

## **STVN14**

### **Political Science: Political Science Methodology, 15 credits**

*Autumn 2017*

## **INSTRUCTORS**

Audrey Vandeleene (Course Organizer) – [audrey.vandeleene@svet.lu.se](mailto:audrey.vandeleene@svet.lu.se)

Bart Bes – [bart.bes@svet.lu.se](mailto:bart.bes@svet.lu.se)

Michael Hansen – [michael.hansen@svet.lu.se](mailto:michael.hansen@svet.lu.se)

Magnus Jerneck – [magnus.jerneck@svet.lu.se](mailto:magnus.jerneck@svet.lu.se)

Alexander Von Hagen-Jamar – [alexander.von\\_hagen-jamar@svet.lu.se](mailto:alexander.von_hagen-jamar@svet.lu.se)

## **COURSE DESCRIPTION**

This course is organized as an introduction to research design with a focus on the ontological, epistemological, and methodological underpinnings of political science research. The course is broken down into three parts. Part I serves as an introduction to the ontologies, epistemologies, and methodologies of political science research, with a focus on formulating a research question and building a research design. Part II allows students to begin comparing and contrasting different research approaches and methods. Each week in Part II focuses on a different theme, including politicization of the EU, political behavior, and the study of political elites. For each theme, students will read texts that employ or explain diverse methodologies and participate in a seminar that uses the methodologies from the readings. In Part III students design their own research project and learn to discuss each other's research project.

The course is designed largely as a survey class that is geared towards familiarizing you with the diversity of ways to conduct political science. Given that you are taking this class (right) before writing your MA thesis, we advise you to use this class as a way to prepare for your thesis, both in terms of research design and methodology and in terms of being able to be a good discussant for your peers.

## **INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES**

- Identify and contrast different research approaches in political science.
- Formulate a coherent research problem and articulate a consistent research question to tackle this problem.
- Evaluate the relevance of selecting quantitative and/or qualitative methodologies to answer a research question.
- Design a research project that is internally consistent in terms of the research problem, the research question, the case selection and the choice of the methodological strategy.
- Discuss and defend in a relevant and constructive way a research project.

## ASSIGNMENTS AND GRADING

### *PART I: Political science research approaches*

**Puzzle Paper** – We ask you to write in pairs a paper that sketches twice a research problem from two different perspectives based on the required literature from Part I and contrasts both theoretical foundations and their consequences on the research design. You could choose a topic among the list of topics available on live@lund or select another political science topic of your choice. The paper should fit on two pages. Puzzle papers are due two days before the seminar. These papers will be shared with all other members of the class and two students will be specifically assigned as discussant for each paper. The assessment of the assignment is Pass/Fail. See live@lund for detailed instructions.

### *PART II: Comparing and contrasting methods*

**Active participation in seminars** – We ask you to actively participate in the methods seminars, be proactive in discussing and implementing methodologies. The assessment is Pass/Fail. Attendance to the seminars is mandatory.

### *PART III: Designing your own project*

**Peer Review Session** – You will peer review each other's research proposals during the peer review seminar. You will be assessed on the quality and relevance of your remarks as a discussant and of your answers as a presenter. The assessment is Pass/Fail. The deadline for submitting the written peer review is January 6<sup>th</sup>, 2018. See the peer review worksheet on live@lund for more instructions.

**Research Proposal** – We ask you to design your own research project in the form of a research proposal in a max 2500-word document due for January 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2018 (draft) and January 12<sup>th</sup>, 2018 (final paper). You are asked to present and defend this proposal during the peer review seminar. The assessment of the assignment is A – B – C – D – E – Fail. See live@lund for detailed instructions.

### *Retake*

**Puzzle Paper** – If you fail this assignment, you will be asked to submit another paper by the end of the course.

**Methods seminars** – If you fail to attend or actively participate in at least one methods seminar, you will be asked to attend the retake examination seminar held in February. You will be asked to make a presentation about a method problem related to the seminar(s) that you missed and answer questions about this method. Details will be given to the ones that are concerned.

**Peer Review Session** – If you fail to review your peers' work, you will be asked to submit an extensive literature review paper during the Spring term. Details will be given to the ones that are concerned.

**Research Proposal** – If you fail the research proposal paper, you will be asked to submit another paper during the Spring term.

## **COURSE CONTENT AND ORGANISATION**

### **PART I – POLITICAL SCIENCE RESEARCH APPROACHES**

#### *Week 44 – Research Approaches I*

*(Course Instructors: Magnus Jerneck and Audrey Vandeleene)*

This week introduces you to the world of political science research. We start by reviewing the various research approaches in political science and the main (sometimes diverging) paradigms existing within the field. This week also sheds light on the research design as the main framework for producing research in political science. How to carry out research? What do we mean by research design? How to formulate a good research question? How to ensure quality in research? These questions and other will be debated during the first part of the course, that will sketch the backbone of this course.

#### Required literature

Marsh, D., & Stoker, G. (Eds.). (2010). *Theory and methods in political science*. Palgrave Macmillan. Chapters 1-9 and 11-16.

Wilson, Woodrow. (1887). The Study of Administration. *Political Science Quarterly*, 2(2), 197–222.

King, G., Keohane, R. O., & Verba, S. (1994). *Designing social inquiry: Scientific inference in qualitative research*. Princeton University Press. Chapter 1.

Laitin, D. (1995). The Qualitative-Quantitative Disputation: Gary King, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba's *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. *American Political Science Review*, 89(2), 454-456.

Rogowski, R. (1995). The role of theory and anomaly in social-scientific inference. *American Political Science Review*, 89(02), 467-470.

Tarrow, S. (1995). Bridging the quantitative-qualitative divide in political science. *American Political Science Review*, 89(02), 471-474.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications. Chapters 1-3 and 6-10

Tracy, S. J. (2010). Qualitative Quality: Eight “Big-Tent” Criteria for Excellent Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(10), 837–851.

Laher, S. (2016). *Ostinato rigore: establishing methodological rigour in quantitative research*. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 46(3), 316–327.

### Recommended literature

King, G., Keohane, R. O., & Verba, S. (1994). *Designing social inquiry: Scientific inference in qualitative research*. Princeton University Press. Chapters 2-6.

Caporaso, J. A. (1995). Research design, falsification, and the qualitative–quantitative divide. *American Political Science Review*, 89(02), 457-460.

King, G., Keohane, R. O., & Verba, S. (1995). The importance of research design in political science. *American political science review*, 89(02), 475-481.

Winter, G. (2000). A Comparative Discussion of the Notion of “Validity” in Qualitative and Quantitative Research. *The Qualitative Report*, 4(3), 1–14.

Gordon, J., & Patterson, J. A. (2013). Response to Tracy’s Under the “Big Tent.” *Qualitative Inquiry*, 19(9), 689–695.

### *Week 45 – Research Approaches II* (Course Instructors: Magnus Jerneck and Audrey Vandeleene)

This week will consist of seminars where we will have the opportunity to discuss your puzzle papers. Early this week, you should meet in pairs to prepare your puzzle paper.

## **PART II – COMPARING METHODS**

The thematic weeks are meant to discuss research methods both at the stage of data collection and regarding data analysis. Each theme is covered during 1.5 week that combines lectures and seminars. The readings and the lectures introduce you to a research theme close to the research interests of the instructor and present the main issues related to the methods used to research this substantive theme. The seminars give you the opportunity to put these research techniques into practice and to debate them.

### *Week 46-47 – Theme 1: Politicizing the EU: Evidence from Content Analysis* (Course Instructor: Bart Bes)

The first week discusses various content analysis techniques against the backdrop of a controversial scholarly debate on the level and intensity of the 'politicization of European

integration'. Politicization refers to the (...) 'increased public involvement of societal actors such as political parties, mass media, and social movements in the process of European integration, and the degree to which this resonates among the wider European citizenry" (De Wilde 2011: 638). Whereas some scholars indeed argue that European integration has shifted from an 'insulated elite to mass politics' (Hooghe and Marks 2009: 13), others argue that European integration has largely remained in the hands of political elites. In this week, we engage with the debate by exploring the visibility and framing of the EU in a selected number of media outlets.

### Required literature

Hurrelmann, A., Gora, A., and Wagner, A. (2013). The legitimation of the European Union in the news media: Three treaty reform debates. *Journal of European Public Policy* 20(4), 515-534.

Hutter, S. and Grande, E. (2014). Politicizing Europe in the national electoral arena: A comparative analysis of five West European countries. *Journal of Common Market Studies* 52(5), 1002-1018.

Krippendorff, K (2004). Conceptual foundation. In K. Krippendorff, *Content analysis. An introduction to its methodology* (pp. 18-43). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Krippendorff, K (2004). Uses and inferences. In K. Krippendorff, *Content analysis. An introduction to its methodology* (pp. 44-80). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Krippendorff, K (2004). Analytical/Representational techniques. In K. Krippendorff, *Content analysis. An introduction to its methodology* (pp. 191-210). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Leopold, A. (2016). A structural approach to politicisation in the Euro crisis. *West European Politics* 39(1), 84-103

### Recommended literature

De Wilde, P. and Zürn, M. (2012). Can the politicization of European integration be reversed? *Journal of Common Market Studies* 50(1), 137-153.

Hooghe, L. and Marks, G. (2009). A postfunctionalist theory of European integration: From permissive consensus to contraining dissensus. *British Journal of Political Science* 39(1), 1-23.

*Week 47-48 – Theme 2: Political behavior and gender politics  
(Course Instructor: Michael Hansen)*

The substantive theme of second thematic week focuses on gender politics in the political behavior subfield. The methodological techniques that will be covered include quantitative and experimental methodologies using survey data.

Required literature

Barabas, Jason and Jennifer Jerit. 2010. “Are Survey Experiments Externally Valid?” *American Political Science Review* 104 (2): 226-242.

Dolan, Kathleen. 2013. “Gender Stereotypes, Candidate Evaluations, and Voting for Women Candidates: What Really Matters?” *Political Research Quarterly*. XX(X): 1-12.

Fox, Richard L. and Jennifer L. Lawless. 2011. “Gendered Perceptions and Political Candidacies: A Central Barrier to Women’s Equality in Electoral Politics.” *American Journal of Political Science* 55 (1): 59-73.

Fridkin, Kim L., Patrick J. Kenney, and Gina Serignese Woodall. 2009. “Bad for Men, Better for Women: The Impact of Stereotypes During Negative Campaigns,” *Political Behavior* 31: 53-77.

Gelman, Andrew. 2010. “‘How many zombies do you know?’ Using indirect survey methods to measure alien attacks and outbreaks of the undead.” (published on Gelman’s Columbia University webpage).

McDermott, Rose. 2013. “The Ten Commandments of Experiments.” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 46(2): 605-610.

Seminar Assignment 1

Prepare answers to these questions by evaluating the different articles on gender politics. Is the experimental method useful for studying gender politics? What are the pros and cons? How do you evaluate the different types of methods used to study gender politics? Are there flaws in the research? Are there better ways of studying the questions the researchers are asking?

Seminar Assignment 2

Develop a research question that you could answer through the use of survey data. Using the European Social Survey online analysis, investigate your question by very basically looking at the relationship between questions in the survey (<http://nesstar.ess.nsd.uib.no/webview/>). In seminar, you will discuss your question and show what you found. Throughout the seminar we will discuss other ways to explore the question, including how you might design an experimental survey.

*Week 49-50 – Theme 3: The study of political elites: representation and access to politics  
(Course Instructor: Audrey Vandeleene)*

The third thematic week will introduce you to the main issues related to “representation”, taken from the elites’ perspective. Are MPs (the “representatives”) representative? How to become an MP and is it feasible by everyone? We will discuss the methodology of works studying how political elites get access to the political arena and whether and how these elites represent who they are asked to represent. The methods covered within this theme will be interviews and qualitative analysis of interview data.

Required literature

Legard, R., Keegan, J., Ward, K. (2003). In-depth Interviews. In Ritchie, J., & Lewis, J. *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE. pp. 138-169

Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as Qualitative Research: A Guide for Researchers in Education and the Social Sciences* (Third Ed.). New York: Teachers College Press. Chapter 8 (Analyzing, Interpreting, and Sharing Interview Material pp. 112-130)

Woliver, L. R. (2002). Ethical Dilemmas in Personal Interviewing. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 35(4), 677–678.

Harvey, W. (2011). Strategies for conducting elite interviews. *Qualitative Research*, 11(4), 431–441.

Matthews, N. (2014). Gendered candidate selection and the representation of women in Northern Ireland. *Parliamentary Affairs*, 67(3), 617–646.

Reiser, M. (2014). The universe of group representation in Germany: Analysing formal and informal party rules and quotas in the process of candidate selection. *International Political Science Review*, 35(1), 55–66.

Celis, K., & Erzeel, S. (2017). The Complementarity Advantage: Parties, Representativeness and Newcomers’ Access to Power. *Parliamentary Affairs*, 70(1), 43–61.

Recommended literature

Lewis, J. & Ritchie, J. Generalising from Qualitative Research. (2003) Ritchie, J., & Lewis, J. *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE. pp 263-286

Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as Qualitative Research: A Guide for Researchers in Education and the Social Sciences* (Third Ed.). New York: Teachers College Press. All other chapters

## **PART III – DESIGNING YOUR OWN PROJECT**

### *Week 50-51 – Writing Research Proposals* (Course Instructor: Alexander Von Hagen-Jamar)

The lecture for the third part of the class discusses research design overall and the practicalities of writing your own research proposal. The different parts of the research proposal are discussed as well as tips for how to navigate the challenges of planning a research project. Students should have a preliminary research question to discuss in class.

There is no classroom meeting during week 51, what will allow you to write the first draft of your research proposal. We ask to you read unassigned literature linked both to the substantive topic and the methodology that you have chosen for your research project. Make sure to make use of this literature in your research proposal.

#### Required literature

Wagner, Robert Harrison. (2007). *War and the state: the theory of international politics*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press, 2007. Chapter 1 (The Theory of International Politics)

LaVaque-Manty, Danielle & LaVaque-Manty, Mika. *Writing in Political Science: A Brief Guide*. Oxford: OUP

Unassigned readings about your research proposal's substantive theme (your own choice): about 400p

### *Week 2 – Discussing Research Proposals* (Course Instructors: All)

This week consists of a peer review session where the draft version of your research proposal is discussed by your peers. At the end of this week, you are invited to submit the final version of your research proposal.