. 2022. “Game Theory.” In Patrick Mello and Falk Ostermann (Eds.) *Routledge Handbook of Foreign Policy Analysis Methods*.
- Wooldridge, Jeffrey M. 2012. *Introductory Econometrics: A Modern Approach*. 5th Edition. Belmont, CA: Cengage Learning.
- Wu, Cathy, and Scott Wolford. 2018. “Leaders, States, and Reputations.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 62(10): 2087–2117.
- 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 Other Recommended Readings

- Angrist, Joshua D., Jorn-Steffen and Prischke. 2015. *Mastering 'Metrics: The Path from Cause to Effect*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- APSA Ethics Principles and Guidelines. 2020. *American Political Science Association* Accessed 29 August 2021 at [Link here].
- 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.
- Christensen, Garret, and Edward Miguel. 2018. “Transparency, Reproducibility, and the Credibility of Economic Research.” *Journal of Economic Literature* 56(3): 920–980.
- Christensen, Garret, Jeremy Freese, and Edward Miguel. 2019. *Transparent and Reproducible Social Science Research: How to Do Open Science*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Dunning, Thad. 2012. *Natural Experiments in the Social Sciences: A Design-Based Approach*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Gerring, John. 2012. *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goertz, Gary. 2017. *Multimethod Research, Causal Mechanisms, and Case Studies: An Integrated Approach*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Healy, Kieran. 2019. *Data Visualization: A Practical Introduction*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Imai, Kosuke, and Nora Webb Williams. 2022. *Quantitative Social Science: An Introduction in tidyverse*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kellstedt, Paul M., and Guy D. Whitten. 2009. *The Fundamentals of Political Science Research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- King, Gary, Robert Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Little, Daniel. 1991. *Varieties of Social Explanation: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Social Science*. Boulder, CO: Westview 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])
- O’Hear, Anthony. 1991. *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Science*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Pollock, Philip H., III. 2012. *The Essentials of Political Analysis*. 4th Ed. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine, and Dvora Yanow. 2012. *Interpretive Research Design: Concepts and Processes*. New York: Routledge.
- Trochim, William, and James Donnelly. 2008. *The Research Methods Knowledge Base*. Mason, OH: Cengage Learning.

8 Other Professionalization Readings

- 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*
- 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*
- Smith and Salmond. 2011. “Verbal Sticks and Rhetorical Stones: Improving Conference Presentations in Political Science.” *PS: Political Science and Politics*
- Mitchell. “A Guide to Preparing for and Taking Comprehensive Examinations.” University of Oregon. https://rmitchel.uoregon.edu/tip/comp_take
- GradHacker. 2012. “Surviving Studying for Comprehensive Exams.” <http://www.gradhacker.org/2012/03/studying-for-comprehensive-exams/>
- 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...”
- 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*
- 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.
- 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*
- Clinton, Josh. “Advice on Computing Issues.”
- King, Gary. 1995. “Replication, Replication.” *PS: Political Science and Politics*
- 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*.
- 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*

9 Resources

- Excellent introductions to statistics, including software assistance:
 - Link: UCLA Statistics and Software
 - Link: Statistics at Square One
 - Link: HyperStat Online Statistics Textbook
 - Link: DataCamp
 - 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, associations, syllabi:
 - 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
- Everything is Fucked: The Syllabus
- Everything is F*cking Nuanced: The Syllabus