

University of Western Ontario
Department of Political Science
The Craft of Political Science
(a.k.a. Advanced Research Design)
Political Science 9502A
Fall 2023

Instructor: Dr. Zack Taylor
E-mail: zack.taylor@uwo.ca
Phone: 519-661-2111 ext. 85169
Office Hours: Online via Zoom by appointment
Dates: Thursdays 9am–12pm
Location: Social Science Centre 7236

COURSE DESCRIPTION AND LEARNING OUTCOMES

The objective of this course is to provide early-stage doctoral students in political science with an understanding of research design principles, as well as disagreements about them, that they will carry forward into their dissertation projects and future careers as researchers. By the end of the course, students will be able to situate their research interests within the development of the discipline, recognize the value of different research approaches, and critically evaluate the theories, empirical strategies, and causal claims found in political science research products, and assess their validity. As much as possible, equal attention will be given to political science research traditions in domestic politics, comparative politics, international relations, and political theory. The goal of this course is not to teach specific *methodologies* – our department offers numerous compulsory and elective “methods” courses – but to reflect on the *craft of political science research* to develop the foundational knowledge necessary to devise and execute high-quality quantitative, qualitative, or mixed-methods research projects, including developing research questions, selecting cases and methods, and acting ethically. We will also touch on proposal and grant writing and publishing. These topics, including approaches to mixed-methods research, will be further developed in POL 9593B Foundations of Qualitative Methods.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

By the end of the course, you should be able to:

- appreciate major methodological debates in the social sciences;
- understand how your research orientations and interests fit within political science as a scholarly discipline;
- identify and assess the positive and negative aspects of major approaches in political science;
- appreciate major issues related to designing research projects;
- navigate major issues of research design with your own research questions; and
- critically analyze readings and prepare materials to teach a topic.

SCHEDULE OF TOPICS

PART I: Approaches to Political Science Research		
1	7 Sep.	Discipline and Department: The Development of the Field(s) <i>What is political science? How has it developed over time?</i>
2	14 Sep.	Ontology & Epistemology I: Approaches and Goals <i>What are the goals of political science? What are its possibilities and limitations?</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflection Paper 1: <i>What do you think the goal of political science should be? What ontology are you aligned with? What kind of political scientist do you want to become?</i>
3	21 Sep.	Ontology & Epistemology II: Levels and Objects of Analysis <i>How does the researcher's chosen level or object of analysis lead to different styles of research and types of research products?</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflection Paper 2 (for non-political theorists): <i>Are different research ontologies and epistemologies commensurable?</i>
4	28 Sep.	Ontology & Epistemology III: The Uses of Evidence <i>What is the difference between inference and interpretation? Are new techniques collapsing the distinction? Is political science necessarily empirical?</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflection Paper 2 (for political theorists): <i>What role can, or should, empirical research have in political theory?</i>
PART II: Crafting Research Projects		
5	5 Oct.	From Puzzle to Research Question
6	12 Oct.	Units of Analysis I: Selection and Comparability of Cases
7	19 Oct.	Units of Analysis II: Observations in Variable-Oriented Research
8	26 Oct.	Conceptualization <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design Paper 1: <i>Reflect on how issues related to selecting units of analysis (cases, observations, or examples) and comparison bear on your research project.</i>
	2 Nov.	<i>Reading Week</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Critique Paper Part 1 (Overview) Due Thursday, November 2 Midnight
9	9 Nov.	Measurement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research Proposal Outline Due
10	16 Nov.	Causal Arguments and Causal Analyses
11	23 Nov.	Ethics, Replication, and Transparency <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design Paper 2: <i>Reflect on how issues related to causation, conceptualization, and measurement bear on your research project.</i>
	30 Nov.	No Class – Work on Your Final Papers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Critique Paper Part 2 (Critique) Due
12	7 Dec.	Proposal Symposium <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal Draft Due Sunday, December 3 Midnight • Peer Review Due Thursday, December 7 Before Class • Final Proposal Due Thursday, December 14 Midnight

COURSE WEBSITE

This course makes use of OWL. Please refer to the course website regularly for announcements and course information: <https://owl.uwo.ca/portal>.

COURSE FORMAT

This is a seminar course. While the instructor will introduce concepts and motivate debate, there will be no lecture. Students will lead and actively contribute to the discussion. **Reading the required texts in advance is a necessary prerequisite for doing well in this course and will make for more exciting and insightful discussion.** The course has a heavy reading load – please try to get a jump on it before the start of term.

READINGS

We will be reading portions of the books listed below, which have been ordered through the Western Bookstore (https://bookstore.uwo.ca/textbook-search?campus=UWO&term=32023&courses%5B0%5D=001_UW/POL9502).





Gerring (2012) is available digitally through the library, but only one person can check out each book at a time. The other books are not available digitally, and the current editions are not currently part of Western Libraries' collection.

Gerring, John. 2012. *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework*, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

<https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/west/detail.action?docID=5120101>

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 2021 [New Edition]. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Lowndes, Vivien, David Marsh, and Gerry Stoker. 2018. *Theory and Methods in Political Science*, 4th ed. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Readings from these books are marked with a  in the reading list. Journal articles and book chapters available digitally through Western Libraries are marked with a . Items available on the internet are marked with a . Finally, items posted on OWL are marked with a .

Supplemental readings are not required but may be useful to explore topics more deeply. You may find guidance and inspiration from Cambridge University Press's excellent *Strategies for Social Inquiry* series, which expands on almost every topic we discuss, and which is available digitally through the library at <https://www.cambridge.org/core/series/strategies-for-social-inquiry/7D51FF41D1EF7D2933DCBBEAB7DC277>.

EVALUATION

Participation (10%): Lively, informed, and thoughtful discussion is at the heart of this course. You will be expected to provide consistent, informed, and active participation throughout the term. Read the material, reflect on it before and during the seminar, and engage in the seminar discussion in an open-minded fashion. **Each student must submit two discussion questions**

before midnight the night before each class. Grades will be assigned based not only on the frequency but also the quality of your oral contributions to the seminar.

Seminar leadership (10%): You will deliver one substantial presentation that will offer a brief introduction to the week's readings as well as *two* additional readings you select. In addition to effective summary and integration of the selected readings, you should raise questions and challenges in such a way as to stimulate seminar discussion in the time to follow. Sign-up will occur in the first class.

Reflection Papers (2 x 5% = 10%): In Part I, you will prepare two short papers (3–5 pages) in which you will reflect on the field of political science and your position in it.

Design Papers (2 x 5% = 10%): In Part II, you will prepare two short papers (3–5 pages) in which you will comment on how issues raised in the readings apply to your own research project. These will help you develop your Research Proposal assignment.

Critique Paper (Overview 5% + Critique 20% = 25%): You will access, read, and critique the research design of a dissertation that has won a best dissertation award in the past six years from the Canadian Political Science Association (the Vincent Lemieux Prize, awarded every two years), the American Political Science Association or one of its organized sections, the British Political Studies Association, or the European Consortium for Political Research (the Jean Blondel PhD Prize or the Joni Lovenduski PhD Prize).

Select on a dissertation on a topic you are interested in, or which uses methodologies that may appeal to you. The goal of this assignment is to put you in the shoes of a dissertation examiner and expose you to work by peers that is deemed high-quality in the field.

The *Overview* will describe the author's ontology, research question, research design, evidence, and methodology. The *Critique* will evaluate the author's research design (including case selection), choice of method or approach, and quality of the analysis and interpretation of it. Consider the appropriateness of the research design and methods to answering the research question, whether the methods and evidence used influenced the conclusion reached, and whether an alternative approach would have yielded different, and perhaps better, results. The Overview and Critique papers should each be no more than five pages in length.

You can find the names of the award winners and dissertation titles on the following websites:

- CPSA: <https://cpsa-acsp.ca/prizes-vincent-lemieux-prize/>
- APSA: <https://apsanet.org/awards>
- APSA: <https://apsanet.org/sectionawards>
- British PSA: https://www.psa.ac.uk/news/search?combine=dissertation&field_para_news_type_tid_1=All
- ECPR, Jean Blondel PhD Prize: <https://ecpr.eu/Prizes/PrizeWinners.aspx?PrizeID=4>
- ECPR, Joni Lovenduski Gender and Politics PhD Prize: <https://ecpr.eu/Prizes/PrizeWinners.aspx?PrizeID=9>

You can search for dissertation texts on open research repositories:

- ProQuest Theses and Dissertations Global: <https://www.proquest.com/pqdtglobal>.

- Library and Archives Canada archives Canadian theses and dissertations: <https://library-archives.canada.ca/eng/services/services-libraries/theses/Pages/search-theses-canada.aspx>.
- British theses are available (following registration) from the British Library at <https://ethos.bl.uk/>.
- The DART-Europe repository contains dissertations from 580 European universities: <https://www.dart-europe.org/basic-search.php>

Not all dissertations may be publicly accessible. If searches fail to turn up the dissertation you seek, you may find that some winners make their dissertations available on their personal websites. Most university libraries archive their own theses and dissertations on institutional research repositories, which can be located through internet searches.

Project Proposal (35%): Academic researchers routinely prepare proposals for future research projects, often to apply for grants. Doctoral students are required to write a proposal for their dissertation project. In this assignment you will prepare a concise project proposal with the goal of applying the knowledge gained throughout the course to a research topic. While this could function as the beginnings of your dissertation proposal or OGS/SSHRC grant application, there is no expectation that you will pursue this the topic and research design for your dissertation. The final proposal will include the following elements:

- Statement of the research question and your ontological orientation to it.
- Literature review, situating your question within it.
- Description of your evidence collection strategy (including the selection of units of analysis and research ethics) and how it is associated with your ontological orientation.
- Description of your analysis approach (including conceptualization and measurement, as appropriate) and how it is associated with your ontological orientation.
- Discussion of the limitations of your research design.

You must reference readings from class to justify your research design choices.

Note: Explicit details about evidence collection techniques (e.g., archival work, experiments, interviews, or surveys) are not expected, but you should provide enough information that the reader will understand the nature of your evidence and where it comes from.

- *Outline (5%)* – Due Nov. 9 – The one-page outline should, at minimum, identify the research question and tentative claims. The instructor will provide timely feedback.
- *Draft Proposal for Discussant (no grade)* – Submit November 30. The instructor will circulate your proposal to your discussants.
- *Discussant Comments (5%)* – Return to instructor on December 3. In no more than three pages, you will identify the most and least successful aspects of the draft proposal and one suggestion for how to improve it. Include two questions to pose to the author at the Symposium.
- *Symposium* – December 7. Each student will present their research proposal (8–10 minutes) after which the discussant will present their comments (5 minutes each).
- *Final Proposal (25%)* – Due December 14. You will use the feedback from your discussants and symposium discussion to revise your proposal prior to final submission.

The final proposals should be at minimum 10 and maximum 15 pages, be double-spaced in a 12-point serif font and with one-inch margins, and use Chicago in-text author-date style (<https://www.lib.uwo.ca/essayhelp/index.html>).

COURSE POLICIES

E-mail policy: All Western University students are required to have an @uwo.ca e-mail account. The instructor will *only* respond to e-mails sent from a Western University account, that clearly identify the sender, and have “POL9502” in the subject line. The instructor will **not** accept assignments by e-mail.

Late assignments: The penalty for late assignments is two percentage points per day (including weekend days). A grade of 80% on an assignment therefore becomes 72% in four days. Assignments more than 10 days late will not be accepted. Extensions due to illness require a medical certificate. If you foresee problems meeting submission deadlines please consult the instructor early; accommodations can always be made with adequate advance notice. This means *at least one week before the deadline*, not the night before the work is due! The last day for submission of term assignments with penalty is **Monday, December 18, 2023**, after which they cannot be accepted.

Academic Offences: Scholastic offences are taken seriously and students are directed to read the appropriate policy, specifically, the definition of what constitutes a Scholastic Offence, at the following Web site:

http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/pdf/academic_policies/appeals/scholastic_discipline_grad.pdf

All required papers may be subject to submission for textual similarity review to the commercial plagiarism-detection software under license to the University for the detection of plagiarism. All papers submitted for such checking will be included as source documents in the reference database for the purpose of detecting plagiarism of papers subsequently submitted to the system. Use of the service is subject to the licensing agreement, currently between The University of Western Ontario and Turnitin.com (<http://www.turnitin.com>).

If you are unclear about what constitutes plagiarism or how to reference sources, please visit the Writing Support Centre <http://www.sdc.uwo.ca/writing/> or review information at: <http://www.lib.uwo.ca/tutorials/plagiarism/>.


ASSISTANCE


If you are having trouble with the course material or are falling behind in your work, please contact the course instructor as soon as possible. We can only help you if the lines of communication are open. Learning to express ideas clearly is a central goal of the university experience. If academic writing does not come easily to you, you are strongly encouraged to make use of the Writing Support Centre: <http://www.sdc.uwo.ca/writing/>.


Health/Wellness Services: Students who are in emotional/mental distress should refer to Western's Wellness and Well-Being hub at <http://www.uwo.ca/uwocom/mentalhealth/> for a complete list of options about how to obtain help.

Accessible Education Western (AEW): Western is committed to achieving barrier-free accessibility for all its members, including graduate students. As part of this commitment, Western provides a variety of services devoted to promoting, advocating, and accommodating persons with disabilities in their respective graduate program. Graduate students with disabilities (for example, chronic illnesses, mental health conditions, mobility impairments) are strongly encouraged to register with Accessible Education Western at http://academicsupport.uwo.ca/accessible_education/index.html, a confidential service designed to support graduate and undergraduate students through their academic program. With the appropriate documentation, the student will work with both AEW and their graduate programs (normally their Graduate Chair and/or Course instructor) to ensure that appropriate academic accommodations to program requirements are arranged. These accommodations include individual counselling, alternative formatted literature, accessible campus transportation, learning strategy instruction, writing exams and assistive technology instruction.

SCHEDULE OF READINGS

 = In required book

 = Journal articles and book chapters available digitally through Western Libraries

 = Available on the internet

 = PDF on OWL

		Part I: Approaches to Political Science Research
1	7 Sep.	<p>Discipline and Department: The Development of the Field(s) <i>On the field of political science and its development</i></p> <p> Bevir, Mark. 2022. <i>A History of Political Science</i>. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. https://ocul-uwo.primo.exlibrisgroup.com/permalink/01OCUL_UWO/r0c2m8/alma991045376594105163</p> <p> Lucas, Jack. 2013. “A Century of Political Science in Canada.” <i>Journal of Canadian Studies</i> 47 (2):89–118. https://doi.org/10.3138/jcs.47.2.89.</p> <p> Lowndes, Marsh, and Stoker, Ch. 1, “Introduction,” 1–13.</p> <p><i>On subfields: IR and political theory</i></p> <p> Reiter, Dan. 2015. “Should We Leave Behind the Subfield of International Relations?” <i>Annual Review of Political Science</i> 18 (1):481–499. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-053013-041156.</p> <p> Rehfeld, Andrew. 2010. “Offensive Political Theory.” <i>Perspectives on Politics</i> 8 (2):465–486. doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592710001209.</p> <p> Corbett, Ross J. 2011. “Political Theory within Political Science.” <i>PS: Political Science & Politics</i> 44 (3):565–570. doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096511000679.</p> <p><i>Supplemental</i></p> <p>Abbott, Andrew. 2001. <i>Chaos of Disciplines</i>. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.</p>
2	14 Sep.	<p>Ontology & Epistemology I: Approaches and Goals <i>On conflicts over ontology and epistemology in the social sciences</i></p> <p> King, Keohane, and Verba, Ch. 1, “The <i>Science</i> in Social Science,” 1–32.</p> <p> Riker, William H. 1982. “The Two-Party System and Duverger's Law: An Essay on the History of Political Science.” <i>The American Political Science Review</i> 76 (4):753–766. https://doi.org/10.2307/1962968.</p> <p> Lowndes, Marsh, and Stoker, Ch. 11, “A Skin is Not a Sweater: Ontology and Epistemology in Political Science,” 177–198.</p> <p> Mahoney, James, and Gary Goertz. 2006. “A Tale of Two Cultures: Contrasting Quantitative and Qualitative Research.” <i>Political Analysis</i> 14 (3):227–249. https://doi.org/10.1093/pan/mpj017.</p> <p> Brown-Saracino, Japonica. 2021. “Unsettling Definitions of Qualitative Research.” <i>Qualitative Sociology</i> 44 (4):591–597. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11133-021-09498-9.</p>

		<p>📖 Lowndes, Marsh, and Stoker, Ch. 19, “The Relevance of Political Science,” 321–331.</p> <p><i>Supplemental</i></p> <p>🎓 Almond, Gabriel A., and Stephen J. Genco. 1977. “Clouds, Clocks, and the Study of Politics.” <i>World Politics</i> 29 (4):489–522. https://doi.org/10.2307/2010037.</p> <p>Hall, Peter. 2003. “Aligning Ontology and Methodology in Comparative Research.” In James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, eds., <i>Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Science</i>. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.</p> <p>Flyvbjerg, Bent. 2001. <i>Making Social Science Matter: Why Social Inquiry Fails and How it Can Succeed Again</i>. Translated by Steven Sampson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.</p>
3	21 Sep.	<p>Ontology & Epistemology II: Levels and Objects of Analysis</p> <p>🎓 Parsons, Craig. <i>How to Map Arguments in Political Science</i>. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. Introduction, 3–20.</p> <p>🎓 Abbott, Andrew. 2004. <i>Methods of Discovery: Heuristics for the Social Sciences</i>. Ch. 6, “Fractal Heuristics,” 162–210.</p> <p>🎓 List, Christian, and Kai Spiekermann. 2013. “Methodological Individualism and Holism in Political Science: A Reconciliation.” <i>American Political Science Review</i> 107 (4):629–643. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055413000373.</p> <p><i>Overviews of different “ways in” to social phenomena</i></p> <p>📖 Lowndes, Marsh, and Stoker, Ch. 2, “Behavioural Analysis,” 20–38.</p> <p>📖 Lowndes, Marsh, and Stoker, Ch. 4, “Institutionalism,” 54–74.</p> <p>📖 Lowndes, Marsh, and Stoker, Ch. 7, “Marxism: A Global Perspective,” 109–124.</p> <p><i>Supplemental</i></p> <p>Alford, Robert R. and Roger Friedland. 1985. <i>Powers of Theory: Capitalism, the State, and Democracy</i>. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Especially introduction and chapter one on levels and analysis and conceptualization.</p> <p>🎓 Milner, Helen V. 1998. “Rationalizing Politics: The Emerging Synthesis of International, American, and Comparative Politics.” <i>International Organization</i> 52 (4):759–786. https://doi.org/10.1162/002081898550743.</p>
4	28 Sep.	<p>Ontology & Epistemology III: The Uses of Evidence</p> <p><i>Types and uses of evidence: Inference and interpretation</i></p> <p>📖 King, Keohane, and Verba, Ch. 2, “Descriptive Inference,” 33–72.</p> <p>🔗 Bevir, Mark, and R.A.W. Rhodes. 2006. “Defending Interpretation.” <i>European Political Science</i> 5 (1):69–83. https://openresearch-repository.anu.edu.au/bitstream/1885/22234/2/01_Bevir_Defending_Interp_2006.pdf.</p> <p><i>Thick and thin evidence</i></p> <p>🎓 Geertz, Clifford. 1973. “Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture.” Reprint, https://philpapers.org/archive/GEETTD.pdf</p>

		<p>☞ Wedeen, Lisa. 2010. “Reflections on Ethnographic Work in Political Science.” <i>Annual Review of Political Science</i> 13 (1):255–272. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.11.052706.123951.</p> <p>☞ Lucas, Christopher et al. 2015. “Computer-Assisted Text Analysis for Comparative Politics.” <i>Political Analysis</i> 23 (2):254–277. https://doi.org/10.1093/pan/mpu019.</p> <p><i>Empirics and political theory</i></p> <p>🦉 Miller, David. 2008. “Political Philosophy for Earthlings.” Ch. 2 in David Leopold and Marc Stears, eds., <i>Political Theory: Methods and Approaches</i>. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 29–48.</p> <p>☞ Grant, Ruth W. 2002. “Political Theory, Political Science, and Politics.” <i>Political Theory</i> 30 (4):577–595. https://doi.org/10.1177/0090591702030004007.</p> <p><i>Supplemental: Emerging big data and data science approaches in political science</i></p> <p>☞ Brady, Henry E. 2019. “The Challenge of Big Data and Data Science.” <i>Annual Review of Political Science</i> 22 (1):297–323. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-090216-023229.</p> <p>☞ Tanweer, Anissa, Emily Kalah Gade, P.M. Krafft, and Sarah Dreier. 2021. “Why the Data Revolution Needs Qualitative Thinking.” <i>Harvard Data Science Review</i> 3 (3):1–32. doi: https://doi.org/10.1162/99608f92.eee0b0da.</p> <p>☞ Grossman, Jonathan, and Ami Pedahzur. 2020. “Political Science and Big Data: Structured Data, Unstructured Data, and How to Use Them.” <i>Political Science Quarterly</i> 135 (2):225–257. https://doi.org/10.1002/polq.13032.</p> <p><i>Supplemental: Methods in political theory</i></p> <p>☞ List, Christian, and Laura Valentini. 2016. “The Methodology of Political Theory.” In <i>The Oxford Handbook of Philosophical Methodology</i>: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199668779.013.10.</p> <p>Swift, Adam, and Stuart White. 2008. “Political theory, social science, and real politics.” In <i>Political Theory: Methods and Approaches</i>, edited by David Leopold and Marc Stears. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.</p>
		<p>PART II: Crafting Research Projects</p>
5	5 Oct.	<p>From Puzzle to Research Question</p> <p>☞ Gerring, John, and Jason Seawright. 2022. <i>Finding your Social Science Project: The Research Sandbox, Strategies for Social Inquiry</i>. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009118620. Chapters 1–4 (pp. 1–101)</p> <p><i>Situating your work: The literature review</i></p> <p>☞ Knopf, Jeffrey W. 2006. “Doing a Literature Review.” <i>PS: Political Science & Politics</i> 39 (1):127–132. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096506060264.</p> <p>☞ Randolph, Justus. 2009. “A Guide to Writing the Dissertation Literature Review.” <i>Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation</i> 14 (13). https://doi.org/10.7275/b0az-8t74.</p>

		<p>🎓 Jungherr, Andreas. 2016. “Twitter use in election campaigns: A systematic literature review.” <i>Journal of Information Technology & Politics</i> 13(1): 72–91. https://doi.org/10.1080/19331681.2015.1132401.</p>
6	12 Oct.	<p>Units of Analysis I: Selection and Comparability of Cases</p> <p>🎓 della Porta, Donatella. 2008. “Comparative Analysis: Case-Oriented versus Variable-Oriented Research.” Ch. 11 in Donatella della Porta and Michael Keating, eds., <i>Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences: A Pluralist Perspective</i>. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. 198–222. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511801938.</p> <p>📖 Lowndes, Marsh, and Stoker, Ch. 16, “The Comparative Method,” 271–289.</p> <p><i>On cases and case selection</i></p> <p>🔗 Ragin, Charles. 1992. “Introduction: Cases of ‘What is a Case?’” In Charles Ragin and Howard Becker, eds., <i>What is a Case? Exploring the Foundations of Social Inquiry</i>. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1–18. https://www.miguelangelmartinez.net/IMG/pdf/1992_Ragin_What_is_a_case_chapter.pdf</p> <p>🎓 Seawright, Jason and John Gerring. 2008. “Case Selection Techniques in Case Studies: A Menu of Qualitative and Quantitative Options,” <i>Political Research Quarterly</i> 61(2): 294–308. https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912907313077.</p> <p>🎓 Gisselquist, Rachel M. 2014. “Paired Comparison and Theory Development: Considerations for Case Selection.” <i>PS: Political Science & Politics</i> 47 (2):477–484. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096514000419.</p> <p><i>Supplemental resources on case study research design. More on this in POL9593!</i></p> <p>George, Alexander L., and Andrew. Bennett. 2005. <i>Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences</i>. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.</p> <p>🎓 Widner, Jennifer, Michael Woolcock, and Daniel Ortega Nieto, eds. 2022. <i>The Case for Case Studies: Methods and Applications in International Development, Strategies for Social Inquiry</i>. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108688253</p> <p>🎓 Geddes, Barbara. 1990. “How the cases you choose affect the answers you get: selection bias in comparative politics.” <i>Political Analysis</i> 2:131–50. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23317768. See also her <i>Paradigms and Sand Castles: Theories and Research Design in Comparative Politics</i> (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2003).</p> <p>🎓 Ragin, Charles C. 2014 <i>The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies</i>, 2nd ed. Berkeley: University of California Press. https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520957350. Especially chapters 1–4.</p> <p>🎓 Tarrow, Sidney. 2010. “The Strategy of Paired Comparison: Toward a Theory of Practice.” <i>Comparative Political Studies</i> 43 (2):230–259. https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414009350044.</p>

7	19 Oct.	<p>Units of Analysis II: Observations in Variable-Oriented Research</p> <p>📖 King, Keohane, and Verba, Ch. 4, “Determining What to Observe,” 113–147.</p> <p>📖 Gerring, John. Ch. 4, “Analysis,” 107–140.</p> <p>🎓 Lynch, Julia D. 2013. “Aligning Sampling Strategies with Analytic Goals.” Ch. 1 in Mosley, Layna, ed. <i>Interview Research in Political Science</i>. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. https://doi.org/10.7591/9780801467974.</p> <p>🎓 Hirschauer, Norbert, Sven Grüner, Oliver Mußhoff, Claudia Becker, and Antje Jantsch. 2021. “Inference Using Non-Random Samples? Stop Right There!” <i>Significance</i> 18 (5):20–24. https://doi.org/10.1111/1740-9713.01568.</p>
8	26 Oct.	<p>Conceptualization</p> <p>🎓 Sartori, Giovanni. 1970. “Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics.” <i>American Political Science Review</i> 64 (4):1033–1053. https://doi.org/10.2307/1958356.</p> <p>📖 Gerring, John. Ch. 5, “Concepts,” 107–140.</p> <p>🎓 Hung, Hoyoon. 2019. “The Evolution of Social Constructivism in Political Science: Past to Present.” <i>SAGE Open</i> 9 (1):1–10. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019832703.</p> <p><i>Examples: Democracy and Culture</i></p> <p>🎓 Collier, David and Steven Levitsky. 1997. “Democracy with Adjectives: Conceptual Innovation in Comparative Research.” <i>World Politics</i> 49(3): 430-451. https://www.jstor.org/stable/25054009.</p> <p>🎓 Baviskar, Siddhartha and Mary Frane T. Malone. 2004. “What Democracy Means to Citizens – and Why It Matters.” <i>European Review of Latin American and Caribbean Studies</i> 76: 3–23.</p> <p>🎓 Wedeen, Lisa. 2002. “Conceptualizing Culture: Possibilities for Political Science,” <i>American Political Science Review</i> 96(4): 713–728.</p>
<i>Reading Week</i>		
9	9 Nov.	<p>Measurement</p> <p>📖 Gerring, John. Ch. 7, “Measurement,” 155–196.</p> <p>📖 King, Keohane, and Verba, Ch. 5, “Understanding What to Avoid,” 33–72.</p> <p>🎓 Gary Goertz and James Mahoney, 2012, “Concepts and measurement: Ontology and epistemology,” <i>Social Science Information</i> 51(2): 205–216. https://doi.org/10.1177/0539018412437108.</p> <p>🎓 Mahoney, James. 2023. <i>The Logic of Social Science</i>. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, Ch. 1, “Scientific Constructivism,” 13–47.</p> <p><i>Examples: Gender, Populism, Urbanity, Democratization</i></p> <p>🎓 Amanda Bittner and Elizabeth Goodyear-Grant. 2017. “Sex Isn’t Gender: Reforming Concepts and Measurements in the Study of Public Opinion.” <i>Political Behavior</i> 39(4): 1019–1041. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-017-9391-y.</p>

		<p>☞ Alexander Wuttke, Christian Schimpf and Harald Schoen, 2020, “When the Whole Is Greater than the Sum of Its Parts,” <i>American Political Science Review</i> 114(2): 356–374. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055419000807.</p> <p>☞ Armstrong, David A., Jack Lucas, and Zack Taylor. 2022. “The Urban-Rural Divide in Canadian Federal Elections, 1896–2019.” <i>Canadian Journal of Political Science</i> 55 (1):84–106. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008423921000792.</p> <p>☞ Møller, Jørgen, and Svend-Erik Skaaning. 2019. “Set-theoretic methods in democratization research: an evaluation of their uses and contributions.” <i>Democratization</i> 26 (1):78-96. https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2018.1449208.</p>
10	16 Nov.	<p>Causal Arguments and Causal Analyses</p> <p>☞ Gerring, John. Ch. 8, “Causal Arguments,” 197–217.</p> <p>☞ Gerring, John. Ch. 9, “Causal Analyses,” 218–255.</p> <p>☞ Gerring, John. Ch. 10, “Causal Strategies: <i>X</i> and <i>Y</i>,” 256–290.</p> <p>☞ Gerring, John. Ch. 12, “Varying Approaches to Causal Inference,” 327–358.</p> <p><i>Supplemental</i></p> <p>☞ Bennett, Andrew and Benjamin Mishkin. 2023. “Nineteen Kinds of Theories about Mechanisms that Every Social Science Graduate Student Should Know.” In <i>The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy of Political Science</i>: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780197519806.013.8</p> <p>☞ King, Keohane, and Verba, Ch. 3, “Causality and Causal Inference,” 73–112.</p> <p>☞ Gerring, John. Ch. 11, “Causal Strategies: Beyond <i>X</i> and <i>Y</i>,” 291–326.</p> <p>☞ Gerring, John. 2008. “The Mechanismic Worldview: Thinking Inside the Box.” <i>British Journal of Political Science</i> 38 (1):161–179. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123408000082.</p> <p>☞ Urlacher, Brian R. 2019. “Complexity, Causality, and Control in Statistical Modeling.” <i>American Behavioral Scientist</i> 64 (1):55–73. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764219859641.</p>
11	23 Nov.	<p>Ethics, Transparency, and Replication</p> <p><i>On research ethics</i></p> <p>☞ Fujii, Lee Ann. 2012. “Research Ethics 101: Dilemmas and Responsibilities.” <i>PS: Political Science & Politics</i> 45 (4):717–723. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096512000819</p> <p><i>Research ethics in Canada and at Western</i></p> <p>☞ Take the <i>Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans</i> (TCPS 2) training: https://tcps2core.ca/welcome</p> <p>☞ Review NMREB process: https://uwo.ca/research/ethics/human/submission.html</p> <p><i>On data access and research transparency</i></p>

 Lupia, Arthur, and Colin Elman. 2014. "Openness in Political Science: Data Access and Research Transparency: Introduction." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 47 (1):19–42. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096513001716>.

 Dafoe, Allan. 2014. "Science Deserves Better: The Imperative to Share Complete Replication Files." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 47 (1):60–66. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S104909651300173X>.

 Elman, Colin, and Diana Kapiszewski. 2014. "Data Access and Research Transparency in the Qualitative Tradition." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 47 (1):43–47. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096513001777>.

 Jacobs, Alan M. et al. 2021. "The Qualitative Transparency Deliberations: Insights and Implications." *Perspectives on Politics* 19 (1):171–208. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592720001164>.

 Johnson, Genevieve Fuji, Mark Pickup, Eline A. de Rooij, and Rémi Léger. 2017. "Research Openness in Canadian Political Science: Toward an Inclusive and Differentiated Discussion." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 50 (1):311–328. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008423917000026>.

Supplemental: Transparency and replication

 "Data Access and Research Transparency." <https://www.dartstatement.org/>

 King, Gary. 1995. "Replication, Replication." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 28 (3):444–452. <https://doi.org/10.2307/420301>.

Supplemental: A cautionary tale of data fabrication

 Aschwanden, Christie and Maggie Koerth-Baker. 2016. "How Two Grad Students Uncovered an Apparent Fraud – And A Way To Change Opinions On Transgender Rights." FiveThirtyEight.com, 7 Apr. <https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/how-two-grad-students-uncovered-michael-lacour-fraud-and-a-way-to-change-opinions-on-transgender-rights>.

 Bartlett, Tom. 2015. "The Unraveling of Michael LaCour." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 2 June. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/the-unraveling-of-michael-lacour/>