

RESEARCH DESIGN
Florida State University

POS 5736
Fall, 2012
Office Hours, Friday
9:00 – 11:00 a.m. or by appointment

Professor Brad T. Gomez
Office: Bellamy 536
E-mail: bgomez@fsu.edu
Telephone: 850-644-7303

This course provides an introduction to the logic and design of empirical political research. We begin with an examination of the logic of the scientific method and its application to (and appropriateness for) studying social and political phenomena. Here, we address the central epistemological question—what is knowledge and how do we acquire it? We then turn our attention to the standards by which we make, test, and evaluate *causal claims* in political science. While many of the readings and much of the discussion in this class is philosophical in nature, this is also a highly pragmatic class. Indeed, the lessons learned in this class are foundational to your daily work as a political scientist, guiding you in the creation of your own research and in the evaluation of the research.

This class also challenges you to put the principles of research design to work. In addition to our weekly meetings, you will participate in regular lab sessions. These labs are designed to facilitate your understanding of statistical computing and data management. This class will also guide you through the first part of your first-year paper, an independent research project guided by a faculty member in the department. *You should plan to devote substantial time outside of class to the conduct of your research.*

REQUIREMENTS:

The main requirements for this seminar are simple—READ, THINK ANALYTICALLY, and DISCUSS! This is a graduate seminar, which means that our meetings will be governed by the insights that you draw from the readings and your individual scholarship. You should prepare for each class meeting as though you will be responsible for leading and stimulating the class discussion. In a graduate seminar, you should be willing to share your critical insights with the group, offer significant questions for seminar discussion, and engage your colleagues (and me) in scholarly debate. Your *full* participation in the seminar is fundamental to its success. (There will be times during the semester—particularly weeks that introduce statistical theory—when I will lecture, but this will not be the norm.)

Assignments and Grading:

Class Participation	20%
Research Labs and Statistical Exercises	20%
First-Year Paper Project	40%
In-Class Final Exam	20%

Grade Scale:

All grades will be assigned based on the following criteria as evaluated by the instructor:

A to A+ (Excellent): Student demonstrates exceptional mastery of the material by offering novel and insightful comments about the readings and demonstrates the ability to integrate

ideas from multiple readings.

B+ to A- (Good): Student demonstrates normal mastery of the material by offering cogently argued points that accurately reflect the content of the reading, but did not necessarily demonstrate novel insights or integrate the readings with other material.

B- to B (Fair): Student was able to articulate clearly the main arguments and evidence of the assigned research but did not argue beyond basic reiteration of main points.

C+ or lower (Poor): Student did not participate, or the student's writing or participation reflected a general lack of knowledge about the readings.

Students will be given a 0 for participation if absent from class without being previously excused.

Incompletes are only granted in the case of a non-academic, documented emergency or illness.

First-Year Paper Project

The largest single component of your grade in this class is your first year paper project, an independent research project conducted with the guidance of the instructor and a faculty advisor. You will begin your first-year paper in this class, but you will complete it in the spring in Methods II, when you will also present your work to the department.

All first-year projects will be based on a replication and extension of a published study that uses a publicly available dataset. Students must turn in a full academic paper by the end of the spring semester, which includes the following five tasks: 1) reiterate the main theory of the study you are replicating, 2) develop and justify a suitable extension to the study, including developing the appropriate hypothesis/hypotheses (see more below about extensions), 3) explain the design of the study, 4) provide operational definitions of the variables in the original study and operationalize any new variables needed for the extension, 5) replicate the original multivariate specification using statistical methods taught in MII and fully interpret the results, and 6) include a second model with the analysis to test the extension and interpret the results. This semester, you are responsible for completing items 1-4.

So, what defines an acceptable "extension?" In order to keep the paper project manageable, the extension should be one of the following three types:

- 1) *Add One (or More) Variables*—the student identifies an alternative hypothesis that should be tested and adds a new variable from a publicly available dataset. (Students who are interested in adding a new variable to an existing dataset *must* seek the approval of the instructor.)
- 2) *Conditional Relationship*—identify and test for a conditional relationship that had been treated as additive in the original paper.
- 3) *Non-linear Relationship*—identify and test for a non-linear relationship that had been treated as linear in the original paper.

A list of acceptable datasets and suggested studies is compiled and updated each year based on recommendations from field faculty. This list will be distributed to students during either Week 2 or 3. (Students may also search the literature to identify a paper that can be replicated. The instructor also has discretion to allow students to choose an alternative replication project if a special circumstance presents itself.)

Students will coordinate the selection of their faculty advisor with the Graduate Coordinator, Professor Cherie Maestas, who will have the final authority in making the assignment. Faculty mentors will be assigned by the end of the 4th week of classes.

Your final grade for this paper will be based on my grade and a grade assigned to you by your faculty advisor. These form the general outline of the expectations regarding the project.

Topic and Faculty Profile Due October 3rd (5%)

You must select a topic by the beginning of October. Once you have selected your topic and your advisor has been selected for you, you must turn in an abstract of your project and a short biography about your advisor and his/her research interests.

Draft 1 Due October 31st (10%)

The first draft—note, it does not say “rough draft”—of your paper is due during the first week of November. You must turn in three copies. One will be given to me, one will be given to your advisor and one will be given to a colleague in this class. You will receive comments that you must respond to as you revise your final paper

Review of Colleague’s Paper Due November 10th (5%)

You must provide a written review of a colleague’s first draft of the paper. Details of the appropriate way to write a review will be handed out in class.

Final Paper with R&R Memo Due December 5th (20%)

Your final paper must be turned in with a “revise and resubmit” memo that explains how you addressed the comments on your first draft. One copy should be given to me and one copy should be given to your faculty advisor.

In-Class Final Exam

The “in-class” final exam will be given during finals week at our regularly scheduled class time. You will have 3 hours to complete the exam, and it will be a closed book exam. You will be given a short summary of a theoretical argument. You must fully articulate theoretical hypotheses that flow from this argument and an empirical research design to test the theoretical hypothesis. You will be provided with an example of the exam format prior to taking it.

Texts: The following texts have been ordered through the Florida State University Bookstore and are *required* for this course:

Chalmers, A.F. 1999. *What is This Thing Called Science?*, 3rd ed. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing.

Gerber, Alan S., and Donald P. Green 2012. *Field Experiments: Design, Analysis, and Interpretation*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

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

Shadish, William R., Thomas D. Cook, and Donald T. Campbell. 2002. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.

Wonnacott, Thomas H., and Ronald J. Wonnacott. 1990. *Introductory Statistics*, 5th ed. New York: John Wiley and Sons. (Note: This book will also be used next semester in Methods II.)

Some additional readings may be suggested during the course of the semester and will be provided on Blackboard

POLICY ON ACADEMIC HONESTY

The Florida State University Academic Honor Policy outlines the University's expectations for the integrity of students' academic work, the procedures for resolving alleged violations of those expectations, and the rights and responsibilities of students and faculty members throughout the process. Students are responsible for reading the Academic Honor Policy and for living up to their pledge to "be honest and truthful and... [to] strive for personal and institutional integrity at Florida State University" (Academic Honor Policy).

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

Students with disabilities needing academic accommodation should: (1) register with and provide documentation to the Student Disability Resource Center; (2) bring a letter to the instructor indicating the need for accommodation and what type. This should be done during the first week of class. For more information about services available to FSU students with disabilities, contact the Student Disability Resource Center, 874 Tradition Way, 108 Student Services Building, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 32306-4167, 850-644-9566 (voice) or 850-644-8504 (TDD), via email sdrc@admin.fsu.edu, or on the web at <http://www.disabilitycenter.fsu.edu/>

OFFICE HOURS AND AVAILABILITY

If at any time you feel confused by the material or simply want to discuss your academic progress, please feel free to seek my help during office hours or by appointment. My formal office hours are Fridays from 9:00 to 11:00 a.m. If you need to contact me outside of office hours, email is probably the best way to do so. I check my email regularly and will respond as quickly as possible.

COURSE SCHEDULE

Week 1: Philosophy of Science I

Required:

Chalmers, A.F. 1999. *What is This Thing Called Science?*, 3rd ed. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing. Chapters 1-7

Clark, William Roberts, Matt Golder, and Sona Golder. 2008. "What is Science?" in *Principles of Comparative Politics*. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Press.

Recommended:

Ayer, Alfred Jules. 1952. *Language, Truth, and Logic*. New York: Dover Publications.

Popper, Karl R. 1968. *Conjectures and Refutations: The Growth of Scientific Knowledge*. New York: Harper and Row.

Popper, Karl R. 1979. *Objective Knowledge*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Week 2: Philosophy of Science II

Required:

Chalmers, A.F. 1999. *What is This Thing Called Science?*, 3rd ed. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing. Chapters 8-15

Gerber, Alan S., and Donald P. Green 2012. *Field Experiments: Design, Analysis, and Interpretation*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company. Chapter 1

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Chapters 1-2

Kasza, Greg. 2001. "Perestroika: For An Ecumenical Science of Politics." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 34 (September): 597-599.

Recommended:

Diesing, Paul. 1992. *How Does Social Science Work? Reflections on Practice*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Gunnell, John G. 1969. "Deduction, Explanation, and Social Scientific Inquiry." *American Political Science Review* 63 (December): 1233-1246.

Lakatos, Imre, and Alan Musgrave, Editors. 1970. *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Przeworski, Adam. 2007. "Is the Science of Comparative Politics Possible?" in Carles Boix and Susan C. Stokes, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Winch, Peter. 1990. *The Idea of a Social Science and its Relation to Philosophy*, 2nd ed. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press.

Week 3: Causation and Causal Inference

Required:

Gerber, Alan S., and Donald P. Green 2012. *Field Experiments: Design, Analysis, and Interpretation*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company. Chapter 2.

Morgan, Stephen L., and Christopher Winship. 2007. *Counterfactuals and Causal Inference: Methods and Principles for Social Research*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1 and 2.

Sekhon, Jasjeet S. 2004. "Quality Meets Quantity: Case Studies, Conditional Probability, and Counterfactuals." *Perspectives on Politics* 2 (June): 281-293.

Shadish, William R., Thomas D. Cook, and Donald T. Campbell. 2002. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning. Chapter 1

Rosato, Sebastian. 2003. "The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory." *American Political Science Review* 97 (November): 585-602.

Slantcheve, Branislav L., Anna Alexandrova, and Erik Gartzke. 2005. "Probabilistic Causality, Selection Bias, and the Logic of the Democratic Peace." *American Political Science Review* 99 (August): 459-462.

Recommended:

Braumoeller, Bear F., and Gary Goertz. 2000. "The Methodology of Necessary Conditions." *American Journal of Political Science* 44 (October): 844-858.

Gerring, John. 2005. "Causation: A Unified Framework for the Social Sciences." *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 17 (April): 163-198.

Goertz, Gary, and Harvey Starr, eds. 2003. *Necessary Conditions: Theory, Methodology, and Applications*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

Mill, John Stuart. 1950. *Philosophy of Scientific Method*. New York: Hafner Press.

Week 4: Theory and Models

Required:

- Clarke, Kevin A., and David M. Primo. 2007. "Modernizing Political Science: A Model-Based Approach." *Perspectives on Politics* 5 (December): 741-753.
- Elster, Jon. 2007. "Part I: Explanation and Mechanisms" in *Explaining Social Behavior: More Nuts and Bolts for the Social Sciences*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Fiorina, Morris P. 1975. "Formal Models in Political Science." *American Journal of Political Science* 19 (February): 133-159.
- King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Chapter 3
- Lave, Charles A., and James G. March. 1993. *An Introduction to Models in the Social Sciences*. New York: Harper and Row. Chapters 1-3

Recommended:

- Morton, Rebecca B. 1999. *Methods and Models: A Guide to the Empirical Analysis of Formal Models in Political Science*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Vasquez, John A. 1997. "The Realist Paradigm and Degenerative versus Progressive Research Programs: An Appraisal of Neotraditional Research on Waltz's Balancing Proposition." *American Political Science Review* 91 (December): 899-912.
- Waltz, Kenneth N. 1997. "Evaluating Theories." *American Political Science Review* 91 (December): 913-917.
- Zinnes, Dina A. 1980. "Three Puzzles in Search of a Researcher: Presidential Address." *International Studies Quarterly* 24 (September): 315-342.

Week 5: Concept Formation

Required:

- Bailey, Kenneth D. 1994. *Typologies and Taxonomies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage University Press., pp. 1-6, 11-16.
- Collier, David, and James E. Mahon, Jr. 1993. "Conceptual "Stretching" Revisited: Adapting Categories in Comparative Analysis." *American Political Science Review* 87 (December): 845-855.

- Goertz, Gary. 2005. *Social Science Concepts: A User's Guide*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Chapters 2-3
- Hempel, Carl G. 1966. *Philosophy of Natural Science*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. Chapter 7.
- Pitkin, Hanna Fenichel. 1967. *The Concept of Representation*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. Chapter 1, Introduction.

Recommended:

- Blalock, Hubert M., Jr. 1982. *Conceptualization and Measurement in the Social Sciences*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Collier, David, and Robert Adcock. 1999. "Democracy and Dichotomies: A Pragmatic Approach to Choices about Concepts." *Annual Review of Political Science* 2 (June): 537-565.
- Dahl, Robert A. 1957. "The Concept of Power." *Behavioral Science* 3 (July): 201-215.
- Gerring, John. 1999. "What Makes a Concept Good? A Criterial Framework for Understanding Concept Formation in the Social Sciences." *Polity* 31 (Spring): 357-393.
- Sartori, Giovanni. 1984. *Social Science Concepts: A Systematic Analysis*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Week 6: Measurement

Required:

- Adcock, Robert, and David Collier. 2001. "Measurement Validity: A Shared Standard for Qualitative and Quantitative Research." *American Political Science Review* 95 (September): 529-546.
- Blalock, Hubert M., Jr. 1979. *Social Statistics*, 2nd ed. Boston, McGraw-Hill. Chapter 2.
- Bollen, Kenneth A. 2002. "Latent Variables in Psychology and the Social Sciences." *Annual Review of Psychology* 53: 605-634.
- Goertz, Gary. 2005. *Social Science Concepts: A User's Guide*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Chapters 4.
- Gomez, Brad T., and J. Matthew Wilson. 2006. "Rethinking Symbolic Racism: Evidence of Attribution Bias." *Journal of Politics* 68 (August): 611-625.

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. pp. 150-168.

McIver, John P., and Edward G. Carmines. 1981. *Unidimensional Scaling*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications. Chapter 1.

Recommended:

Carmines, Edward G., and Richard A. Zeller. 1979. *Reliability and Validity Assessment*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

King, Gary, Christopher J. L. Murray, Joshua A. Salomon, and Ajay Tandon. 2004. "Enhancing the Validity and Cross-Cultural Comparability of Measurement in Survey Research." *American Political Science Review* 98 (February): 191-207.

Manheim, Jarol B., Richard C. Rich, Lars Willnat, and Craig Leonard Brians. 2007. *Empirical Political Analysis: Quantitative and Qualitative Research Methods*, 7th ed. Old Tappan, NJ: Longman. Chapter 5.

McIver, John P., and Edward G. Carmines. 1981. *Unidimensional Scaling*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Week 7: Hypothesis Formation and Test Validity

Required:

Hempel, Carl G. 1966. *Philosophy of Natural Science*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. Chapters 2-4.

Shadish, William R., Thomas D. Cook, and Donald T. Campbell. 2002. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning. Chapters 2 and 3.

Recommended:

Cohen, Morris R., and Ernest Nagel. 2002 [1934]. *An Introduction to Logic and Scientific Method*. Behesda, MD: Simon Publications.

Downs, Anthony. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: Harper & Row. Part I and Chapter 16.

Week 8: Sampling Theory and Practice [Note: The next three sessions will likely require extra weekly class meetings.]

(This week builds on the knowledge of probability and discrete and continuous distributions that you have developed in Professor Reenock's math class. Students who are unacquainted with basic statistics may wish to read Wonnacott and Wonnacott, Chapters 1-5.)

Required:

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Chapter 4.

Wonnacott, Thomas H., and Ronald J. Wonnacott. 1990. *Introductory Statistics*, 5th ed. New York: John Wiley and Sons. Chapter 6.

Recommended:

Cochran, William G. 1977. *Sampling Techniques*, 3rd ed. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Groves, Robert M., Floyd J. Fowler, Jr., Mick P. Couper, James M. Lepkowski, Eleanor Singer, and Roger Tourangeau. 2009. *Survey Methodology*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.

Kish, Leslie. 1995. *Survey Sampling*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Lohr, Sharon L. 2010. *Sampling: Design and Analysis*, 2nd ed. Boston, MA: Brooks/Cole.

Week 9: Statistical Inference: Point Estimation and Confidence Intervals

Required:

Wonnacott, Thomas H., and Ronald J. Wonnacott. 1990. *Introductory Statistics*, 5th ed. New York: John Wiley and Sons. Chapters 7-8.

Week 10: Statistical Inference: Hypothesis Testing and ANOVA

Required:

Gerber, Alan S., and Donald P. Green 2012. *Field Experiments: Design, Analysis, and Interpretation*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company. Chapter 3.

Wonnacott, Thomas H., and Ronald J. Wonnacott. 1990. *Introductory Statistics*, 5th ed. New York: John Wiley and Sons. Chapters 9-10.

Week 11: Experimental Design I

Required:

Gerber, Alan S., and Donald P. Green 2012. *Field Experiments: Design, Analysis, and Interpretation*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company. Chapter 4

Shadish, William R., Thomas D. Cook, and Donald T. Campbell. 2002. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning. Chapters 8-10

Recommended:

Campbell, Donald T., and Julian C. Stanley. 1963. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research*. Chicago, IL: RandMcNally.

Druckman, James N., Donald P. Green, James H. Kuklinski, and Arthur Lupia, eds. 2011. *Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kinder, Donald, and Thomas R. Palfrey, eds. 1993. *The Experimental Foundations of Political Science*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Green, Donald P., and Alan S. Gerber. 2002a. "Reclaiming the Experimental Tradition in Political Science." In Helen V. Milner and Ira Katznelson, eds. *Political Science: The State of the Discipline*, 3rd ed. New York: W. W. Norton and Company

Green, Donald P., and Alan S. Gerber. 2002. "The Downstream Benefits of Experimentation." *Political Analysis* 10 (Autumn): 394-402.

Week 12: Experimental Design II – Field, Lab, Natural, and Survey Experiments in Political Science

Required:

Barabas, Jason, and Jennifer Jerit. 2010. "Are Survey Experiments Externally Valid?" *American Political Science Review* 104 (May): 226-42.

Fisman, Raymond. 2001. "Estimating the Value of Political Connections." *American Economic Review* 91 (September): 1095-1102.

Gerber, Alan S., and Donald P. Green 2012. *Field Experiments: Design, Analysis, and Interpretation*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company. Chapter 12.

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 (February): 33-48.

Kuklinski, James H., Paul M. Sniderman, Kathleen Knight, Thomas Piazza, Philip E. Tetlock, Gordon R. Lawrence, and Barbara Mellers. 1997. "Racial Prejudice and Attitudes Toward Affirmative Action." *American Journal of Political Science* 41 (April): 402-419.

Sears, David O. 1986. "College Sophomores in The Laboratory - Influences Of A Narrow Database On Social-Psychology View Of Human Nature." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 51(3): 515-530.

Sekhon, Jasjeet S., and Rocío Titiunik. 2011. "When Natural Experiments are Neither Natural Nor Experiments." Unpublished Manuscript
<<http://sekhon.berkeley.edu/papers/SekhonTitiunik.pdf>>

Week 13: Quasi-Experimental Design I

Required:

Caughey, Devin, and Jasjeet S. Sekhon. 2011. "Elections and the Regression Discontinuity Design: Lessons from Close U.S. House Races, 1942-2008." *Political Analysis* 19 (Autumn): 385-408.

Shadish, William R., Thomas D. Cook, and Donald T. Campbell. 2002. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning. Chapter 4-7

Recommended:

Campbell, Donald T., and Julian C. Stanley. 1963. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research*. Chicago, IL: RandMcNally.

Sovey, Allison J., and Donald P. Green. 2011. "Instrumental Variables Estimation in Political Science." *American Journal of Political Science* 55 (January): 188-200.

Week 14: Observational Studies: Introduction to Various Statistical Models [This subject will likely require an extra meeting during the week.]

(This week offers a non-technical (sort of) introduction to regression analysis, the generalized linear model (GLM), and a few extensions. The purpose is to help you make sense of many of the most common modeling choices that you see being made in your substantive readings. You will be introduced to the technical side of regression analysis and the generalized linear model in Methods II and III.)

Required:

Berry, William, and Mitchell Sanders. 2000. *Understanding Multivariate Research: A Primer for Beginning Social Scientists*. New York: Westview Press. Chapters 2-4. (In case you have no idea what a regression is.)

Jackman, Simon. Nd. "Generalized Linear Models." Typescript.
<<http://jackman.stanford.edu/papers/glm.pdf>>

Seawright, Jason. 2010. "Regression-Based Inference: A Case Study in Failed Causal Assessment." In Henry E. Brady and David Collier, eds. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Recommended:

Gerber, Alan S., Donald P. Green Edward H. Kaplan. 2004. "The Illusion of Learning from Observational Research." In Ian Shapiro, Rogers M. Smith, and Tarek E. Masoud, eds. *Problems and Methods in the Study of Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gill, Jeff. 1999. "The Insignificance of Null Hypothesis Testing." *Political Research Quarterly* 52 (September): 647-674.

Leamer, Edward E. 1983. "Let's Take the Con Out of Econometrics." *American Economic Review* 73 (March): 31-44.

Week 15: Case Study

Required:

Bennett, Andrew. 2010. "Process Tracing and Causal Inference." In Henry E. Brady and David Collier, eds. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Freedman, David A. 2010. "On Types of Scientific Inquiry: The Role of Qualitative Reasoning." In Henry E. Brady and David Collier, eds. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Gerring, John. 2004. "What is a Case Study and What is it Good for?" *American Political Science Review* 98 (May): 341-354.

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Chapter 6.

Levi, Margaret. 2002. "Modeling Complex Historical Processes with Analytic Narratives." In Renate Mayntz, ed. *Akteure, Mechanismen, Modelle: Zur Theoriefähigkeit Makrosozialer Analysen*. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag. Available Here: <<http://www.yale.edu/probmeth/Levi.pdf>>

Recommended:

George, Alexander L., and Andrew Bennett. 2005. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press

Gerring, John. 2007. *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lieberson, Stanley. 1991. "Small N's and Big Conclusions: An Examination of the Reasoning in Comparative Studies Based on a Small Number of Cases." *Social Forces* 70 (2): 307-320.