**Course:** Research Design and Methods in Political Science

**Instructor:** Gábor Tóka (Department of Political Science, CEU)

**Credits:** 4 credits (8 ECTS credits)

**Semester:** Fall 2009

**Level, track:** Core course for all tracks in the PhD program in Political Science

**Course Objectives**
This course is to assist participants in designing dissertation projects and other research activities, and in debating and adjudicating methodological issues in the profession. As a starting point, we shall locate dissertation projects within the broader framework of careers in political science and contemplate how the concept and evaluative criteria of dissertations have evolved in the profession in recent years. We will then review issues in conceptualizing research questions, study design, methodology, data collection, and different strategies in data analysis. In doing so, the course will focus partly on the issues and problems that occur in all fields and methodological traditions in political science, and partly on strategies related to “small-N” qualitative research, for the most part setting aside techniques of large-N statistical analysis that are dealt with in separate statistics courses in the school’s curriculum. The course participants will read and discuss texts related to theory formation, hypothesis testing, and concept formation; creating proxies and measurement; descriptive and causal inference; basics of logical reasoning; longitudinal, comparative and case study research; field data collection; working with texts and analyzing qualitative data; and, finally, dissertation write-up. Throughout the course, we will not avoid issues of epistemology, i.e., how we know what we know and how to adjudicate competing “truth” claims. However, we will set aside or bracket many of the epistemological and ontological debates in order to discuss at a practical level particular techniques for researching and analyzing social phenomena. The course will therefore focus on the following main topics: (1) the goals of dissertations and other scholarly analyses, and elements of research design; (2) selection and application of different methodologies for conducting research; (3) collection of primary and secondary data on the field; (4) analysis and synthesis of data in the dissertation-writing process; (5) professional practices and conventions.

---

1 **Acknowledgements:** The general concept of this course was developed in exchanges with Zsolt Enyedi, Erin Jenne, and Carsten Schneider. The section on course objectives is a nearly direct borrowing from the predecessor of this course, i.e Erin Jenne’s ‘Methods and Research Design’ for PhD students in IR and European Studies. Zdenek Kudrna, Elena Stavreska, and Sara Svensson offered a number of thoughts and comments on the initial concept that helped refining and expanding the agenda. Xymena Kurowska was very helpful in selecting readings and developing concepts for the sessions on interpretive methods and discourse analysis. Thilo Bodenstein, Andreas Goldthau, Andrea Krizsán, and Nick Sitter gave valuable advice on readings, methods and topics that may be of particular interest to public policy scholars, while Dorothee Bohle, András Bozóki, Levente Littvay and Carsten Schneider offered various suggestions on readings in the philosophy of science and methodology. Scott Althaus kindly agreed to let his dissertation be used as a course reading. Thanks are due to all of them for the advice and encouragement.
Learning outcome
By the end of this course, participants will be better able to:

- Identify their central research question
- Situate their research question in the relevant literature(s)
- Formulate a theoretically-interesting argument
- Identify the relevant universe of cases and units of analysis
- Select appropriate methods best suited for addressing the research question
- Prepare an executable research plan
- Apply the method(s) to a research project
- Assess the empirical support for an argument
- Make informed decisions on their future academic career path
- Participate in scholarly discussions and the peer-review system in political science
- Argue about the relevance and merits of different research methods and study designs in the context of particular research questions

Course requirements: reading, participation, presentations, short assignments, final paper

Readings are listed below in the week-by-week program. Readings marked by a # mark are mandatory and everyone has to cover them before the first class of the respective week. The syllabus also gives shortlists of further useful readings, occasionally showing internet addresses or Dewey numbers (e.g. 300./1) for library shelves where they can be accessed.

Class participation including two presentations (30%): Active participation in discussions throughout the course will be essential and should help in developing a better understanding of your already existing strengths and (soon to be overcome) weaknesses as a researcher, and improving your approach to methods issues as a participant to discussions. Each participant will introduce the discussion on one of the research articles discussed in the course and play the role of the (reasonable and not necessarily uncritical, but nevertheless firm) advocate of the positions taken by that reading while the rest of us will contemplate the merits and possible weaknesses of the given analysis. Presenters must meet the instructor during office hours during the week before their presentation is scheduled, and submit by e-mail their slides by 1 pm on the Wednesday of the presentation’s week. The second presentation will be a five-minute outline of a draft dissertation proposal, which we will discuss then at some length. The topic may be something that you just invented merely for the purpose of this course, but ideally it would be the one that you actually intend to develop into your dissertation proposal in the coming months. The two presentations will each count for 10% of the final grade.

Weekly assignments (30%): several times during the term, each course participant will have to turn in a short written assignment by email to the instructor (at ceu.hu). Unless otherwise noted in the syllabus below, the deadline for submission is always at noon on the Wednesday of the given week. For details on the assignments see the week by week program below. Feedback on the assignments will be provided in class as well as in one-to-
one consultations (two times 20 minutes for each participant) organized in weeks 4 and 6 of the course.

**Final paper (40%)**: By 11 January 2010, all course participants will have to submit a maximum 4000 words (plus references) long draft research proposal – ideally, for those planning to do empirical research in their dissertation, a first draft of the participants’ dissertation proposal. This paper should contain (1) the central research question; (2) an identification of the scholarly literature and the debate (if any) that it addresses; (3) the theory and hypotheses/theoretical expectations (the latter have to be stated if the purpose of the study is not purely descriptive); (4) the methodology; (5) a technical discussion of case selection and its substantive and methodological justification; (6) a plan of data collection and analysis; and may add (7) a timetable for the planned research activities and further arguments about the feasibility of the research plan, including write-up.

**Rules on late submission**: Marks on written assignments submitted after the deadline will be reduced by ten percent for every day passed since the respective deadline unless evidence is provided of a (e.g., medical) condition beyond the student’s control that inhibited work on the assignment. Any such evidence has to be submitted together with the assignment in question.

**Class schedule and course structure**
As a general rule, we have three time slots for this class every week during the term: Wednesday 17:20-19:00; Thursday 15:30-17:10; and Friday 15:30-17:10. The idea is that we split into two groups for half the classes so that we can have more intense participation in the seminar discussions. Thus, the Wednesday and Thursday classes will normally be dedicated to discussions and you will each attend just one of the two classes, while we will all meet on Friday afternoons to complete and wrap up the topics of the week. The Friday classes will also have some mini-lectures on methods topics that – in a somewhat arbitrary order – were added to the topics to be covered during the various weeks.

The course is divided into four parts. The first two weeks cover various aspects of the profession and should be useful for making prudent choices about your academic targets for the next couple of years. The second section looks at some other factors that you should consider in choosing a dissertation topic, such as: what epistemologies do you feel comfortable with? How can you identify or develop appropriate theories? Where will you get the necessary data for your analysis? Part three surveys some scholarly methods of analysis. The purpose here is neither to organize a crash-course introduction into particular methods nor to have a systematic and comprehensive survey of the most frequently used methodologies in the profession. Instead, the aim is to improve your understanding of (A) general methodological issues in political research and how they occur with respect to just about any method that you may use; and (B) the strengths of particular methods and what their application may require from you in terms of research questions, data, skills, and further training. Part four will consist of two kinds of events. The Friday classes of this period will explore some very practical issues with the help of guest speakers, while the seminars will be devoted to your presentation of your (possibly just
preliminary) ideas for a research proposal, which you will then revise, elaborate and submit as the final assignment for this course in January 2009.

**Expected prior knowledge, general and further readings**

This course is meant to be taken by a relatively large and heterogeneous group of participants. Many of you took academic writing as well as methods classes like *Qualitative Methods* with Thilo Boldenstein, or *Methods and Research Design* with Erin Jenne or *Scope and Methods in Political Science* with Levi Littvay and Tamas Meszerics during your previous studies, and we cannot revisit here the material covered in those courses (for a good collection of syllabi for similar courses, visit [http://www.maxwell.syr.edu/moynihan/programs/cqrm/syllabi.html](http://www.maxwell.syr.edu/moynihan/programs/cqrm/syllabi.html)). Instead, this course is organized mostly as a series of seminar discussions about concrete examples of empirical research, and we will merely refer back to the specialist literature on research design and specific methods when issues covered in that literature arise in our discussions. On the questions of greatest relevance for your own work, you will of course want to follow up independently the scholarly discussions of the specific methods, research design, or professional practice issues covered in this course, but the course can only direct you to some further readings on each week’s topics, and it may be useful to browse these materials before the seminars, and, maybe, also shortlist for yourself a couple of them for careful reading some time after this semester is over. To take full advantage of this course while it is running, you should, however, never accept having difficulties in following discussions in the class, but either ask for instant clarification or consult some of the following general works (that provide at least some starting points) or other appropriate sources.

**Epistemological issues**


Modes and designs of inquiry. Methodology textbooks and handbooks


Academic Writing, Style Sheets, Prose, Charts, Figures, Reference Managers


TOPICS BY WEEK

Zero Week: The plan and scope of the course

All course participants are strongly encouraged to attend the “PhD ZeroWeekend” organized for you by senior PhD students on 18-21 September. That event will be an excellent opportunity for some peer-to-peer exchange of information about how to get by during and after doing a CEU PhD, and to establish contacts that can provide you some of the essential gossip that may be useful in making some big choices, and which you will anyway need if for no other reason than to be a valued information source among your colleagues!

PART I: CHOOSING INSPIRING TARGETS


Readings (just sample and skim some of these before the classes as they will help you contribute questions, observations and theories to our discussions. The titles are all self-explanatory about
the subject matter, except for the first three titles that are really about the choice of your research question):


Assignment: Consult at least some of the readings listed above before the classes and come prepared to say what you are contemplating to choose as your dissertation topic. After the classes of this week, think this through again and write down in one or two pages what you are, at this moment, thinking about to pick as your dissertation topic and why. What kind of data and methods of analysis do you think may be needed, and what may be the possible problems or disadvantages of picking this topic? It is more than OK if you are not totally sure about your choice of topic at this point, and in that case list and discuss two or three alternatives rather than just one topic. But in any case, try to think about each possible choice from the multiple perspectives that came up during our discussions, not just in terms of intellectual appeal, and consider as many criteria for a good choice as you can identify. Email me your product by Monday noon of the second week of the semester.

Week 2: Scholarly journals and their central role in regulating the attention and other rewards that your work will receive. Choosing outlets and titles for your papers, writing abstracts. The review process. Journal rankings, impact factors, tracking citations, and why all this matter. Bibliographic performance indicators and their increasing use in administrative decisions. Anticipating publication targets in dissertation, paper and grant proposals. Structuring your argument

Readings:

For some analyses of what gets published, where, by whom, and whether and why academic productivity in Europe is lower than in North America, see:


Advice on the reasons that may lead editors to reject your manuscript:


Uses of bibliographic performance indicators:

---

2 Breunung nad Sanders (2007) also show some data on journal articles produced by PhD students.

3 Masuoka et al. (2007) produce a ranking of the academically speaking most influential political scientists of recent times. Note that a correction of their data was published in *PS: Political Science & Politics* 40 (4): 629. Alas, the Hix data underestimated our performance – he counted 30 full time political scientists at CEU in a period when there were only 20, which reduced our per capita scores and CEU’s position in the ranking by 20 places. But never mind, the point is the illustration that when other academicians try to evaluate you ‘objectively’ within a European context, where placement stats are unavailable, there is little else that they can do than looking at your publication output.
Assignment: For the seminar of this week, do a little research to find out the answers to the following questions. What are the six scholarly journals that are most likely to publish articles in the field of your interest? Do not just focus on specialist outlets but also consider general political science journals. Which others do you have to follow regularly to keep up with the literature? What is the impact factor of these journals relative to the most cited political science journals (for a list of these, see, e.g., the first article by Hix among the readings)? Which one do you think you may be able to get published in? Look through all research articles in the last two full volumes of this journal and prepare the following statistics: what percentage of the articles uses one method and another, and what is the percentage distribution of the various substantive topics that appear in these publications? Prepare these tables (one for topics and one for methods) with the help of your own coding scheme that allows you to classify every article into one or more categories and less than ten percent of all articles are allocated in the residual ‘other methods/topics’ category. Last but not least, explain why you would not want to target a more highly ranked journal. Email me your results by noon on the Wednesday of the second week.

PART II: CHOOSING YOUR THEORY, DATA, AND METHODS

Motto: “Truth is like a truffle: ‘First you have to figure out where to dig; then you have to dig around a lot, and then you have to get rid of all the clinging dirt that obscures what you really want.” (A. Wuffle on the Wuffeauldian perspective on science)

Week 3: Nomothetic versus ideographic research. The template for clinical research in medical science compared to policy studies and hypothesis testing in the social sciences. Experiments and quasi-experiments provided by cross-sectional, panel or longitudinal data. Interpretive research in the ethnographic tradition; participant observation
Guest speaker: Xymena Kurowska (Department of International Relations and European Studies)

Readings (the first two are among the shortest possible illustrations of ‘positivist’ methods, with the first mocking them rather than really meaning what it says. The next three discuss or illustrate interpretivist research by field observation/ethnographic methods):


For (a) a fascinating ethnographic analysis of what laboratory experimenters actually do and how arbitrary some conventions are, and (b) what experimental researchers in their turn think about what ethnographic research does and what is wrong with that, see:


Further on the use of experiments in political science:

For some introductory methods texts on research by observation (with two examples at the end of the listing), see:


For some thoughts on whether and how interpretivist and positivist research practices need to be combined, see:


**Assignment**: I would like you to practice a bit how you can make a research proposal appealing to reviewers, and to do so before you would even start writing your dissertation proposal (and have forgotten, while struggling to develop the detailed design of your own study, what we learnt about the keys to a successful proposal). So let’s play a bit and pretend that the research reported in the assigned readings for this week have not yet been done, we have no idea what results they would produce, and you are about to propose exactly one of those projects for a grant agency. Write a very concise, max. three-page research proposal for undertaking this study. Feel free to improve on the study design employed in the reading. Omit references and any literature review
this time, but otherwise please follow closely the Schmitter and Przeworski-Salomon guidelines (see both among the previous week’s readings) for the ideal proposal.4

**Week 4: The role and development of generalizations, theories, concepts, and hypotheses.** Formulas models, simulations, and agent-based modeling. Causal laws, social mechanisms, probabilistic relationships, multiple conjunctural causation, analytical narratives, causal chains, feedback processes, self-fulfilling and self-negating prophecies

**Readings:**


# Schelling, Thomas C. 2006. “Dynamic Models of Segregation.” in *Strategies of Commitment and Other Essays*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 249-310. (Note that for our current purposes, it is enough if you read the section titled “Prologue, 2006” on pp. 249-53; however, it is worth to at least browse the whole article to get a feel for what it does.)


For some more thoughts on how theories come about:


---

4 Basically the task is to exercise yourself in writing a proposal - but not in inventing the substantive content of some research but rather in writing up the idea in a good, well-argued research proposal. Hence you get the substantive ideas of the research project ready-made in the readings and you can pick one from any of the four research articles for the week. They are indeed amusing pieces in one way or another but all have a discernible research question and research design. You can improve on their research design in your fictitious research proposal (i.e. the assignment) if you do not like some aspects of what they do, but the key task is not to show that you are good in designing research but rather that you are good in writing up the proposal (for any kind of research).


For a discussion of how the notion of causality may apply in the social sciences and specifically in politics:


For the key texts on concept formation in political science and their interpretivist critique, see:


**Assignment**: This week’s readings illustrate some ways of forming theories and concepts that we will discuss in class. Your writing task is to develop an empirically testable theory about “why European political science is so unproductive” (cf. Schneider, Gerald, Bernard Steunenberg, Katharina Holzinger, and Nils Petter Gleditsch. 2007. "Symposium: Why European Political Science is So Unproductive and What Should Be Done About It." *European Political Science* 6 (2): 156-91). Write up the whole thing in maximum 700 words but make sure that you clarify the concepts in your theory, suggest hypotheses that follow from it, and outline feasible empirical tests of your propositions. Obviously, you may or may not accept at face value the proposition that “European political science is so unproductive”, e.g. if you so wish then you can propose theories about who and why has this perception and/or makes this claim.

**Week 5: The ambiguous relationship between data and theory.** Data archives, publicly available databases, replications datasets, data available on request, expert surveys, secondary data analysis, fraud in science. Replicability, validity and reliability: how can you tell what data sets and variables are credible enough for you to rely on them? An example of how these questions emerge in case study designs

**Readings:**


For more on the subject matter of our examples, see:


On measurement standards and case study methodology, see:
Mahoney, James. 2007. "Qualitative Methodology and Comparative Politics." Comparative Political Studies 40 (2): 122-44.

Assignment: Search for publicly available data sets in your field of interest. Choose one and describe a theoretical problem that you could analyze using these data. Explain how exactly this data will allow the required analysis. Evaluate the data set in terms of substantive content; coverage (geographic and temporal dimensions); validity; reliability; replicability; and accessibility. There may be some more criteria to think about when you are assessing whether you can actually use a given data to address a particular question (sometimes specific to the kind of data that you are looking at), so do not necessarily take these six points as an exhaustive list. In some cases some of these six items will really look so trivial that you do not want to bother writing down your answer to them in the assignment. But do try to think through these kinds of questions about the data set that you will discuss in the assignment and write down your assessment. Do all this in no more than 600 words. See the forum on this assignment on the
course’s e-learning site for some more idea about what you may consider “data” and where you can look for useful materials, as well as what you may want to look at while assessing a dataset in terms of the above criteria.

PART III: Problems of case selection, data collection and analysis, external and internal validity, and inference under different methods

*Motto:* “I’ve missed over 9,000 shots in my career. Twenty-six times I’ve been trusted to take the game winning shot and missed. I’ve failed over and over again in life. And that is why I succeed.” (Michael Jordan)

Week 6: Research cultures from arts via crafts to industrial production. Frequency distribution of various methods in political science and across its different fields. Cross-sectional and longitudinal quantitative data in the analysis of causal relationships

*NOTE:* CEU hosts some high-profile lectures this week and because of that each of our time slots for the 6th week were moved one hour later, i.e. to 6.10-7.50 pm on Wednesday, 28 October; to 4.10-5.50 pm on Thursday, 29 October; and 4.10-5.50 pm on Friday, 30 October.

**Readings:**

For some commentary on Putnam’s book, see:
For an example of a CEU PhD student applying quantitative macro-data analysis for her dissertation and getting published a co-authored journal article on the way, see:

For some recent evidence on the frequency distribution of various methods and approaches in the discipline, see:

Week 7: Interpretive research with discourse analysis

Guest speaker: Xymena Kurowska (Department of International Relations and European Studies)

Readings:

For more on discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis, see, e.g.:


For some more applications, see:


Note that most journals dedicated to discourse analysis – e.g., *Discourse & Communication, Discourse & Society* and *Critical Discourse Studies* – are, like the Wodak, Chiang and Fairclough readings above, mostly devoted to critical discourse analysis, i.e. a “critical realist” and (socio-)linguistics-oriented branch of discourse analysis.

**Week 8: Hypothesis testing in comparative (case) studies. Case selection in small-, medium-, large-N and multilevel research**

**Readings:**


For journal articles emanating from the same research project (a nice illustration of how you can get more than just a book out of a book project), see:


On the comparative methods, see:


For troubling questions and good advice about case selection in comparative research, see:


For a fitting example of the complexity of arguments about case selection in a particular study:


**Week 9: Research at the ideographic end of the continuum. The use of interviews, (participatory) action research, content analysis, and focus groups. Accounting for possible data errors and the treatment of missing observations in the analysis**

**Guest speaker:** Andrea Krizsán (Center for Policy Studies)

**Readings** (*Descriptively-oriented research tends to require longer reports than nomothetic studies, so be prepared to skim Ferree et al. 2002 in its entirety. As you will see, the book is organized around ‘two stories’. We will discuss the first (analyzing alternative frames of an issue) at the Wednesday seminar, so if you attend that seminar then make sure that you read more carefully the following bits: pp. 3-24, 43-57, 59, 82-153, 286-304. The second ‘story’ (evaluating discourse quality) will be discussed at the Thursday seminar, so if you attend that then make sure that you read more carefully the following bits: pp. 3-24, 43-57, 59, 126-30, 201-255, 280-5, 286-304. On Friday we shall move on to have a look at some further methods topics that, once
again, were somewhat arbitrarily allocated to this week, and you find a few readings for those below.


On descriptive designs:

On interviewing:

For a concise introduction to issues in the treatment of missing data, see:

On content analysis (textbooks and examples of use):

On the design and conduct of focus groups and their possible substantive yield, see:
PART IV: PRESENTATIONS OF DRAFT PROPOSALS AND SOME PRACTICAL QUESTIONS

Week 10: Presentation of draft dissertation proposals starts. Taking stock about research design - what have we learnt, what do we miss, and what can we do about that?

Note: The original idea was that the “taking stock” class would take place in week 12 and involve a round-table “discussion about job markets, jobbanks, interview guides and mock-interviews; combining dissertation writing with teaching, other research, and parenthood” with CEU faculty, alumni, and ABD (all-but-dissertation) PhD students. However, now that the doctoral school plans to organize a whole seminar series on academic practice, it seems that we can better spend this class with taking stock of where we got and you are still missing for writing up your draft dissertation proposals. I did however leave the recommended readings unchanged, i.e. they are related to the originally intended topic of the week 12 roundtable.

Readings (none is mandatory this week and the caveat again applies that, unless you are interested in Anglosaxon job markets, the readings below may give more ideas about the questions that you can ask than about the answers that you are interested in):


The PS: Political Science & Politics magazine of the APSA and European Political Science published by the ECPR are useful source of informal but evidence-based commentary on this kind of matters, and are written specifically for political scientist. Less discipline-specific, far more subjective, but also more plentiful advice can be found in the magazine Inside Higher...
Education, which has a ‘Career Advice’ section featuring a handy search facility and lots of great
tips. See, e.g.:
Advice%20on%20job%20talks.pdf
Mathews-Gardner, Lanethea, Michelle D. Deardorff, Grant Reeher, William Hudson, MaryAnne
Borrelli, and Glen Halva-Neubauer. 2008. "Getting a Job at a Teaching Institution and
Then Succeeding: A Q&A with Experienced Teacher-Scholars." PS: Political Science &
Wuffle, A. 1993. “Uncle Wuffle's Advice to the Assistant Professor.” PS: Political Science &
Politics 26 (1): 89-90. Available from:
There are plenty of websites with commentary and rumours on academic job markets, but
chances are that you can get better tips about these from peers than senior faculty.

Week 11: Discussion of draft dissertation proposals continues. Discussion on literature
reviews, library search techniques, and the formal evaluation of past evidence. The
differential role and composition of literature reviews in articles, books, proposals and
dissertations. Literature search techniques for books, journal articles, conference papers,
work in progress, electronic publications, open access and grey literature. Speed reading.
Meta-analysis and the incorporation of past evidence in the analysis of new data via
Bayesian models

Guest speaker:  Tunde Lepp (CEU Library)

Readings:
# Althaus, Scott L. 1996. "Who Speaks for the People? Political Knowledge, Representation, and
the Use of Opinion Surveys in Democratic Politics." PhD thesis. UMI Number 9714540.
Chicago, IL: Department of Political Science, Northwestern University, chapter 5.


**Open access:**

“The Berlin Declaration on Open Access to Knowledge in the Sciences and Humanities.” Available from [http://oa.mpg.de/openaccess-berlin/berlindeclaration.html](http://oa.mpg.de/openaccess-berlin/berlindeclaration.html)


“Social Sciences Open Access Repository.” Available at [www.ssoar.info](http://www.ssoar.info)


**Techniques for literature review, meta-analysis, Bayesian priors:**


Jackman, Simon. 2004. "Bayesian Analysis for Political Research."  *Annual Review of Political Science* 7 (1): 483-505. (NB: Focus on his first example: the second example is beyond the orbit of this week’s conversation.)

For an excellent example of meta-analysis as a tool of reviewing the literature:


This is an example of how you do the same when the literature is less extensive and much of it looks methodologically problematic:

**Assignment:** All participants will have two tasks this week. First, send in at least one relevant question about how you can search for relevant literature for your research that you would like to ask from a library information service specialist. Second, analyze how an article, a monograph, and a PhD dissertation by the same person on the same topic cover the previous literature. The article-monograph-dissertation set that we take as our example comes from Scott Althaus, because he was so successful in turning his dissertation into influential, prize-winning, much cited publications. Think about possible explanations for the differences that you find between the way the three works do the literature review, and summarize in max two pages these differences and what your explanations would be for them.  

**Week 12:** Discussion of draft dissertation proposals. The facts and values debate, especially with respect to explanations, predictions, policy recommendations and evaluation research. Research ethics and legal issues in studying human subjects

**Guest speaker:** Diane Stone (Department of Public Policy)

**Readings:**

Some more food for thought about how scientific analysis impacts political practice:

---

5 The book version was awarded both the 2004 David Easton Prize by the Foundations of Political Theory Section of the American Political Science Association (this prize is given for a book published in the previous five years that "broadens the horizons of contemporary political science by engaging issues of philosophical significance in political life through any of a variety of approaches in the social sciences and humanities") and the 2004 Goldsmith Book Prize by the Joan Shorenstein Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy at Harvard University (the Goldsmith Prize is given to “the best academic and best trade books that seek to improve the quality of government or politics through an examination of press and politics in the formation of public policy.”) The 1998 APSR article on the same topic, in turn, became a mainstay in graduate reading packs in voting behavior and public opinion research (cf. e.g. the most widely used Niemi and Weisberg textbook).


For some discussions of ethics issues in political science, see:


**Assignment:** The readings for this week should give you some ideas about how your research (i.e., the one that you present some initial ideas about in our seminar series) might raise ethical concerns. Send in at least one relevant question so that we can discuss it in class.