



## **POGO 801: Research Design for Social Science and Public Policy (3 Credits)**

Fall 2022 (August 22 – December 12)

Wednesdays, 7:20 – 10:00pm, Horizon Hall 4010

Office Hours Mondays and Wednesdays 2:00 - 4:00pm and by appointment

Office Hours Signup [Link](#)

August 17, 2022 Draft (See Draft Modification Notes at End of Syllabus)

Syllabus May Be Updated During Semester

Professor: Eric McGlinchey

Office: 313 Aquia

Email: [emcglinc@gmu.edu](mailto:emcglinc@gmu.edu)

### **Course Description**

This course grounds students in the principles of the scientific method, the framework for investigating research questions in the social sciences. Focus is on sound and rigorous research design. Students will explore approaches and potential pitfalls to conceptualization, measurement, and causality. Along the way students will examine case study, ethnographic, survey, experimental, game theory, and network analysis research designs. We will assess the strengths and limitations of these approaches in our effort to probe causality and build theory that can inform policy and politics.

### **Course Learning Outcomes**

By the close of this course, students will be able to:

1. Identify and execute multiple social science research designs.
2. Identify strengths and limitations of different research designs and methods.
3. Write a research proposal that can serve as a foundation for future PhD research.
4. Orally present research concisely in a way that engages academic as well as policy audiences.

### **Course Texts**

Students are encouraged to obtain the following texts:

- George, A. L. & Bennett, A. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. MIT Press, 2005. (Available for purchase at the university bookstore)
- Curini, Luigi, and Robert Franzese. *The SAGE Handbook of Research Methods in Political Science and International Relations*. Sage Publications, 2020. (Available through GMU Library Electronic Collections)

- Kapiszewski, Diana, Lauren M. MacLean, and Benjamin L. Read. *Field Research in Political Science: Practices and Principles*. Cambridge University Press, 2015. (Available through GMU Library Electronic Collections)
- Atkinson, Paul, Amanda Coffey, Sara Delamont, John Lofland and Lyn Lofland, eds., *Handbook of Ethnography*. Sage Publications, 2001. (Available through GMU Library Electronic Collections)

### **Instructor-Student Communication**

I will respond to your emails within 48 hours. If I will be away from email for more than one day, I will post an announcement to Blackboard. Before sending an email, please check the following:

1. Syllabus
2. Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)
3. Help forum (Feel free to respond to other students in the Help forum)
4. Blackboard videos on how to use Blackboard features
5. Blackboard Q&A, and
6. Technology Requirements

### **Mason EMAIL**

- GMU requires that university email be used for all course communication. I will be sending messages to your Mason email. Please make sure you have access to these messages.
- When you email me, please include POGO 801 in the subject heading.

### **Course Logistics**

We meet in person, Wednesdays, 7:20 – 10:00 pm. We will use Blackboard to facilitate asynchronous discussion and peer collaborations. In a typical week:

- You will read between 100 and 200 pages and discuss the material with classmates
- Complete assignments to be submitted as hard copies in seminar
- Discuss course readings as well as your application of course readings in your written assignments

### **To Access Blackboard**

1. Go to <https://mymasonportal.gmu.edu>
2. Login using your NETID and password.
3. Click on the ‘Courses’ tab.
4. Double-click on POGO-801 (Fall 2022) under the course listings.

### **Technical Help**

- If you have difficulty accessing Blackboard, you can contact ITU Support at 703.993.8870 or [support@gmu.edu](mailto:support@gmu.edu).
- If you have trouble using features in Blackboard, email [courses@gmu.edu](mailto:courses@gmu.edu).

### **Course Requirements**

The following requirements are designed to promote an optimal learning environment for motivated students. This syllabus is a contract. Enrollment in this class constitutes your acceptance of course requirements.

1. Students are expected to complete readings and assignments prior to seminar. Written assignments – except for the final draft of the research proposal – will be submitted as hard copies during seminar.
2. Students will participate in weekly in-person seminars.
3. Students will complete the following written assignments:
  - 500-word reflection on the weeks 1 and 2 readings
  - 500-word discussion of the problem / puzzle / research question that will provide the foundation for your seminar’s draft dissertation research proposal

- 2,000-word literature review that provides an overview of existing theories that plausibly might explain the variation / puzzle driving your research question
  - 1,000-word discussion of observable implications associated with theories discussed in your literature review and critical tests
  - 1,250-word (5 assignments, 250 words each) discussion of methods you might use to probe for the observable implications associated with the theories under investigation in your draft dissertation research proposal
  - 6,000-word draft dissertation proposal (Note: This is a “draft” in the sense that the dissertation proposal you submit prior to advancing to PhD candidacy may differ from the proposal you submit for this seminar. Please do ensure your proposal is rigorously edited and includes citations and bibliography.)
4. Students will deliver a 10-minute dissertation proposal “oral defense.”

### **Late Assignments Policy**

One-third of a grade will be deducted for every day a paper is late. Incompletes—both for papers and for the seminar—will be extended only in cases of documented emergencies.

### **Student Responsibilities**

**Academic Integrity:** Students are responsible for their own work. Students and faculty are responsible for addressing violations of the honor code.

**Honor Code:** Students must adhere to the guidelines of the George Mason University Honor Code. The George Mason University Honor Code states: “Cheating and attempted cheating, plagiarism, lying, and stealing of academic work and related materials constitute Honor Code violations. To maintain an academic community according to these standards, students and faculty members must report all alleged violations to the Honor Committee.” Students are encouraged to read the full Honor Code (link: <https://oai.gmu.edu/mason-honor-code/>) and to remain vigilant against any violation of the Code in their own work. Any cases of academic dishonesty in this course will be pursued according to the guidelines detailed in the University Catalog.

**Time Conflict:** George Mason University is committed to creating a welcoming, respectful, and inclusive educational environment that values diversity. Students should review the syllabus at the beginning of the term to determine if there are any conflicts between class time and religious observance. It is the student’s responsibility to inform the instructor of these conflicts within the first week of the semester. <https://ulife.gmu.edu/calendar/religious-holiday-calendar/>

**Responsible Use of Computing:** Students must follow the university policy for Responsible Use of Computing. [See <https://universitypolicy.gmu.edu/policies/responsible-use-of-computing/>].

**University Calendar:** <https://registrar.gmu.edu/calendars/>

**University Catalog:** <https://catalog.gmu.edu>

### **Student Services**

**Writing Center:** The George Mason University Writing Center staff provides a variety of resources and services (tutoring, workshops, writing guides, handbooks) intended to support students as they work to construct and share knowledge through writing. [See <https://writingcenter.gmu.edu>].

**Counseling and Psychological Services:** The George Mason University Counseling and Psychological

Services (CAPS) staff consists of professional counseling and clinical psychologists, social workers, and counselors who offer a wide range of services (e.g., individual and group counseling, workshops and outreach programs) to enhance students' personal experience and academic performance [See <https://caps.gmu.edu>].

**Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA):** The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (FERPA), also known as the "Buckley Amendment," is a federal law that gives protection to student educational records and provides students with certain rights. [See <https://registrar.gmu.edu/privacy>].

**Special Needs:** Please address any special needs or accommodations with me at the beginning of the semester or as soon as you become aware of your needs. Those seeking accommodations should contact the Disability Resource Center, [<https://ods.gmu.edu>] (703) 993-2474, or the Equity Office (703) 993-8730.

**Enrollment:** Students are responsible for verifying their enrollment in this class. Schedule adjustments should be made by the deadlines published in the Registrar calendar.

### **Grading:**

Reflection on Weeks 1 and 2 Readings	25
Research Question	25
Literature / Theory Review	50
Identifying Observable Implications	50
Use of Research Methods to 'Test' for Observable Implications (5 Applications, 25 Points Each)	125
First Draft of Seminar Research Proposal	50
Final Draft of Seminar Research Proposal	120
Research Proposal Presentation	25
Seminar Participation	30
Total	500 points

### **Grading Scale:**

A+: 490-500	A: 460-489	A-: 450-459
B+: 440-449	B: 410-439	B-: 400-409
C+: 390-399	C: 360-389	C-: 350-359
D+: 340-349	D: 310-339	D-: 300-309
F: 299 and below		

### **Course Schedule**

<b>Week</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Readings</b>	<b>Discussions and Assignments</b>
1 8/24	Introduction	1. Zotero.org (Review documentation) 2. Outtake from PBS <i>Naturally Obsessed: The Making of a Scientist</i> , <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RwOv2Z7byv0">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RwOv2Z7byv0</a> . (As this	<b>Seminar Opening Discussion:</b> Reflecting on the <i>Naturally Obsessed</i> video, what similarities and differences do you see between the natural sciences and the social sciences? How do scholars in these fields approach success and failure?

		<p>video illustrates, science is challenging! Our projects often fail. Regardless the discipline – molecular biology, public policy, political science – we are all in this together and we all share the same method.</p> <p>3. Clark, William Roberts. 2020. “Asking Interesting Questions.” In Luigi Curini and Robert Franzese, eds., <i>The SAGE Handbook of Research Methods in Political Science and International Relations</i>. (Ch. 1, pp. 7-25).</p> <p>4. Radnitz, Scott. 2022. “Solidarity through Cynicism? The Influence of Russian Conspiracy Narratives Abroad.” <i>International Studies Quarterly</i> 66(2).</p>	<p><b>Methods Discussion:</b> What are the 5 questions Clark asks us to consider? And how do we, as scholars, become adept at answering these questions?</p> <p><b>Lab:</b> In seminar application of Clark’s 5 questions to Radnitz’s “Solidarity through Cynicism.” We will apply Clark’s framework in seminar but do read the Radnitz article prior to class.</p>
2 8/31	What Is Social Science?	<p>1. King, G., Keohane, R. O. &amp; Verba, S. <i>Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research</i>. (Princeton University Press, 1994), Ch. 1, pp. 3-33, “The Science in Social Science” (Often referred to as KKV <i>DSI</i>)</p> <p>2. Mahoney, James. 2010. “After KKV: The New Methodology of Qualitative Research.” <i>World Politics</i> 62(1): 120–47.</p> <p>3. Tannenwald, Nina. 1999. “The Nuclear Taboo: The United States and the Normative Basis of Nuclear Non-Use.” <i>International organization</i> 53(3): 433–68.</p>	<p><b>Seminar Opening Discussion:</b> What is required for a work of social science to be “scientific?” Is one style of research—qualitative or quantitative—more scientific than another?</p> <p><b>Methods Discussion:</b> What is the manifesto KKV advanced in 1994? How has social science moved to a post-KKV era?</p> <p><b>Lab:</b> How do the research methods Tannenwald uses differ from the research methods Radnitz applies? Do you find one research design more compelling than the other? How successful are Tannenwald and Radnitz at providing compelling answers to their research questions?</p> <p><b>Assignment:</b> The initial weeks of studying research design can be both motivating and overwhelming. What are two research design principles raised in the Clark, KKV, and Mahoney readings that you find motivating, principles you might incorporate in your research? What are two research design principles you find unusual or perplexing? And in what way do these principles—both motivating and perplexing—intersect or not intersect with your own area of anticipated research?</p> <p><b>Assignment Word Count and Deadline:</b> Try to limit your response paper to 500 words. Please bring a hard copy of your paper to seminar.</p>
3 9/7	Concepts and Measurement	<p>1. Adcock, R. &amp; Collier, D. Measurement Validity: A Shared Standard for Qualitative and Quantitative Research. <i>American Political Science Review</i> 95, 529–546 (2001).</p>	<p><b>Seminar Opening Discussion:</b> Take a second look at the <i>Naturally Obsessed</i> video – starting at the <a href="#">3:32 minute mark</a>. What are the parallels between clear crystals in molecular biology and clear concepts in the social sciences? Should we expect social science concepts to crystalize more</p>

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sartori, G. Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics. <i>American Political Science Review</i> <b>64</b>, 1033–1053 (1970).</li> <li>Jardina, Ashley, and Spencer Piston. 2022. “The Effects of Dehumanizing Attitudes about Black People on Whites’ Voting Decisions.” <i>British journal of political science</i> 52(3): 1076–98.</li> </ol>	<p>readily than molecular biologists expect proteins to crystalize?</p> <p><b>Methods Discussion:</b> What are the research design principles Adcock, Collier, and Sartori raise and why might we consider these principles <i>prior</i> to advancing causal explanations?</p> <p><b>Lab:</b> How does Jardina <i>conceptualize dehumanizing attitudes</i>? How does Tannenwald conceptualize the <i>nuclear taboo</i>? How does Radnitz conceptualize <i>alienation from the political system</i>? What are the strengths and weaknesses of these conceptualizations?</p> <p><b>Assignment:</b> Present two different research questions you wish to study. How have scholars conceptualized the variables central to these research questions? How do you intend to conceptualize the variables central to these research questions?</p> <p><b>Assignment Word Count and Deadline:</b> Try to limit your response paper to 500 words. Please bring a hard copy of your paper to seminar.</p>
4 9/14	Causality and Introduction to Case Study Analysis	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mahoney, J. &amp; Goertz, G. A Tale of Two Cultures: Contrasting Quantitative and Qualitative Research. <i>Political Analysis</i> <b>14</b>, 227–249 (2006).</li> <li>Ruffa, Chiara. 2020. “Case Study Methods: Case Selection and Case Analysis.” In Luigi Curini and Robert Franzese, eds., <i>The SAGE Handbook of Research Methods in Political Science and International Relations</i>. (Ch. 59, pp. 1133 - 1147).</li> <li>George, A. L. &amp; Bennett, A. <i>Case Studies and Theory Development in The Social Sciences</i>. (MIT Press, 2005), Ch. 7, “Case Studies and the Philosophy of Science.”</li> <li>Martin, Philip A., Giulia Piccolino, and Jeremy S. Speight. 2021. “Ex-Rebel Authority after Civil War: Theory and Evidence from Côte d’Ivoire.” <i>Comparative politics</i> 53(2): 209–32.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Seminar Opening Discussion:</b> What are the differing advantages and limitations quantitative and qualitative methods offer in advancing causal analysis?</p> <p><b>Methods Discussion:</b> What is causality and what role does case study analysis play in play in our efforts to explain puzzles?</p> <p><b>Lab:</b> In what ways does Martin’s Côte d’Ivoire case study advance our understanding of state building? What are the limits of what a single case study can offer to broader theories of state building? And how does Martin conceptualize key variables like ex-rebel authority and social order?</p> <p><b>Assignment:</b> Identify at least 15 sources that will serve as the foundation of a literature review. Build a bibliography using Zotero.</p> <p><b>Assignment Deadline:</b> Please bring a hard copy of your paper to seminar.</p>
5 9/21	Case Study Analysis	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>George and Bennett, Chapters 3–6, pp. 67–123 and Chapters 8–10, pp. 151–231.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Seminar Opening Discussion:</b> How does case study analysis differ from history? From “thick description?”</p>



		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gerring, J. What Is a Case Study and What Is It Good for? <i>American Political Science Review</i> <b>98</b>, 341–354 (2004).</li> <li>Berk, Christopher D. 2018. “On Prison Democracy: The Politics of Participation in a Maximum Security Prison.” <i>Critical Inquiry</i> 44(2): 275–302.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Methods Discussion:</b> The CSA guidance Gerring and George and Benett provide the foundations for many dissertation proposals. What are the key methodological tools of CSA? And who might you deploy these tools in pursuit of answering the puzzle in your proposal?</p> <p><b>Lab:</b> What strategies of CSA does Berk use in his investigation of the Massachusetts Correctional Institution at Walpole? What theoretical insights does Berks study of MCI-Walpole bring to our understanding of participatory democracy broadly?</p> <p><b>Assignment:</b> Using the bibliography you created last week, write a literature / theory review in which you layout multiple plausible causal mechanisms that may be the source of variation in the dependent variable you are investigating.</p> <p><b>Assignment Deadline:</b> Please bring a hard copy of your paper to seminar.</p>
6 9/28	Case Selection	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Geddes, B. How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics. <i>Political Analysis</i> <b>2</b>, 131–150 (1990).</li> <li>George and Bennett, Chapter 11, “Integrating Comparative and Within-Case Analysis: Typological Theory,” pp. 233–263.</li> <li>Fearon, James D. “Counterfactuals and Hypothesis Testing in Political Science.” <i>World Politics</i> 43, no. 2 (January 1991): 169–95.</li> <li>Butt, Ahsan I. 2019. “Why Did the United States Invade Iraq in 2003?” <i>Security Studies</i> 28(2): 250–85.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Seminar Opening Discussion:</b> Is the advice Geddes offers incompatible with case studies like Berk’s and Martins?</p> <p><b>Methods Discussion:</b> What is the challenge of selection bias and what strategies do Fearon and George and Bennett offer to overcome this challenge?</p> <p><b>Lab:</b> How might Geddes critique Butt’s study? And how might you counter this critique? What are Butt’s findings and are these findings, in your evaluation, sound despite (or even, perhaps because of?) his focus the one case of the invasion of 2003?</p> <p><b>Assignment:</b> Reread Clark’s chapter, “Asking Interesting Questions,” from week 1 of this course. Pay particular attention to the sections, “What Is the Explanation?” and “If the Explanation Is True, What Else Should We Observe?” After rereading the Clark chapter, attempt to identify observable implications associated with each of the causal mechanisms you discussed in last week’s literature / theory review.</p> <p><b>Assignment Deadline:</b> Please bring a hard copy of your paper to seminar.</p>
7 10/5	Survey Research	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brady, H. E. “Contributions of Survey Research to Political Science.” <i>PS: Political Science and Politics</i> <b>33</b>, 47–57 (2000).</li> <li>Kapiszewski, D., MacLean, L.M., Read, B.L. (2015). “Surveys in the Context of Field Research.” <i>Field Research in Political Science: Practices and Principles</i>. Cambridge</li> </ol>	<p><b>Seminar Opening Discussion:</b> Identify a recent article in your field of research that uses survey analysis. What contribution does the article make? What are the limitations of the article’s analysis?</p> <p><b>Methods Discussion:</b> How has survey analysis transformed the social sciences? And how can scholars overcome the challenges to survey analysis identified in this week’s readings?</p>

		<p>University Press. Chapter 8 (266-298).</p> <p>3. Schaffer, Frederic Charles. 2014. "Thin Descriptions: The Limits of Survey Research on the Meaning of Democracy." <i>Polity</i> 46(3): 303–30.</p> <p>4. Coffman, Katherine B., Lucas C. Coffman, and Keith M. Marzilli Ericson. 2017. "The Size of the LGBT Population and the Magnitude of Antigay Sentiment Are Substantially Underestimated." <i>Management science</i> 63(10): 3168–86.</p> <p>5. Gest, Justin, Tyler Reny, and Jeremy Mayer. 2018. "Roots of the Radical Right: Nostalgic Deprivation in the United States and Britain." <i>Comparative political studies</i> 51(13): 1694–1719.</p>	<p><b>Lab:</b> What does Gest, Reny, and Mayer's survey analysis tell us about the roots of the radical right? In what ways might the critiques Schaffer and Coffman raise regarding survey analysis apply to the Gest, Reny, and Mayer study?</p> <p><b>Assignment:</b> In approximately 250 words discuss how you might use survey research to probe for one or more of the observable implications you identified in the week 6 assignment.</p> <p><b>Assignment Deadline:</b> Please bring a hard copy of your paper to seminar.</p>
8 10/12	Complements to CSA: Formal Modelling	<p>1. Meirowitz, Adam, and Kristopher W. Ramsay. 2020. "Applied Game Theory: An Overview and First Thoughts on the Use of Game Theoretic Tools." In Luigi Curini and Robert Franzese, eds., <i>The SAGE Handbook of Research Methods in Political Science and International Relations</i>. (Ch. 11, pp. 192-204).</p> <p>2. Morrow, James D., and Jessica S. Sun. 2020. "Models of Interstate Conflict." In Luigi Curini and Robert Franzese, eds., <i>The SAGE Handbook of Research Methods in Political Science and International Relations</i>. (Ch. 15, pp. 261-276).</p> <p>3. Clark, Golder and Golder, "The British Academy Brian Barry Prize Essay: An Exit, Voice and Loyalty Model of Politics," <i>British Journal of Political Science</i> 47, 4 (October 2017), pp. 719–748.</p> <p>4. Ostrom, Elinor. <i>Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action</i>. Cambridge University</p>	<p><b>Seminar Opening Discussion:</b> Simplification is central to formal modelling. What is gained and, potentially, lost when formal models simply causal processes to their most fundamental essence?</p> <p><b>Methods Discussion:</b> What situations lend themselves to analysis using formal models? What contexts might be less conducive to formal modelling? What assumptions do we as scholars make when deploying formal models?</p> <p><b>Lab:</b> What insights do CGG and Ostrom's use of formal models bring to our understanding of power and collective action?</p> <p><b>Assignment:</b> In approximately 250 words discuss how you might use formal models to probe for one or more of the observable implications you identified in the week 6 assignment.</p> <p><b>Assignment Deadline:</b> Please bring a hard copy of your paper to seminar.</p>



		Press, 1990, Ch. 1, “Reflections on the commons,” 1-28.	
9 10/19	Complements to CSA: Experiments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Druckman, J. N., Green, D. P., Kuklinski, J. H. &amp; Lupia, A. The Growth and Development of Experimental Research in Political Science. <i>American Political Science Review</i> <b>100</b>, 627 (2006), 627-635.</li> <li>2. Kapiszewski, D., MacLean, L.M., Read, B.L. (2015). “Experiments in the Field.” <i>Field Research in Political Science: Practices and Principles</i>. Cambridge University Press. Chapter 9, 299-331.</li> <li>3. Paluck, E. L. The Promising Integration of Qualitative Methods and Field Experiments. <i>The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science</i> <b>628</b>, 59–71 (2010).</li> <li>4. Diaz, Gustavo, Christopher Grady and James H. Kuklinski. 2020. “Survey Experiments and the Quest for Valid Interpretation.” In Luigi Curini and Robert Franzese, eds., <i>The SAGE Handbook of Research Methods in Political Science and International Relations</i>. (Ch. 54, pp. 1036-1052).</li> <li>5. Larson, Jennifer M., and Janet I. Lewis. “Ethnic Networks.” <i>American Journal of Political Science</i> 61, no. 2 (April 1, 2017): 350–64.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Seminar Opening Discussion:</b> KKV direct our attention to the “Fundamental Problem of Causal Inference”—the reality that, when studying outcomes, we cannot perfectly “re-run” the variables that <i>may have</i> contributed to these outcomes. To what extent does the experimental-turn in social sciences overcome KKV’s concern with the fundamental problem of causal inference?</p> <p><b>Methods Discussion:</b> What are the different types of experiments social scientists use and how have these experiments advanced understanding across the social sciences?</p> <p><b>Lab:</b> Rarely do social scientists use only one method. What methods do Larson and Lewis use in their analysis of ethnic networks and how does their mixed method approach strengthen their causal findings?</p> <p><b>Assignment:</b> In approximately 250 words discuss how you might use experiments to probe for one or more of the observable implications you identified in the week 6 assignment.</p> <p><b>Assignment Deadline:</b> Please bring a hard copy of your paper to seminar.</p>
10 10/26	Complements to CSA: Network Analysis	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Victor, Jennifer N., and Elsa T. Khwaja. 2020. “Network Analysis: Theory and Testing.” In Luigi Curini and Robert Franzese, eds., <i>The SAGE Handbook of Research Methods in Political Science and International Relations</i>. (Ch. 45, pp. 858-875).</li> <li>2. Larson, Jennifer M., and Janet I. Lewis. 2020. “Measuring Networks in the Field.” <i>Political Science Research and Methods</i> 8(1): 123–35.</li> <li>3. Ringe, Nils, Jennifer Nicoll Victor, and Justin H. Gross. 2013. “Keeping Your Friends</li> </ol>	<p><b>Seminar Opening Discussion:</b> In what ways do on- and offline social networks differ and what implications, if any, do these differences pose for social network analysis?</p> <p><b>Methods Discussion:</b> How is the data for network analysis collected? How is this data analyzed? And what contributions does network analysis offer both for descriptive and causal analysis?</p> <p><b>Lab:</b> What are the causal arguments advanced in the Ringe et al. and the Brady et al. studies and what role do networks play in these causal explanations?</p>

		<p>Close and Your Enemies Closer? Information Networks in Legislative Politics." <i>British Journal of Political Science</i> 43(3): 601–28.</p> <p>4. Brady, William J. et al. 2017. "Emotion Shapes the Diffusion of Moralized Content in Social Networks." <i>Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences</i> 114(28): 7313–18.</p>	<p><b>Assignment:</b> In approximately 250 words discuss how you might use network analysis to probe for one or more of the observable implications you identified in the week 6 assignment.</p> <p><b>Assignment Deadline:</b> Please bring a hard copy of your paper to seminar.</p>
11 11/2	Complements to CSA: Ethnography	<p>1. Brodtkin, Evelyn Z. 2017. "The Ethnographic Turn in Political Science: Reflections on the State of the Art." <i>PS: Political Science &amp; Politics</i> 50(1): 131–34.</p> <p>2. Schatz, E. (2009). "Ethnographic Immersion and the Study of Politics." In Schatz, E. ed., <i>Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power</i>. University of Chicago Press. (Ch. 1, pp. 1-22).</p> <p>3. Heyl, B.S. (2001). "Ethnographic Interviewing." In Paul Atkinson, Amanda Coffey, Sara Delamont, John Lofland and Lyn Lofland, eds., <i>Handbook of Ethnography</i>. Sage, 369-383.</p> <p>4. Emerson, Robert M., Rachel I. Fretz, and Linda L. Shaw. (2001). "Participant Observation and Fieldnotes." In Paul Atkinson, Amanda Coffey, Sara Delamont, John Lofland and Lyn Lofland, eds., <i>Handbook of Ethnography</i>. Sage, 352-368.</p> <p>5. Correa-Cabrera, Guadalupe, and Kathleen Blair Shaefer (2022). "Notes on a Perilous Journey to the United States: Irregular Migration, Trafficking in Persons, and Organized Crime." <i>Latin American Politics and Society</i>: 1-19.</p> <p>6. Stretesky, Paul B., and Mark R. Pogrebin. 2007. "Gang-Related Gun Violence: Socialization, Identity, and Self." <i>Journal of</i></p>	<p><b>Seminar Opening Discussion:</b> What ethical concerns should scholars consider when conducting ethnographic research?</p> <p><b>Methods Discussion:</b> What differentiates ethnographies from case study analysis?</p> <p><b>Lab:</b> What are the ethnographic approaches Correa-Cabrera et al. and Stretesky et al. use in their analysis of gang-related gun violence? What are the advantages and potential disadvantages of these approaches? And what insights do these investigations achieve that might not otherwise have been achieved had the scholars used other methodological approaches?</p> <p><b>Assignment:</b> In approximately 250 words discuss how you might use ethnographic approaches to probe for one or more of the observable implications you identified in the week 6 assignment.</p> <p><b>Assignment Deadline:</b> Please bring a hard copy of your paper to seminar.</p>

		<i>Contemporary Ethnography</i> 36(1): 85–114.	
12 11/9	Avoiding Pitfalls / Draft Proposals Due	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Murphy, Elizabeth, and Robert Dingwall. (2001). "The Ethics of Ethnography." In Paul Atkinson, Amanda Coffey, Sara Delamont, John Lofland and Lyn Lofland, eds., <i>Handbook of Ethnography</i>. Sage, 339-351.</li> <li>2. Alvarez, R. Michael, Ellen M. Key, and Lucas Núñez. 2018. "Research Replication: Practical Considerations." <i>PS: Political Science &amp; Politics</i> 51(2): 422–26.</li> <li>3. Maria Konikova, "How a Gay-Marriage Study Went Wrong," <i>The New Yorker</i>, May 22, 2015.</li> <li>4. Eugene Volokh, "Prof. Alice Goffman, 'On the Run,' and Driving a Gang Member Around, Looking for a Mutual Friend's Killer," <i>The Washington Post</i>, June 2, 2015.</li> <li>5. Skim symposia at: Data Access and Research Transparency: <a href="http://www.dartstatement.org/resources">http://www.dartstatement.org/resources</a>.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Assignment:</b> Compile your draft research proposal. Successful proposals will offer clearly specified research questions / problems, devote attention to conceptualization and measurement of outcomes and causes, justify case selection and research methodology, and engage the current literature related to the topic under investigation.</p> <p><b>Assignment Deadline:</b> Please bring 3 hard copies of your draft research proposal to seminar.</p>
13 11/16	Proposal Peer Reviews	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Miller, Beth et al. 2013. "How To Be a Peer Reviewer: A Guide for Recent and Soon-to-Be PhDs." <i>PS: Political Science &amp; Politics</i> 46(1): 120–23.</li> <li>2. Peer (2) Research Proposals</li> </ol>	<p><b>Assignment:</b> Write one-page reviews for two of your colleagues' research proposals.</p> <p><b>Assignment Deadline:</b> Please bring 2 hard copies of each of your peer reviews to seminar.</p>
14 11/30	Research Proposal Presentations		<b>Assignment:</b> Prepare and deliver a 10-minute presentation of your research proposal.
12/6	Final Research Proposal		<b>Final Proposal Deadline:</b> The final research proposal is to be submitted through the Blackboard by 11:59 pm, Tuesday, December 6.

### Syllabus Draft Modification Notes