

# **THE APPROACH AND METHODS OF COMPARATIVE POLITICS**

*Comparative Politics*

Guillermo Toral

IE University

# What are we covering today?

- Can we study politics scientifically?

# What are we covering today?

- Can we study politics scientifically?
- What are the features of good (political) science?

# What are we covering today?

- Can we study politics scientifically?
- What are the features of good (political) science?
- Workshop and exercise: Dissecting an academic article

Can we study politics scientifically?

## Exercise in groups

- Find the website of the **American Political Science Review**, and locate the *Latest issue*

## Exercise in groups

- Find the website of the **American Political Science Review**, and locate the *Latest issue*
- Open 1-2 of the articles published to **take a quick look at the format, abstract, and analyses contained in those articles**

## Exercise in groups

- Find the website of the **American Political Science Review**, and locate the *Latest issue*
- Open 1-2 of the articles published to **take a quick look at the format, abstract, and analyses contained in those articles**
- Think through and take notes on your answers to these **questions**:

## Exercise in groups

- Find the website of the **American Political Science Review**, and locate the *Latest issue*
- Open 1-2 of the articles published to **take a quick look at the format, abstract, and analyses contained in those articles**
- Think through and take notes on your answers to these **questions**:
  - What are some features that these articles have in common?

## Exercise in groups

- Find the website of the **American Political Science Review**, and locate the *Latest issue*
- Open 1-2 of the articles published to **take a quick look at the format, abstract, and analyses contained in those articles**
- Think through and take notes on your answers to these **questions**:
  - What are some features that these articles have in common?
  - How do these academic articles differ from newspaper articles about similar topics?

## Exercise in groups

- Find the website of the **American Political Science Review**, and locate the *Latest issue*
- Open 1-2 of the articles published to **take a quick look at the format, abstract, and analyses contained in those articles**
- Think through and take notes on your answers to these **questions**:
  - What are some features that these articles have in common?
  - How do these academic articles differ from newspaper articles about similar topics?
  - In what ways are these articles easy / difficult to digest?

## Exercise in groups

- Find the website of the **American Political Science Review**, and locate the *Latest issue*
- Open 1-2 of the articles published to **take a quick look at the format, abstract, and analyses contained in those articles**
- Think through and take notes on your answers to these **questions**:
  - What are some features that these articles have in common?
  - How do these academic articles differ from newspaper articles about similar topics?
  - In what ways are these articles easy / difficult to digest?
  - Are these articles relevant to non-academic communities? Why or why not?

# Exercise in groups



Discover Content Products and Services

Cambridge Core

Browse subjects Publications Open research Services About Cambridge Core

Institution login

Register

Log In

Cart (0)

Search all journal & book content

Home > Journals > American Political Science Review

English | Français



## American Political Science Review

Search American Political Science Review & Past titles

Search within full text

[Submit your article](#) [Announcements](#) [Subscribe](#)

[Journal home](#)

[Journal information](#)

[Special Collections](#)

[FirstView articles](#)

[Latest issue](#)

[Most cited](#)

[All issues](#)

[Open access articles](#)



[Get access](#) Contains open access

Continues *Proceedings of the American Political Science Association* (1905 - 1914)  
[Title history](#)

ISSN: 0003-0554 (Print), 1537-5943 (Online)

**Editors:** John Gerring *University of Texas at Austin*, USA, Monika Nalepa *University of Chicago*, USA, Marissa Abrajano *University of California, San Diego*, USA, Laia Balcells *Georgetown University*, USA, Pablo Beramendi *Duke University*, USA, Carles Boix *Princeton University*, USA, Scott de Marchi *Duke University*, USA, Alexandre Debs *Yale University*, USA, Andrew Eggers *University of Chicago*, USA, Gregory Huber *Yale University*, USA, Sebastian Karcher *Syracuse University*, USA, Isabela Mares *Yale University*, USA, Alison McQueen *Stanford University*, USA, Daniel Bernstein *North Dakota State University*, USA, Julie Rose *Dartmouth College*, USA, and Sharee Thrower *Vanderbilt University*, USA  
[Editorial board](#)

*American Political Science Review* is political science's premier scholarly research journal, providing peer-reviewed articles and review essays from subfields throughout the discipline. Areas covered include political theory, American politics, public policy, public administration, comparative politics, and international relations. APSR has published continuously since 1906.

Transition at the  
APSR 2024

Access Blog posts  
by APSR Authors

Access the new  
Editors' Blog here

# Is “political science” a science?

- Is a scientific approach to politics possible?

# Is “political science” a science?

- Is a scientific approach to politics possible?
- In what senses yes, and in which ones not really?

# Is “political science” a science?

- Is a scientific approach to politics possible?
- In what senses yes, and in which ones not really?
- Are some parts of politics more amenable to scientific study than others?

# Is “political science” a science?

- Is a scientific approach to politics possible?
- In what senses yes, and in which ones not really?
- Are some parts of politics more amenable to scientific study than others?
- How does political science differ from other sciences?

## Things that are **not true** about science – political or otherwise

- Science proves things definitively and leads to certain truth

## Things that are **not true** about science – political or otherwise

- Science proves things definitively and leads to certain truth
- Doing science requires experimentally manipulating treatments

## Things that are **not true** about science – political or otherwise

- Science proves things definitively and leads to certain truth
- Doing science requires experimentally manipulating treatments
- Science is done by value-neutral researchers

## Things that are **not true** about science – political or otherwise

- Science proves things definitively and leads to certain truth
- Doing science requires experimentally manipulating treatments
- Science is done by value-neutral researchers
- Science is just a way to make biased claims appear legitimate

## Things that are **not true** about science – political or otherwise

- Science proves things definitively and leads to certain truth
- Doing science requires experimentally manipulating treatments
- Science is done by value-neutral researchers
- Science is just a way to make biased claims appear legitimate
- Scientific progress depends on individual, extraordinary studies – or scientists

What are the features of good (political) science?

# Features of good (political) science: Overview

## 1. Clear theory

# Features of good (political) science: Overview

1. Clear theory
2. Testable hypotheses

# Features of good (political) science: Overview

1. Clear theory
2. Testable hypotheses
3. Rigorous methodology

# Features of good (political) science: Overview

1. Clear theory
2. Testable hypotheses
3. Rigorous methodology
4. Transparency

# Features of good (political) science: Overview

1. Clear theory
2. Testable hypotheses
3. Rigorous methodology
4. Transparency
5. Ethical standards

# Features of good (political) science: Overview

1. Clear theory
2. Testable hypotheses
3. Rigorous methodology
4. Transparency
5. Ethical standards
6. Social relevance

# 1. Theoretical clarity

A **theory** is a proposition or set of propositions about the relationship between variables, providing an internally consistent logic to explain (political) phenomena, and which can be subjected to empirical testing through observation or experimentation

Good theories:

- have some **generality**

# 1. Theoretical clarity

A **theory** is a proposition or set of propositions about the relationship between variables, providing an internally consistent logic to explain (political) phenomena, and which can be subjected to empirical testing through observation or experimentation

Good theories:

- have some **generality**
- are **phrased independently of the empirical cases** used to build or test them

## 1. Theoretical clarity

A **theory** is a proposition or set of propositions about the relationship between variables, providing an internally consistent logic to explain (political) phenomena, and which can be subjected to empirical testing through observation or experimentation

Good theories:

- have some **generality**
- are **phrased independently of the empirical cases** used to build or test them
- specify any relevant **mechanisms** (or channels through which variables are connected)

## 1. Theoretical clarity

A **theory** is a proposition or set of propositions about the relationship between variables, providing an internally consistent logic to explain (political) phenomena, and which can be subjected to empirical testing through observation or experimentation

Good theories:

- have some **generality**
- are **phrased independently of the empirical cases** used to build or test them
- specify any relevant **mechanisms** (or channels through which variables are connected)
- specify any relevant **scope conditions** (or where / when it should apply)

# What kinds of propositions or arguments are there?

- **Normative** – implications for what should be and for values

# What kinds of propositions or arguments are there?

- **Normative** – implications for what should be and for values
- **Descriptive** – implications for organizing and summarizing reality

# What kinds of propositions or arguments are there?

- **Normative** – implications for what should be and for values
- **Descriptive** – implications for organizing and summarizing reality
- **Predictive** – implications for forecasting

# What kinds of propositions or arguments are there?

- **Normative** – implications for what should be and for values
- **Descriptive** – implications for organizing and summarizing reality
- **Predictive** – implications for forecasting
- **Causal** – implications for explaining cause-and-effect relationships, and manipulating outcomes

# What kinds of propositions or arguments are there?

- **Normative** – implications for what should be and for values
- **Descriptive** – implications for organizing and summarizing reality
- **Predictive** – implications for forecasting
- **Causal** – implications for explaining cause-and-effect relationships, and manipulating outcomes
- Comparative politics typically engages causal, predictive, and/or descriptive arguments

# What theoretical perspectives or paradigms are most common when talking about politics?

- **Institutionalism:** focus on how formal or informal institutions shape outcomes and behavior

*By training our ability to identify and assess arguments from different perspectives, we can become better at critiquing others' and at building our own theories about politics*

# What theoretical perspectives or paradigms are most common when talking about politics?

- **Institutionalism:** focus on how formal or informal institutions shape outcomes and behavior
- **Interests:** focus on individuals' strategic calculations (for maximizing utility) and their aggregation

*By training our ability to identify and assess arguments from different perspectives, we can become better at critiquing others' and at building our own theories about politics*

# What theoretical perspectives or paradigms are most common when talking about politics?

- **Institutionalism**: focus on how formal or informal institutions shape outcomes and behavior
- **Interests**: focus on individuals' strategic calculations (for maximizing utility) and their aggregation
- **Ideas**: focus on how ideas, ideologies and culture shape behavior and outcomes

*By training our ability to identify and assess arguments from different perspectives, we can become better at critiquing others' and at building our own theories about politics*

# What theoretical perspectives or paradigms are most common when talking about politics?

- **Institutionalism**: focus on how formal or informal institutions shape outcomes and behavior
- **Interests**: focus on individuals' strategic calculations (for maximizing utility) and their aggregation
- **Ideas**: focus on how ideas, ideologies and culture shape behavior and outcomes
- **Individuals**: focus on how specific people and in particular leaders shape outcomes


*By training our ability to identify and assess arguments from different perspectives, we can become better at critiquing others' and at building our own theories about politics*

# What theoretical perspectives or paradigms are most common when talking about politics?

- **Institutionalism**: focus on how formal or informal institutions shape outcomes and behavior
- **Interests**: focus on individuals' strategic calculations (for maximizing utility) and their aggregation
- **Ideas**: focus on how ideas, ideologies and culture shape behavior and outcomes
- **Individuals**: focus on how specific people and in particular leaders shape outcomes
- **International environment**: focus on how global pressures shape domestic politics

*By training our ability to identify and assess arguments from different perspectives, we can become better at critiquing others' and at building our own theories about politics*

# What theoretical perspectives or paradigms are most common when talking about politics?



## 2. Testable hypotheses

A **hypothesis** is a specific and testable claim based on a theory. It allows us to systematically evaluate the validity of the theory.

Good hypotheses:

- Are **logically derived** or deducted from the theory / argument

## 2. Testable hypotheses

A **hypothesis** is a specific and testable claim based on a theory. It allows us to systematically evaluate the validity of the theory.

Good hypotheses:

- Are **logically derived** or deducted from the theory / argument
- Are **precise**

## 2. Testable hypotheses

A **hypothesis** is a specific and testable claim based on a theory. It allows us to systematically evaluate the validity of the theory.

Good hypotheses:

- Are **logically derived** or deducted from the theory / argument
- Are **precise**
- Can be subject to empirical testing – aka are **falsifiable**

## 2. Testable hypotheses

A **hypothesis** is a specific and testable claim based on a theory. It allows us to systematically evaluate the validity of the theory.

Good hypotheses:

- Are **logically derived** or deducted from the theory / argument
- Are **precise**
- Can be subject to empirical testing – aka are **falsifiable**
- Are **testable with different observations** from those used to build the theory

## 2. Testable hypotheses

A **hypothesis** is a specific and testable claim based on a theory. It allows us to systematically evaluate the validity of the theory.

Good hypotheses:

- Are **logically derived** or deducted from the theory / argument
- Are **precise**
- Can be subject to empirical testing – aka are **falsifiable**
- Are **testable with different observations** from those used to build the theory
- Are **non-trivial** or are surprising in some way

### 3. Rigorous methodology

A **research design** is a strategy for answering a research question using empirical material. We broadly refer to that strategy as the study's methodology or methods.

Good research designs:

- Produce **internally valid** conclusions (i.e., results we observe are in fact driven by the variables we claim drive them)

### 3. Rigorous methodology

A **research design** is a strategy for answering a research question using empirical material. We broadly refer to that strategy as the study's methodology or methods.

Good research designs:

- Produce **internally valid** conclusions (i.e., results we observe are in fact driven by the variables we claim drive them)
- Give us **a sense of the uncertainty** around those conclusions (e.g., a confidence interval around a quantitative estimate)

### 3. Rigorous methodology

A **research design** is a strategy for answering a research question using empirical material. We broadly refer to that strategy as the study's methodology or methods.

Good research designs:

- Produce **internally valid** conclusions (i.e., results we observe are in fact driven by the variables we claim drive them)
- Give us **a sense of the uncertainty** around those conclusions (e.g., a confidence interval around a quantitative estimate)
- Have some degree of **external validity** (i.e., allow us to draw conclusions that can be generalized to samples or settings other than the one we studied)

# Key elements of a research design

- A set of **cases**

# Key elements of a research design

- A set of **cases**
- A **comparison** (e.g., treatment group versus control group; Trump supporters versus Harris supporters)

# Key elements of a research design

- A set of **cases**
- A **comparison** (e.g., treatment group versus control group; Trump supporters versus Harris supporters)
- A strategy for **making inferences** (causal / descriptive / predictive)

# Key elements of a research design

- A set of **cases**
- A **comparison** (e.g., treatment group versus control group; Trump supporters versus Harris supporters)
- A strategy for **making inferences** (causal / descriptive / predictive)
- A strategy for **measuring uncertainty** around such inferences

# Key elements of a research design

- A set of **cases**
- A **comparison** (e.g., treatment group versus control group; Trump supporters versus Harris supporters)
- A strategy for **making inferences** (causal / descriptive / predictive)
- A strategy for **measuring uncertainty** around such inferences
- A **rationale** (and supporting evidence) why the methods we use get at the key quantity of interest

## How to make credible inferences

If we want to learn about the effect of X (treatment) on Y (outcome), typically looking at the level of Y among units with high vs low levels of X will not be a valid strategy.

- Social and political variables are typically correlated with many other variables

## How to make credible inferences

If we want to learn about the effect of X (treatment) on Y (outcome), typically looking at the level of Y among units with high vs low levels of X will not be a valid strategy.

- Social and political variables are typically correlated with many other variables
- Particularly challenging for credible inferences are variables correlated with both the outcome and the treatment, aka **confounders**

## How to make credible inferences

If we want to learn about the effect of X (treatment) on Y (outcome), typically looking at the level of Y among units with high vs low levels of X will not be a valid strategy.


- Social and political variables are typically correlated with many other variables
- Particularly challenging for credible inferences are variables correlated with both the outcome and the treatment, aka **confounders**
- Moreover, it may be that the outcome we are interested in is also a cause of the treatment or cause we care about – this is called **reverse causality**

## How to make credible inferences

If we want to learn about the effect of X (treatment) on Y (outcome), typically looking at the level of Y among units with high vs low levels of X will not be a valid strategy.

- Social and political variables are typically correlated with many other variables
- Particularly challenging for credible inferences are variables correlated with both the outcome and the treatment, aka **confounders**
- Moreover, it may be that the outcome we are interested in is also a cause of the treatment or cause we care about – this is called **reverse causality**
- We typically want to argue that a relationship between X and Y holds **ceteris paribus**, i.e. " or “all other things being equal”. How can we say that credibly?

# The main threats to credible causal claims



# How to make *ceteris paribus* comparisons?

- **Methods** that can be used to get to “ceteris paribus”:

# How to make *ceteris paribus* comparisons?

- **Methods** that can be used to get to “ceteris paribus”:
  - Process tracing

# How to make *ceteris paribus* comparisons?

- **Methods** that can be used to get to “ceteris paribus”:
  - Process tracing
  - Controlled case comparisons

# How to make *ceteris paribus* comparisons?

- **Methods** that can be used to get to “ceteris paribus”:
  - Process tracing
  - Controlled case comparisons
  - Statistical models with controls

# How to make *ceteris paribus* comparisons?

- **Methods** that can be used to get to “ceteris paribus”:
  - Process tracing
  - Controlled case comparisons
  - Statistical models with controls
  - Quasi-experiments

# How to make *ceteris paribus* comparisons?

- **Methods** that can be used to get to “ceteris paribus”:
  - Process tracing
  - Controlled case comparisons
  - Statistical models with controls
  - Quasi-experiments
  - Experiments – most credible

# How to make *ceteris paribus* comparisons?

- **Methods** that can be used to get to “ceteris paribus”:
  - Process tracing
  - Controlled case comparisons
  - Statistical models with controls
  - Quasi-experiments
  - Experiments – most credible
- **Types of data** that can be used include:

# How to make *ceteris paribus* comparisons?

- **Methods** that can be used to get to “ceteris paribus”:
  - Process tracing
  - Controlled case comparisons
  - Statistical models with controls
  - Quasi-experiments
  - Experiments – most credible
- **Types of data** that can be used include:
  - Ethnography

# How to make *ceteris paribus* comparisons?

- **Methods** that can be used to get to “ceteris paribus”:
  - Process tracing
  - Controlled case comparisons
  - Statistical models with controls
  - Quasi-experiments
  - Experiments – most credible
- **Types of data** that can be used include:
  - Ethnography
  - Interviews

# How to make *ceteris paribus* comparisons?

- **Methods** that can be used to get to “ceteris paribus”:
  - Process tracing
  - Controlled case comparisons
  - Statistical models with controls
  - Quasi-experiments
  - Experiments – most credible
- **Types of data** that can be used include:
  - Ethnography
  - Interviews
  - Case studies

# How to make *ceteris paribus* comparisons?

- **Methods** that can be used to get to “ceteris paribus”:
  - Process tracing
  - Controlled case comparisons
  - Statistical models with controls
  - Quasi-experiments
  - Experiments – most credible
- **Types of data** that can be used include:
  - Ethnography
  - Interviews
  - Case studies
  - Surveys

# How to make *ceteris paribus* comparisons?

- **Methods** that can be used to get to “ceteris paribus”:
  - Process tracing
  - Controlled case comparisons
  - Statistical models with controls
  - Quasi-experiments
  - Experiments – most credible
- **Types of data** that can be used include:
  - Ethnography
  - Interviews
  - Case studies
  - Surveys
  - Administrative data

# How to make *ceteris paribus* comparisons?

- **Methods** that can be used to get to “ceteris paribus”:
  - Process tracing
  - Controlled case comparisons
  - Statistical models with controls
  - Quasi-experiments
  - Experiments – most credible
- **Types of data** that can be used include:
  - Ethnography
  - Interviews
  - Case studies
  - Surveys
  - Administrative data
  - Satellite imagery

# Experiments: The gold standard to make causal inference

- Experiments **randomly assign an intervention** (aka treatment) whose impact on one or several outcomes of interest we want to evaluate

# Experiments: The gold standard to make causal inference

- Experiments **randomly assign an intervention** (aka treatment) whose impact on one or several outcomes of interest we want to evaluate
- In the experiment, individuals (e.g., people, households, firms) assigned to different **groups are comparable because they were formed by lottery**


# Experiments: The gold standard to make causal inference

- Experiments **randomly assign an intervention** (aka treatment) whose impact on one or several outcomes of interest we want to evaluate
- In the experiment, individuals (e.g., people, households, firms) assigned to different **groups are comparable because they were formed by lottery**
- Therefore, any difference we observe between the treatment and control groups after the intervention must be caused by it

# Experiments: The gold standard to make causal inference

- Experiments **randomly assign an intervention** (aka treatment) whose impact on one or several outcomes of interest we want to evaluate
- In the experiment, individuals (e.g., people, households, firms) assigned to different **groups are comparable because they were formed by lottery**
- Therefore, any difference we observe between the treatment and control groups groups after the intervention must be caused by it
- Experiments therefore ensure there are **no confounders and no reverse causality**

# Experiments: The gold standard to make causal inference



## 4. Transparency

**Transparently reporting on the methodology**, from data collection to analysis, is a central component of good science.

Why transparency matters:

- It allows others to **assess the validity** of the methods and to identify biases or limitations of the research

## 4. Transparency

**Transparently reporting on the methodology**, from data collection to analysis, is a central component of good science.

Why transparency matters:

- It allows others to **assess the validity** of the methods and to identify biases or limitations of the research
- It also allows others to **reproduce the study** (with the same data) or to try and replicate it


## 4. Transparency

**Transparently reporting on the methodology**, from data collection to analysis, is a central component of good science.

Why transparency matters:

- It allows others to **assess the validity** of the methods and to identify biases or limitations of the research
- It also allows others to **reproduce the study** (with the same data) or to try and replicate it
- It also allows the scientific community to **reuse that data** for other purposes

# Open science is at the center of good science



## 5. Ethical standards

(Political) science needs to be subject to high ethical standards – otherwise significant harm to individuals / communities can ensue.

Key **ethical risks** in comparative politics:

- Variables of interest are often very sensitive and/or consequential (e.g., identity, racism, order, democracy)

Key **principles of ethical research** with human subjects (in political science, medicine, etc.):

## 5. Ethical standards

(Political) science needs to be subject to high ethical standards – otherwise significant harm to individuals / communities can ensue.

Key **ethical risks** in comparative politics:

- Variables of interest are often very sensitive and/or consequential (e.g., identity, racism, order, democracy)
- Variables of interest can often not be experimented on ethically (e.g., partisanship, electoral system)

Key **principles of ethical research** with human subjects (in political science, medicine, etc.):

## 5. Ethical standards

(Political) science needs to be subject to high ethical standards – otherwise significant harm to individuals / communities can ensue.

Key **ethical risks** in comparative politics:

- Variables of interest are often very sensitive and/or consequential (e.g., identity, racism, order, democracy)
- Variables of interest can often not be experimented on ethically (e.g., partisanship, electoral system)

Key **principles of ethical research** with human subjects (in political science, medicine, etc.):

- Informed consent

## 5. Ethical standards

(Political) science needs to be subject to high ethical standards – otherwise significant harm to individuals / communities can ensue.

Key **ethical risks** in comparative politics:

- Variables of interest are often very sensitive and/or consequential (e.g., identity, racism, order, democracy)
- Variables of interest can often not be experimented on ethically (e.g., partisanship, electoral system)

Key **principles of ethical research** with human subjects (in political science, medicine, etc.):

- Informed consent
- Privacy and confidentiality

## 5. Ethical standards

(Political) science needs to be subject to high ethical standards – otherwise significant harm to individuals / communities can ensue.

Key **ethical risks** in comparative politics:

- Variables of interest are often very sensitive and/or consequential (e.g., identity, racism, order, democracy)
- Variables of interest can often not be experimented on ethically (e.g., partisanship, electoral system)

Key **principles of ethical research** with human subjects (in political science, medicine, etc.):

- Informed consent
- Privacy and confidentiality
- Minimization of harm

## 5. Ethical standards

(Political) science needs to be subject to high ethical standards – otherwise significant harm to individuals / communities can ensue.

Key **ethical risks** in comparative politics:

- Variables of interest are often very sensitive and/or consequential (e.g., identity, racism, order, democracy)
- Variables of interest can often not be experimented on ethically (e.g., partisanship, electoral system)

Key **principles of ethical research** with human subjects (in political science, medicine, etc.):

- Informed consent
- Privacy and confidentiality
- Minimization of harm
- Justice and fairness

## 5. Ethical standards

(Political) science needs to be subject to high ethical standards – otherwise significant harm to individuals / communities can ensue.

Key **ethical risks** in comparative politics:

- Variables of interest are often very sensitive and/or consequential (e.g., identity, racism, order, democracy)
- Variables of interest can often not be experimented on ethically (e.g., partisanship, electoral system)

Key **principles of ethical research** with human subjects (in political science, medicine, etc.):

- Informed consent
- Privacy and confidentiality
- Minimization of harm
- Justice and fairness
- Respect for autonomy

## 5. Ethical standards

(Political) science needs to be subject to high ethical standards – otherwise significant harm to individuals / communities can ensue.

Key **ethical risks** in comparative politics:

- Variables of interest are often very sensitive and/or consequential (e.g., identity, racism, order, democracy)
- Variables of interest can often not be experimented on ethically (e.g., partisanship, electoral system)

Key **principles of ethical research** with human subjects (in political science, medicine, etc.):


- Informed consent
- Privacy and confidentiality
- Minimization of harm
- Justice and fairness
- Respect for autonomy
- Prior review and approval

## Is this study unethical, and if so why?




# **2014 Montana General Election Voter Information Guide**


Election Date: November 4, 2014



## **Nonpartisan Supreme Court Justice #1 Race**



## Nonpartisan Supreme Court Justice #2 Race



For more information on how these figures were created, please see <http://data.stanford.edu/dime>. Please note that this guide is non-partisan and does not endorse my candidate or party. This guide was created as part of a joint research project at Stanford and Dartmouth.

Paid for by researchers at Stanford University and Dartmouth College, 616 Serra Street, Stanford, CA 94305

## **Take this to the polls!**

# Is this study unethical, and if so why?

[GIVE](#)[RESOURCE CENTER](#)[WHO WE ARE](#)[WHAT WE DO](#)[GET INVOLVED](#)[HOME](#) | [NEWS](#)

## Political Scientists in Hot Water over Field Research



8 January 2015

An experiment by political science researchers at Stanford and Dartmouth Universities is raising hackles in Montana. Three political science professors may have broken Montana state election laws, calling into question the ethics of performing research experiments with the potential to affect election results.

As part of the study, mailers containing information on the ideological leanings of four nonpartisan candidates for Montana State's Supreme Court were sent to 100,000 Montana voters. The research project was intended to test whether voter turnout will increase in nonpartisan elections if voters receive more information about a candidate's political leaning. The mailer, entitled "2014 Montana General Election Voter Information Guide," features the official state seal and ranks the judicial candidates on an ideological spectrum from President Barack Obama on the liberal end, to former presidential candidate Mitt Romney on the conservative end. Similar mailers were sent to voters in California and New Hampshire, although there has not been a backlash in those areas.

## 6. Social relevance

Science should contribute back to society, directly or indirectly.

- **Tasks** for which comparative politics research can be useful:

## 6. Social relevance

Science should contribute back to society, directly or indirectly.

- **Tasks** for which comparative politics research can be useful:
  - Designing institutions

## 6. Social relevance

Science should contribute back to society, directly or indirectly.

- **Tasks** for which comparative politics research can be useful:
  - Designing institutions
  - Improving policy outcomes

## 6. Social relevance

Science should contribute back to society, directly or indirectly.

- **Tasks** for which comparative politics research can be useful:

- Designing institutions
- Improving policy outcomes
- Making forecasts

## 6. Social relevance

Science should contribute back to society, directly or indirectly.

- **Tasks** for which comparative politics research can be useful:

- Designing institutions
- Improving policy outcomes
- Making forecasts
- Promoting or resisting changes

## 6. Social relevance

Science should contribute back to society, directly or indirectly.

- **Tasks** for which comparative politics research can be useful:
  - Designing institutions
  - Improving policy outcomes
  - Making forecasts
  - Promoting or resisting changes
- **Audiences** for whom comparative politics may be useful:

## 6. Social relevance

Science should contribute back to society, directly or indirectly.

- **Tasks** for which comparative politics research can be useful:
  - Designing institutions
  - Improving policy outcomes
  - Making forecasts
  - Promoting or resisting changes
- **Audiences** for whom comparative politics may be useful:
  - Government leaders

## 6. Social relevance

Science should contribute back to society, directly or indirectly.

- **Tasks** for which comparative politics research can be useful:

- Designing institutions
- Improving policy outcomes
- Making forecasts
- Promoting or resisting changes

- **Audiences** for whom comparative politics may be useful:

- Government leaders
- Political consultants

## 6. Social relevance

Science should contribute back to society, directly or indirectly.

- **Tasks** for which comparative politics research can be useful:

- Designing institutions
- Improving policy outcomes
- Making forecasts
- Promoting or resisting changes

- **Audiences** for whom comparative politics may be useful:

- Government leaders
- Political consultants
- Political commentators

## 6. Social relevance

Science should contribute back to society, directly or indirectly.

- **Tasks** for which comparative politics research can be useful:

- Designing institutions
- Improving policy outcomes
- Making forecasts
- Promoting or resisting changes

- **Audiences** for whom comparative politics may be useful:

- Government leaders
- Political consultants
- Political commentators
- Policy makers

## 6. Social relevance

Science should contribute back to society, directly or indirectly.

- **Tasks** for which comparative politics research can be useful:

- Designing institutions
- Improving policy outcomes
- Making forecasts
- Promoting or resisting changes

- **Audiences** for whom comparative politics may be useful:

- Government leaders
- Political consultants
- Political commentators
- Policy makers
- Businesspeople and firms

## 6. Social relevance

Science should contribute back to society, directly or indirectly.

- **Tasks** for which comparative politics research can be useful:

- Designing institutions
- Improving policy outcomes
- Making forecasts
- Promoting or resisting changes

- **Audiences** for whom comparative politics may be useful:

- Government leaders
- Political consultants
- Political commentators
- Policy makers
- Businesspeople and firms
- Civil society organizations

## Workshop and exercise: Dissecting an academic article

# Why it pays to build your ability to read academic articles

- In this course (and probably in others) you will have to read multiple academic papers

# Why it pays to build your ability to read academic articles

- In this course (and probably in others) you will have to read multiple academic papers
- Your research design due at the end of the semester should approximate, in some aspects, an academic paper (although much shorter and without data)

# Why it pays to build your ability to read academic articles

- In this course (and probably in others) you will have to read multiple academic papers
- Your research design due at the end of the semester should approximate, in some aspects, an academic paper (although much shorter and without data)
- Getting better at reading academic papers is a great way to build your ability to process large amounts of (often technical) information, which is something you'll often do in careers beyond research too – e.g., in government, law, journalism, consulting, tech, etc.

## What is an academic article or paper?

- They may seem obscure pieces of academic knowledge, but  
**they sometimes shape policy debates and decisions**

## What is an academic article or paper?

- They may seem obscure pieces of academic knowledge, but **they sometimes shape policy debates and decisions**
- They present **cutting-edge research on a very specific question**, sometimes leveraging advanced research methods

## What is an academic article or paper?

- They may seem obscure pieces of academic knowledge, but **they sometimes shape policy debates and decisions**
- They present **cutting-edge research on a very specific question**, sometimes leveraging advanced research methods
- They are **written as a defense of a claim** (theoretical and/or empirical); authors try to close the door to critiques

## What is an academic article or paper?

- They may seem obscure pieces of academic knowledge, but **they sometimes shape policy debates and decisions**
- They present **cutting-edge research on a very specific question**, sometimes leveraging advanced research methods
- They are **written as a defense of a claim** (theoretical and/or empirical); authors try to close the door to critiques
- **Key implications** of these three facts:

## What is an academic article or paper?

- They may seem obscure pieces of academic knowledge, but **they sometimes shape policy debates and decisions**
- They present **cutting-edge research on a very specific question**, sometimes leveraging advanced research methods
- They are **written as a defense of a claim** (theoretical and/or empirical); authors try to close the door to critiques
- **Key implications** of these three facts:
  - As a reader, it is critical to understand what academic articles claim, how they support those claims, and in what ways the evidence may be weak

## What is an academic article or paper?

- They may seem obscure pieces of academic knowledge, but **they sometimes shape policy debates and decisions**
- They present **cutting-edge research on a very specific question**, sometimes leveraging advanced research methods
- They are **written as a defense of a claim** (theoretical and/or empirical); authors try to close the door to critiques
- **Key implications** of these three facts:
  - As a reader, it is critical to understand what academic articles claim, how they support those claims, and in what ways the evidence may be weak
  - They often have a lot of technical details, jargon, often formulas

## What is an academic article or paper?

- They may seem obscure pieces of academic knowledge, but **they sometimes shape policy debates and decisions**
- They present **cutting-edge research on a very specific question**, sometimes leveraging advanced research methods
- They are **written as a defense of a claim** (theoretical and/or empirical); authors try to close the door to critiques
- **Key implications** of these three facts:
  - As a reader, it is critical to understand what academic articles claim, how they support those claims, and in what ways the evidence may be weak
  - They often have a lot of technical details, jargon, often formulas
  - They follow a common structure and have plenty of signposts to help the reader

# The common structure of academic articles

- **Abstract** – short summary

# The common structure of academic articles

- **Abstract** – short summary
- **Introduction** – longer summary, more details

# The common structure of academic articles

- **Abstract** – short summary
- **Introduction** – longer summary, more details
- **Theory** (including hypotheses, the predictions the authors seek to test)

# The common structure of academic articles

- **Abstract** – short summary
- **Introduction** – longer summary, more details
- **Theory** (including hypotheses, the predictions the authors seek to test)
- **Research design** or methods (i.e., what data the authors use and how they analyze it to test their hypotheses)

# The common structure of academic articles

- **Abstract** – short summary
- **Introduction** – longer summary, more details
- **Theory** (including hypotheses, the predictions the authors seek to test)
- **Research design** or methods (i.e., what data the authors use and how they analyze it to test their hypotheses)
- **Results** (typically three sets of results, in order of importance: 1) main results, 2) mechanisms, 3) robustness checks)

# The common structure of academic articles

- **Abstract** – short summary
- **Introduction** – longer summary, more details
- **Theory** (including hypotheses, the predictions the authors seek to test)
- **Research design** or methods (i.e., what data the authors use and how they analyze it to test their hypotheses)
- **Results** (typically three sets of results, in order of importance: 1) main results, 2) mechanisms, 3) robustness checks)
- **Conclusion** – summary, implications, gaps for future research

# Key take-aways for reading academic articles

- **Don't be intimidated** or discouraged

## Key take-aways for reading academic articles

- **Don't be intimidated** or discouraged
- **Exploit the core structure** to your advantage

## Key take-aways for reading academic articles

- **Don't be intimidated** or discouraged
- **Exploit the core structure** to your advantage
- **Do not pay equal attention to all parts** in the paper. Put more energy in the abstract and introduction.

## Key take-aways for reading academic articles

- **Don't be intimidated** or discouraged
- **Exploit the core structure** to your advantage
- **Do not pay equal attention to all parts** in the paper. Put more energy in the abstract and introduction.
- **Do not read linearly** – it's not a novel or a newspaper article. Read selectively. First the abstract and intro, then skim the rest of the paper, then go deeper into most important sections if you need to

## Key take-aways for reading academic articles

- **Don't be intimidated** or discouraged
- **Exploit the core structure** to your advantage
- **Do not pay equal attention to all parts** in the paper. Put more energy in the abstract and introduction.
- **Do not read linearly** – it's not a novel or a newspaper article. Read selectively. First the abstract and intro, then skim the rest of the paper, then go deeper into most important sections if you need to
- **Take a look at the main graphs and tables**, where a lot of the message is condensed

# Key take-aways for reading academic articles

- **Don't be intimidated** or discouraged
- **Exploit the core structure** to your advantage
- **Do not pay equal attention to all parts** in the paper. Put more energy in the abstract and introduction.
- **Do not read linearly** – it's not a novel or a newspaper article. Read selectively. First the abstract and intro, then skim the rest of the paper, then go deeper into most important sections if you need to
- **Take a look at the main graphs and tables**, where a lot of the message is condensed
- **Leverage topic sentences**

# Key take-aways for reading academic articles

- **Don't be intimidated** or discouraged
- **Exploit the core structure** to your advantage
- **Do not pay equal attention to all parts** in the paper. Put more energy in the abstract and introduction.
- **Do not read linearly** – it's not a novel or a newspaper article. Read selectively. First the abstract and intro, then skim the rest of the paper, then go deeper into most important sections if you need to
- **Take a look at the main graphs and tables**, where a lot of the message is condensed
- **Leverage topic sentences**
- **Be comfortable with not understanding 100%** of the paper

## Key questions to ask of an academic article

- What is the author's **argument** or thesis? Who or what is the author arguing against?

## Key questions to ask of an academic article

- What is the author's **argument** or thesis? Who or what is the author arguing against?
- What are the **implications** of the argument? What is at stake?

## Key questions to ask of an academic article

- What is the author's **argument** or thesis? Who or what is the author arguing against?
- What are the **implications** of the argument? What is at stake?
- What **evidence** does the author present in support of their thesis? What is the **research design**?

## Key questions to ask of an academic article

- What is the author's **argument** or thesis? Who or what is the author arguing against?
- What are the **implications** of the argument? What is at stake?
- What **evidence** does the author present in support of their thesis? What is the **research design**?
- What are the **cases**? Are the cases relevant?

## Key questions to ask of an academic article

- What is the author's **argument** or thesis? Who or what is the author arguing against?
- What are the **implications** of the argument? What is at stake?
- What **evidence** does the author present in support of their thesis? What is the **research design**?
- What are the **cases**? Are the cases relevant?
- Is the evidence **credible**? Does the author present evidence about the **mechanisms** behind the main results?

## Key questions to ask of an academic article

- What is the author's **argument** or thesis? Who or what is the author arguing against?
- What are the **implications** of the argument? What is at stake?
- What **evidence** does the author present in support of their thesis? What is the **research design**?
- What are the **cases**? Are the cases relevant?
- Is the evidence **credible**? Does the author present evidence about the **mechanisms** behind the main results?
- Could there be other reasons why we see those results, other than the author's theory being right? How does the author address those potential **alternative explanations**?

## Key questions to ask of an academic article

- What is the author's **argument** or thesis? Who or what is the author arguing against?
- What are the **implications** of the argument? What is at stake?
- What **evidence** does the author present in support of their thesis? What is the **research design**?
- What are the **cases**? Are the cases relevant?
- Is the evidence **credible**? Does the author present evidence about the **mechanisms** behind the main results?
- Could there be other reasons why we see those results, other than the author's theory being right? How does the author address those potential **alternative explanations**?
- Are the author's **conclusions** reasonable, given the evidence?

# Exercise: Dissecting an academic article

Download the article at [www.guillermotoral.com/cp/bhandari](http://www.guillermotoral.com/cp/bhandari)



## Political Determinants of Economic Exchange: Evidence from a Business Experiment in Senegal



**Abhit Bhandari**

Institute for Advanced Study in Toulouse

**Abstract:** *Economic growth requires confidence in the state's ability to enforce secure exchange. But when states selectively enforce rule of law, political considerations can moderate the trust that buyers have in sellers. I argue that political connections produce moral hazard in exchange because they introduce biases in expectations of judicial enforcement. Buyers avoid trade with politically connected sellers, and, in this context of unequal enforcement, formal contracts disproportionately protect politically connected buyers. To examine these features of connections and contracts, I created a sales business in Senegal and randomized whether employees signaled political connections and/or offered formal contracts during transactions. The results show that political connections decreased buyers' willingness to exchange. Formal contracts increased exchange, though primarily for connected buyers. These findings show that asymmetric political connections can impede daily trade and intensify economic inequalities in developing contexts, while simultaneously demonstrating the limits of state institutions for mitigating politically driven moral hazard.*

## Group assignment on Blackboard

- What is the author's core argument? And the key hypotheses?

## Group assignment on Blackboard

- What is the author's core argument? And the key hypotheses?
- Is the argument descriptive, predictive, causal, or normative?

## Group assignment on Blackboard

- What is the author's core argument? And the key hypotheses?
- Is the argument descriptive, predictive, causal, or normative?
- What is at stake? What are some implications of the argument?

## Group assignment on Blackboard

- What is the author's core argument? And the key hypotheses?
- Is the argument descriptive, predictive, causal, or normative?
- What is at stake? What are some implications of the argument?
- In their theory, what are the key variables, and how are they related?

## Group assignment on Blackboard

- What is the author's core argument? And the key hypotheses?
- Is the argument descriptive, predictive, causal, or normative?
- What is at stake? What are some implications of the argument?
- In their theory, what are the key variables, and how are they related?
- What is the author's research design?

## Group assignment on Blackboard

- What is the author's core argument? And the key hypotheses?
- Is the argument descriptive, predictive, causal, or normative?
- What is at stake? What are some implications of the argument?
- In their theory, what are the key variables, and how are they related?
- What is the author's research design?
- Are the findings or conclusions credible?

## Group assignment on Blackboard

- What is the author's core argument? And the key hypotheses?
- Is the argument descriptive, predictive, causal, or normative?
- What is at stake? What are some implications of the argument?
- In their theory, what are the key variables, and how are they related?
- What is the author's research design?
- Are the findings or conclusions credible?
- Are the author's findings relevant / useful?

## Group assignment on Blackboard

- What is the author's core argument? And the key hypotheses?
- Is the argument descriptive, predictive, causal, or normative?
- What is at stake? What are some implications of the argument?
- In their theory, what are the key variables, and how are they related?
- What is the author's research design?
- Are the findings or conclusions credible?
- Are the author's findings relevant / useful?
- Are the methods transparently documented? If so, how?

## Group assignment on Blackboard

- What is the author's core argument? And the key hypotheses?
- Is the argument descriptive, predictive, causal, or normative?
- What is at stake? What are some implications of the argument?
- In their theory, what are the key variables, and how are they related?
- What is the author's research design?
- Are the findings or conclusions credible?
- Are the author's findings relevant / useful?
- Are the methods transparently documented? If so, how?
- Can you think of ethical issues in the research? Are they addressed? How?

# Wrap-up

# Taking stock of what we saw today

- Can we study politics scientifically?

# Taking stock of what we saw today

- Can we study politics scientifically?
- What are the features of good (political) science?

# Taking stock of what we saw today

- Can we study politics scientifically?
- What are the features of good (political) science?
- Workshop and exercise: Dissecting an academic article

## Next steps

- Next we will be discussing **the nature, formation, and development of states:**

## Next steps

- Next we will be discussing **the nature, formation, and development of states:**
  - *What is a state?*

## Next steps

- Next we will be discussing **the nature, formation, and development of states:**
  - *What is a state?*
  - *Why are states arguably the most important political invention in human history?*

## Next steps

- Next we will be discussing **the nature, formation, and development of states:**
  - *What is a state?*
  - *Why are states arguably the most important political invention in human history?*
  - *Where do states come from?*

## Next steps

- Next we will be discussing **the nature, formation, and development of states:**
  - *What is a state?*
  - *Why are states arguably the most important political invention in human history?*
  - *Where do states come from?*
  - *What makes states successful – and why do they sometimes fail?*

## Next steps

- Next we will be discussing **the nature, formation, and development of states:**
  - *What is a state?*
  - *Why are states arguably the most important political invention in human history?*
  - *Where do states come from?*
  - *What makes states successful – and why do they sometimes fail?*
- **Do the readings** and come prepared for a potential quiz:

## Next steps

- Next we will be discussing **the nature, formation, and development of states:**
  - *What is a state?*
  - *Why are states arguably the most important political invention in human history?*
  - *Where do states come from?*
  - *What makes states successful – and why do they sometimes fail?*
- **Do the readings** and come prepared for a potential quiz:
  - *Comparative politics – chapter 4*

## Next steps

- Next we will be discussing **the nature, formation, and development of states:**
  - *What is a state?*
  - *Why are states arguably the most important political invention in human history?*
  - *Where do states come from?*
  - *What makes states successful – and why do they sometimes fail?*
- **Do the readings** and come prepared for a potential quiz:
  - *Comparative politics* – chapter 4
  - *Foundations of comparative politics* – chapter 4