

Last Updated: 13 March 2023

MA in Religious and Middle Eastern Politics

Qualitative and Quantitative Research Methods in Political Science 71-887-90

Dr. Ariel Zellman

Course Type: Lecture

Course Load: 4 hrs/week **Semester:** Second **Academic Year:** 2022-23 (תשפ"ג)

Course Website: <https://lemida.biu.ac.il>

Course Hours and Location: Monday, 1600-2000, Online Lecture via Zoom

Lecturer Office Hours: Wednesday, 1400-1600, Building 213 (Mexico), Room 252

Email: ariel.zellman@biu.ac.il

A. Course Objectives

The objective of the course is to assist graduate students in understanding, analyzing, and applying quantitative and qualitative research, while emphasizing qualitative comparative logic. Because research methods are many and varied, the purpose of the course is not to encompass all the research methods in the literature, but to provide the student with sufficient tools for proper qualitative research, while being aware of the theoretical assumptions of the selected methods as well as their limitations and advantages. Emphasis will be placed on research methods and research in the field of political science, based on the understanding that studies in political science tend to emphasize aspects different from those of other fields. Particular emphasis will be placed on critical skills related to the formulation and writing of an academic research proposal with the intent to enable masters students in the "research track" to advance their thesis research. By the end of the semester, students will be familiar with the relevant literature and will be able to critically evaluate quantitative and qualitative research.

B. Course Content

Class Procedures: Open discussion between lecturer and students on the reading, and near weekly in-class assignments by students related to the primary subject under discussion.

Detailed teaching program for all course meetings:

Assigned readings are mandatory for each and every week. Nearly every week there will be discussions related to particular methodologies and/or approaches as well as articles relevant to these methods, whether teaching a particular research method, its theoretical importance, or demonstrating its application. Students will complete 4 of 9 possible weekly assignments, the results of which will be discussed at the beginning of the following class.

Week 1: Foundations: Political Science as Science

Required:

Brady, Henry E., David Collier, and Jason Seawright, "Refocusing the Discussion of Methodology," in *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*, Rowman & Littlefield: Lanham, MD, 2004: 3-20.

Hempel, Carl G. 1942. "The Function of General Laws in History." *The Journal of Philosophy* 39 (2), 35-48.

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba, "The Science in Social Science", in *Designing Social Inquiry*, Princeton UP: Princeton, NJ, 1994: 3-33.

Popper, Karl. "Science: Conjectures and Refutations," 1953.

Laubepin, Frederique. 2013. "How to Read (and Understand) a Social Science Journal Article." *Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research*.

Assignment #1: How to Read a Social Science Journal Article

Using the guidelines provided by Laubepin, select one of the example texts to read. During your reading of the article, fill in the information with answers to the questions posed by Laubepin for each of the sections of the article.

Examples:

Brubaker, Rogers. 2017. "Between nationalism and civilizationism: the European populist moment in comparative perspective." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 40 (8), 1191-1226.

Powell, Emilia Justyna. 2015. "Islamic Law States and Peaceful Resolution of Territorial Disputes." *International Organization* 69 (4), 777-807.

Woodberry, Robert D. 2012. "The Missionary Roots of Liberal Democracy," *American Political Science Review* 106 (2), 244-274.

Yanik, Lerna K. And Jelena Subotic. 2021. "Cultural heritage as status seeking: The international politics of Turkey's restoration wave," *Cooperation and Conflict* 56 (3), 246-263.

Optional:

Barakso, Maryann, Daniel M. Sabet, and Brian Schaffner, "Introduction," in *Understanding Political Science Research Methods: The Challenge of Inference* (New York: Routledge, 2014): 1-8.

Bay, Christian. 1965. "Politics and Pseudopolitics: A Critical Evaluation of Some Behavioral Literature", *American Political Science Review*, 59 (1), 39-51.

Dryzek, John S. 2006. "Revolutions Without Enemies: Key Transformations in Political Science", *American Political Science Review* 100, 487-492.

Grant, J. Tobin. 2005. "What Divides Us? The Image and Organization of Political Science." *PS: Political Science and Politics*.

Week 2: Descriptive and Causal Inference in Political Science

Required:

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, Sidney Verba, "Descriptive Inference" and "Causal Inference" in *Designing Social Inquiry*, Princeton UP: Princeton, NJ, 1994: 34-74, 74-99.

Collier, David, Jason Seawright, and Gerardo L. Munck, "The Quest for Standards: King, Keohane, and Verba's *Designing Social Inquiry*", in *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*, Rowman & Littlefield: Lanham, MD, 2004: 21-50.

Assignment #2: Debating the Clash of Civilizations

To what extent did Huntington successfully “describe” the post-Cold War era? Upon what basis should we judge the validity of his proposed “causes” of his anticipated civilizational clash?

Examples:

Huntington, Samuel P. 1993. “The Clash of Civilizations?” *Foreign Affairs* 72 (3), 22-49.

Adib-Moghaddam, Arshin. 2008. “A (short) history of the clash of civilizations,” *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 21 (2), 217-234.

Acharya, Amitav. 2020. “The Myth of the ‘Civilization State’: Rising Powers and the Cultural Challenge to World Order.” *Ethics & International Affairs* 34 (2), 139–56.

Bettiza, Gregorio and Fabio Petito. 2018. “Why (Clash of) Civilizations Discourses Just Won’t Go Away? Understanding the Civilizational Politics of Our Times.” *E-International Relations*, <https://www.e-ir.info/2018/05/01/why-clash-of-civilizations-discourses-just-wont-go-away-understanding-the-civilizational-politics-of-our-times/>.

Fox, Jonathan. 2005. “Paradigm Lost: Huntington’s Unfulfilled Clash of Civilizations Prediction into the 21st Century.” *International Politics* 42, 428–457.

Haynes, Jeffrey. 2019. “From Huntington to Trump: Twenty-Five Years of the ‘Clash of Civilizations’,” *The Review of Faith & International Affairs* 17 (1), 11-23.

Henderson, Errol. 2005. “Not Letting Evidence Get in the Way of Assumptions: Testing the Clash of Civilizations Thesis with More Recent Data.” *International Politics* 42, 458–469.

Russett, Bruce M., John R. Oneal, and Michaelene Cox. 2000. “Clash of Civilizations, or Realism and Liberalism Déjà Vu? Some Evidence.” *Journal of Peace Research* 37 (5), 583-608.

Optional:

Barakso, Maryann, Daniel M. Sabet, and Brian Schaffner, “The Challenge of Inference,” in *Understanding Political Science Research Methods: The Challenge of Inference* (New York: Routledge, 2014): 11-35.

Gerring, John. “Part II: Description” and “Part III: Causation” in *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework*, Cambridge UP: New York, 2012: pgs. 105-194, 195-358.

Holland, Paul W. 1986. “Statistics and Causal Inference.” *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 81, 945-960.

King, Gary. 1986. “How Not to Lie with Statistics.” *American Journal of Political Science* 30, 666-687.

Week 3: Research Questions

Required:

Barakso, Maryann, Daniel M. Sabet, and Brian Schaffner, “The Research Question,” in *Understanding Political Science Research Methods: The Challenge of Inference* (New York: Routledge, 2014): 36-55.

Day, Christopher and Kendra L. Koivu. 2019. “Finding the Question: A Puzzle-Based Approach to the Logic of Discovery,” *Journal of Political Science Education* 15 (3), 377-386

Assignment #3: Evaluating Research Questions in Politics and Religion

Select one of the research questions presented in the example texts. Evaluate the process by which the authors developed this research question and why this question is a “good” one according to the criteria discussed in this class.

Examples:

Elman, Miriam Fendius. 2008. “Does Democracy Tame the Radicals? Lessons from Israel's Jewish Religious Political Parties,” *Asian Security* 4 (1), 79-99.

Grzymala-Busse, Anna. 2020. “Beyond War and Contracts: The Medieval and Religious Roots of the European State.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 23, 19-36.

Hassner, Ron. 2011. “Blasphemy and Violence.” *International Studies Quarterly* 55 (1), 23-45.

Henne, Peter S. 2012. “The two swords: Religion–state connections and interstate disputes.” *Journal of Peace Research* 49 (6), 753-768.

Optional:

Gustafsson, Karl and Linus Hagström. 2017. “What is the point? Teaching graduate students how to construct political science research puzzles,” *European Political Science*.

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, Sidney Verba, “Improving Research Questions” in *Designing Social Inquiry*, Princeton UP: Princeton, NJ, 1994: 14-19.

Lehnert M., Miller B., Wonka A. 2007, “Increasing the Relevance of Research Questions: Considerations on Theoretical and Social Relevance in Political Science.” In: Gschwend T., Schimmelfennig F. (eds) *Research Design in Political Science*. Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Week 4: Defining Concepts

Required:

Collier, David, and Steven Levitsky. 1997. “Democracy with Adjectives: Conceptual Innovation in Comparative Research.” *World Politics* 49 (3), 430-51.

Collier, David, and James E. Mahon. 1993. “Conceptual “Stretching” Revisited: Adapting Categories in Comparative Analysis.” *American Political Science Review* 87 (4), 845-55.

Gerring, John. 1999. “What Makes a Concept Good? A Critical Framework for Understanding Concept Formation in the Social Sciences,” *Polity* 31 (3), 357-393.

Assignment #4: Defining Difficult Concepts in Politics and Religion

Examine the concept of “sacred space” as presented in the example texts and describe them using schematic diagrams, tables of necessary and (if relevant) sufficient conditions, and present at least three “real world” examples.

Examples:

Cesari, Jocelyne. 2021. “Time, Power, and Religion: Comparing the Disputes over Temple Mount and the Ayodhya Sacred Sites.” *Journal of Law, Religion and State*, 9 (1), 95-123.

Hassner, Ron E. 2003. "‘To Halve and to Hold’: Conflicts over Sacred Space and the Problem of Indivisibility." *Security Studies* 12 (4): 1–33.

Jobani, Yuval and Nahshon Perez. 2018. "Governing the sacred: A critical typology of models of political toleration in contested sacred sites." *Oxford Journal of Law and Religion*, 7(2), 250-273.

Zellman, Ariel and Jonathan Fox. 2023. "Under God, Indivisible? Religious Salience and Interstate Territorial Conflict." *Journal of Peace Research*, forthcoming.

Optional:

Adcock, Robert N. and David Collier. 2001. "Measurement Validity: A Shared Standard for Qualitative and Quantitative Research," *American Political Science Review* 95 (3), 529-546.

Gerring, John. "Part II: Description" in *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework*, Cambridge UP: New York, 2012: pgs. 105-194.

Goertz, Gary. "Structuring and Theorizing Concepts", "Concept Intention and Extension," in *Social Science Concepts: A User Guide*, Princeton UP: Princeton, NJ, 2006: 27-67, 69-94.

MacIntyre, Alasdair. 1973. "The Essential Contestability of Some Social Concepts", *Ethics*, 84 (1), 1-9.

Wonka, Arndt. 2007. "Concept Specification in Political Science Research." In: Gschwend T., Schimmelfennig F. (eds) *Research Design in Political Science*. Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Week 5: Writing a Literature Review and Building Hypotheses

Required:

Barakso, Maryann, Daniel M. Sabet, and Brian Schaffner, "Linking Theory and Inference," in *Understanding Political Science Research Methods: The Challenge of Inference* (New York: Routledge, 2014), pgs. 56-80.

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba, "Rules for Constructing Causal Theories" in *Designing Social Inquiry*, Princeton UP: Princeton, NJ, 1994, pgs. 99-114.

Miller, Stephen V. 2017. "How to do a literature review".

<http://svmiller.com/blog/2014/11/how-to-do-a-literature-review/>

Assignment #5: Understanding and Expanding upon the Literature in Politics and Religion

Using one of the example texts provided below, analyze the content of the literature review and how the authors employed this literature review to develop testable hypotheses. Then evaluate the extent to which you believe the article's proposed hypotheses follow from said literature review and provide observable implications of these hypotheses.

Examples:

Fox, Jonathan, Chris Bader, and Jennifer M. McClure. 2017. "Don't get mad: The disconnect between religious discrimination and individual perceptions of government," *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 36 (5), 495-516.

Hegghammer, Thomas. 2010/2011. "The Rise of Muslim Foreign Fighters: Islam and the Globalization of Jihad," *International Security* 35 (3), 53-94.

Ives, Brandon. 2019. "Religious Institutionalism: A Domestic Explanation for External Support of Rebel Groups" *International Interactions* 45 (4), 693-719.

Wainscott, Ann Marie. 2018. "Religious Regulation as Foreign Policy: Morocco's Islamic Diplomacy in West Africa," *Politics and Religion* 11 (1), 1-26.

Zellman, Ariel and Davis Brown. 2022. "Uneasy Lies the Crown: External Threats to Religious Legitimacy and Interstate Dispute Militarization." *Security Studies* 31 (1), 152-182.

Optional:

Knopf, Jeffery W. 2006. "Doing a Literature Review," *PS: Political Science and Politics* 39 (1), 127-132.

McMenamin, Iain. 2006. "Process and Text: Teaching Students to Review the Literature," *PS: Political Science and Politics* 39 (1), 133-135.

Topal, Reyhan and Farzin Shargh. 2023. "Teaching Students How to Find and Identify Reliable Online Sources: A Series of Exercises." *Journal of Political Science Education*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/15512169.2022.2163899>.

Week 6: Qualitative versus Quantitative Research

Required:

Brady, Henry E., "Data-Set Observations versus Causal-Process Observations: The 2000 U.S. Presidential Election," in *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*, Rowman & Littlefield: Lanham, MD, 2004: 267-271.

Collier, David, Henry E. Brady, and Jason Seawright, "Sources of Leverage in Causal Inference: Toward an Alternative View of Methodology," in *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*, Rowman & Littlefield: Lanham, MD, 2004: 229-266.

James Mahoney and Gary Goertz, "A Tale of Two Cultures: Contrasting Quantitative and Qualitative Research," *Political Analysis* 14:3 (Summer 2006): 227-249.

Assignment #6: Proposing a Quantitative Study in Politics and Religion

Propose a basic research agenda in politics and religion employing quantitative methods based upon currently publicly available data sources. This basic proposal should include a framing research question, at least two testable hypotheses, a clearly specified dependent variable, and several explanatory (independent) variables. Include at least one to two sentence justifications for each, explaining why, how, and the extent to which each variable offers a reasonable proxy for the proposed causal factors and research outcomes.

Examples: Similar Research Agendas, Different Methods

Qualitative: Inbari, Motti. "Fundamentalism in Crisis: The Response of the Gush Emunim Rabbinical Authorities to the Theological Dilemmas Raised by Israel's Disengagement Plan." *Journal of Church and State* 49, 697-717.

Quantitative: Freedman, Michael. 2019. "Fighting from the Pulpit: Religious Leaders and Violent Conflict in Israel" *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 63 (10), 2262–2288.

Optional:

Levy, Jack S. "Qualitative Methods and Cross-Method Dialogue in Political Science". *Comparative Political Studies* 40, no. 2 (February 2007): 196-214.

Tarrow, Sidney. "Bridging the Quantitative-Qualitative Divide" in *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*, Rowman & Littlefield: Lanham, MD, 2004: 171-180.

Weeks 7: Selecting Cases

Required:

Geddes, Barbara. 1990. "How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics." *Political Analysis* 2, 131-150.

Gerring, John. 2007. "Is There a (Viable) Crucial-Case Method?" *Comparative Political Studies* 40 (3), 231-253.

Seawright, Jason and John Gerring. 2008. "Case Selection Techniques in Case Study Research: A Menu of Qualitative and Quantitative Options." *Political Research Quarterly* 61 (2), 294-308.

Slater, Dan, and Daniel Ziblatt. 2013. "The Enduring Indispensability of the Controlled Comparison." *Comparative Political Studies* 46 (10), 1301-27.

Assignment #7: Proposing a Qualitative Comparative Study in Politics and Religion

Propose a basic research agenda in politics and religion employing qualitative case-comparative methods. This basic proposal should include a framing research question, at least one qualitatively testable hypothesis, a clearly specified range of outcomes (dependent variable values), and at least two dichotomous explanatory (independent) variables, the differing combinations of values of which should lead to four distinct outcomes. Provide a 2x2 table summarizing these interactions and outcomes and provide relevant cases matching each of your four cells. Include a sentence or two justifying your inclusion of each of these cases, considering how their comparative examination offers more generalizable conclusions than the examination of any single case alone.

Examples: Varieties of Case Selection in Politics and Religion

Abulof, Uriel. 2014. "The Roles of Religion in National Legitimation: Judaism and Zionism's Elusive Quest for Legitimacy." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 53 (3), 515-533.

Huang, Reyko and Mohammad Ayatollahi Tabaar. 2021. "We Are All Coethnics: State Identities and Foreign Interventions in Violent Conflict." *Journal of Global Security Studies* 6 (3): oga047.

Veković, Marko and Miroljub Jevtić. 2019. "Render unto Caesar: Explaining Political Dimension of the Autocephaly Demands in Ukraine and Montenegro" *Journal of Church and State* 61 (4), 591-609.

Optional:

Barakso, Maryann, Daniel M. Sabet, and Brian Schaffner, "Small-n Observational Studies," in *Understanding Political Science Research Methods: The Challenge of Inference* (New York: Routledge, 2014): 177-204.

Bennett, Andrew and Colin Elman. 2006. "Qualitative Research: Recent Developments in Case Study Methods," *Annual Review of Political Science* 9, 455-476.

Collier, David, James Mahoney, and Jason Seawright, "Claiming Too Much: Warnings about Selection Bias," in *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*, Rowman & Littlefield: Lanham, MD, 2004: 85-102.

George, Alexander L. and Andrew Bennett, "Chapter 1: Case Studies and Theory Development", "Comparative Methods: Controlled Comparison and Within-Case Analysis", "The Congruence Method" in *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*, MIT Press: Cambridge, MA, 2005, pgs. 3-36. (How to do case studies, chapters 3-5, pgs. 67-124), 151-179, 181-204.

Gerring, John. 2004. "What is a Case Study and What is it Good For?" *American Political Science Review* 98 (2), 341-354.

Goertz, Gary. "Part Two" in *Social Science Concepts: A User Guide*, Princeton UP: Princeton, NJ, 2006: pgs. 157-234.

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba, "Determining What to Observe" in *Designing Social Inquiry*, Princeton UP: Princeton, NJ, 1994, pgs. 115-149.

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

Lijphart, Arend. "Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method." *American Political Science Review* 65, no. 3 (1971): 682-693.

Seawright, Jason. 2018. "Beyond Mill: Why Cross-Case Qualitative Causal Inference is Weak, and Why We Should Still Compare". *Qualitative and Multi-Method Research* 16 (1), 8-14.

Seawright, Jason. 2018. "The Case for Selecting Cases that are Deviant or Extreme on the Independent Variable." *Sociological Methods and Research* 45 (3), 493-525.

Week 8: Process Tracing and Path Dependence

Required:

Collier, David. 2011. "Understanding Process Tracing". *PS: Political Science and Politics* 44 (4), 823-830.

Mahoney, James, Erin Kimball, and Kendra Koivu. 2009. "The Logic of Historical Explanation in the Social Sciences." *Comparative Political Studies* 42 (1), 114-146.

Pierson, Paul. 2000. "Increasing Returns, Path Dependence, and the Study of Politics". *American Political Science Review* 94 (2), 251-267.

Verghese, Ajay. 2023. "The Problem of Infinite Regress: A Stopping Rules Approach." *Sociological Theory*, 1-28, <https://doi.org/10.1177/07352751221142929>.

Assignment #8: Process Tracing and Identifying Critical Junctions in Politics and Religion

For one of the example articles below, draw a map of causal-process observations by which one can process trace the causal mechanisms each author argues resulted in their observed outcome. Identify relevant critical junctures and, if specified in the article, alternative decisions and/or pathways which may have led to counterfactual outcomes. In addition to said map, include a one to two paragraph evaluation of the extent to which you believe the author's analysis of historical processes supports their theoretical intuitions.

Examples:

Ngoun, Kimly. 2018. "From a pile of stones to a national symbol: Preah Vihear Temple and Norodom Sihanouk's politics of postcolonial nation-building" *South East Asia Research* 26 (2), 194-212.

Shelef, Nadav G. 2004. "From 'Both Banks of the Jordan' to the 'Whole Land of Israel': Ideological Change in Revisionist Zionism." *Israel Studies* 9 (1), 125-48.

Optional:

George, Alexander L. and Andrew Bennett, "Chapters 10: Process-Tracing and Historical Explanation" in *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*, MIT Press: Cambridge, MA, 2005, pgs. 205-232.

Mahoney, James. 2015. "Process Tracing and Historical Explanation" *Security Studies* 24, 200-218.

Page, Scott. 2006. "Path Dependence" *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* (1), 87-115.

Rueschemeyer, Dietrich, and John D. Stephens. 1997. "Comparing Historical Sequences – A Powerful Tool for Causal Analysis" *Comparative Social Research* 17, 55-72.

Week 9: Experimental Approaches

Required:

Barabas, Jason and Jennifer Jerit. 2010. "Are Survey Experiments Externally Valid?" *The American Political Science Review* 104 (2), 226-42.

Hainmueller, Jens, Dominik Hangartner, and Teppei Yamamoto. 2015. "Do survey experiments capture real-world behavior?" *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 112 (8), 2395-2400.

Mullinix, Kevin J., Thomas J. Leeper, James N. Druckman, and Jeremy Freese. 2015. "The Generalizability of Survey Experiments." *Journal of Experimental Political Science* 2 (2), 109–38.

Assignment #9: Proposing an Experimental Study in Politics and Religion

Propose a basic research agenda in politics and religion employing experimental methods. This basic proposal should include a framing research question and at least one quantitatively testable hypothesis. It should also include a set of vignettes designed to test the effect of variations in said vignettes on responses of experiment participants. Also include three to four questions that participants would answer after receiving the experimental treatment.

Examples:

Beyerlein, Kraig and Jason Klocek. 2020. "How do religion and sexual orientation affect support for U.S. presidential candidates? Evidence from a survey experiment." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 59 (4), 551-568.

Wu, Joshua Su-Ya and Austin J. Knuppe. 2016. "My Brother's Keeper? Religious Cues and Support for Foreign Military Intervention." *Politics and Religion* 9, 537-565.

Optional:

Mutz, Diane C., 2011. *Population-based survey experiments*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Week 10: Typological Theory and Mixed Methods

Required:

Brookes, Marissa, ed. 2017. "Symposium: The Road Less Traveled: An Agenda for Mixed-Method Research" *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50 (4), 1015-1042.

Lieberman, Evan. 2005. "Nested Analysis as a Mixed-Method Strategy for Comparative Research," *American Political Science Review* 93 (3), 435-452.

Assignment #10: Proposing a QCA/fsQCA Study in Politics and Religion

Propose a basic research agenda in politics and religion employing crisp or fuzzy set QCA. This basic proposal should include a framing research question, a list of relevant cases, and several testable hypotheses that speak to the necessity and/or sufficiency of a set of explanatory (independent) variables to lead to a given set of outcomes (values on the dependent variable). Design a rubric for scoring at least one of your independent variables and your dependent variable in terms of five levels of "fuzzy" values from 0 to 1.

Examples: QCA applications in Politics and Religion

Ahram, Ariel I. 2020. "Separatism, the Arab uprisings and the legacies of lost territorial autonomy," *Territory, Politics, Governance* 8 (1), 117-137.

Bank, André, Thomas Richter, and Anna Sunik. 2015. "Long-term monarchical survival in the Middle East: a configurational comparison, 1945–2012" *Democratization* 22 (1), 179-200.

Optional:

George, Alexander L. and Andrew Bennett, "Integrating Comparative and Within-Case Analysis: Typological Theory" in *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*, MIT Press: Cambridge, MA, 2005, pgs. 233-262.

Glynn, Adam N. and Nahomi Ichino. 2015. "Using Qualitative Information to Improve Causal Inference." *American Journal of Political Science* 59 (4), 1055-1071.

Goertz, Gary. "Concepts in Theories: Two-Level Theories" in *Social Science Concepts: A User Guide*, Princeton UP: Princeton, NJ, 2006: pgs. 237-268.

Krogslund, Chris, et al. 2015. "Fuzzy Sets on Shaky Ground: Parameter Sensitivity and Confirmation Bias in fsQCA". *Political Analysis* 23 (1), 21-41.

Russo, Ivan and Ilenia Confente. 2018. "From dataset to qualitative comparative analysis (QCA)—Challenges and tricky points: A research note on contrarian case analysis and data calibration." *Australasian Marketing Journal*, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ausmj.2018.11.001>.

Week 11: Ethics, Plagiarism, Preregistration, Replication, and Transparency

Alvarez, Michael R., Ellen M. Key, and Lucas Núñez. 2018. "Research Replication: Practical Considerations." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 51 (2). Cambridge University Press: 422–26.

Kapiszewski, Diana and Sebastian Karcher. 2021. "Transparency in Practice in Qualitative Research." *PS: Political Science and Politics*. 54 (2), 285-291.

Lupia, Arthur and Colin Elman. 2014. "Openness in Political Science: Data Access and Research Transparency." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 47 (1), 19-42.

Monogan, James E., III. 2015. "Research Preregistration in Political Science: The Case, Counterarguments, and a Response to Critiques." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 48 (3), 425-429.

C. Course Requirements

Prerequisites: This course is required for all students in the "Religious and Middle Eastern Politics" masters program.

Requirements / Assignments

1. Weekly readings and classroom participation (20%)
2. Submission of 4 of 10 possible assignments, in which the student is prepared to discuss their answers/results in class in the week following the class in which the relevant material was originally taught (4*20%)

D. Bibliography: (required/optional)

Required:

All required academic articles listed in the lesson schedule above.

Brady, Henry E. and David Collier, *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*, Rowman & Littlefield: Lanham, MD, 2004.

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

Optional:

All optional academic articles listed in the lesson schedule above.

Barakso, Maryann, Daniel M. Sabet, and Brian Schaffner, *Understanding Political Science Research Methods: The Challenge of Inference*, Routledge: New York, 2014.

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

Gerring, John, *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework*, Cambridge UP: New York, 2012.

Goertz, Gary, *Social Science Concepts: A User's Guide*, Princeton UP: Princeton, NJ, 2006.

Gschwend T., Schimmelfennig F., *Research Design in Political Science*. Palgrave Macmillan, London, 2007.