Carleton University
Fall 2021
Arthur Kroeger College of Public Affairs

PAPM 3000 – Policy Research

Lectures: Tuesdays, 8:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.
Delivery Method: synchronous lectures via-Zoom
(September 8 to December 10, 2021)

Instructor: Michael E. Campbell
Office: N/A
Office Hours: by appointment (via-Zoom)
E-mail: MichaelECampbell@cmail.carleton.ca
T.A.: T.B.A

Course Description:

The purpose of this course is to introduce student to, and/or to reinforce students' existing understanding of, the research processes and methods that are crucial for policy research and analysis. To accomplish this, this course is organized around the development of the Honours Research Essay (HRE) proposal. While not all students will go on to write the HRE, the content of this course is nonetheless valuable for anyone who wants to develop the skills required to engage in meaningful policy research.

Emphasis is placed on the various elements that constitute the HRE proposal. Ideally, this will help students cultivate strategies for: (1) developing original and compelling research topics and questions, (2) locating literature and data related to one's research, (3) incorporating pertinent information into a concise literature review, (4) establishing an appropriate theoretical framework, (5) selecting suitable methods and justifying that choice through methodological elaboration, (6) finding and approaching a research supervisor, and (6) anticipating and addressing common challenges that may arise during research.

Course Objectives:

This course is designed to help students develop essential skills that are necessary for formal policy analysis. The main course objectives are as follows:

(1) Review important information related to policy research (with specific emphasis on key concepts related to policy analysis and project development – e.g., issues related to the philosophy of science, literature review, theoretical frameworks, methodology and methods, and so forth).

(2) Translate knowledge acquired from lectures and assigned readings into a well-formulated policy research proposal (using the HRE proposal requirements as a template).

(3) Explore the intricacies of multiple research methods and to identify the method(s) that is/are most appropriate for proposed research topics.

(4) Highlight common problems that might arise throughout the research process – including ethical issues, but also matters related to scientific inquiry, as well as research and writing processes.

(5) Respond to consistent and meaningful feedback that is intended to help students develop the skills required to address any potential weaknesses found in their work. Feedback must be used to effectively revise and edit one's work.

Format:

Weekly lectures will be delivered synchronously via-Zoom. The focus of each lecture topic can be identified in the **Course Schedule**. Each week's topic indicates assigned readings, which students are expected to read *before* lecture begins. These readings are important for achieving success in this course but are also very useful for academic and professional development. Throughout each lecture, your instructor will intermittently inquire if students have any questions. In addition, the instructor will also allocate ten to fifteen minutes towards the end of each class, so that any students' questions or concerns may be addressed. If any student does not feel comfortable speaking within a group setting, they may submit questions through the chat function on zoom. Although it is understandable if a student is hesitant to speak during lecture, sociability is a skill that can be improved with practice. Therefore, students are encouraged to overcome whatever reservations they might have about speaking in a public forum. Outside of lecture, general questions or concerns should be directed to the teaching assistant first. If an issue or question cannot be resolved through communication with the teaching assistant, the student may then contact the primary instructor.

There are no tutorials for this course, but attendance at weekly lectures is expected. Given that this is an online class, and students will likely have their cameras turned off during lecture, measures have been designed to incentivize regular attendance (see **Course Evaluation**). Furthermore, there may be weeks in which a guest lecturer is invited to speak about a certain topic. These guests will be experts on the subject(s) that they discuss, meaning the insight they share will be of significant value. Please note that guests will be taking time out of their own busy schedules for no reason other than to help students in this course. As such, students are expected to listen attentively and treat these guests with the utmost respect.

Instructor's note on respect: I strongly believe in academic freedom, and there are few – *if any* – subjects I think should be avoided. John Stuart Mill (1859) once wrote: "if any opinion is compelled to silence, that opinion may, for aught we can certainly know, be true. To deny this is to assume our own infallibility." Therefore, I strongly encourage students to research and write about whatever topics they are interested in, no matter how controversial these topics might seem. Such is the nature of true academia, and I am open to everyone's opinion. Noting that, abusive language, prejudice, or any other form of disrespect has no place in this or any other classroom. I believe that the ability to discuss and analyze topics – however unsettling they may seem – without resorting to anger, is the sign of a well-rounded and sophisticated individual. If anyone has a problem with this policy, or if anyone ever thinks that they have been treated unfairly or with disrespect in this course, they may contact me or the university's administration directly. If any issues arise, I strongly recommend contacting me first, but that decision is up to you.

We are in a contentious time in history, with cultural shifts and paradigmatic changes I have not witnessed before. Certain behaviors and beliefs that were once unambiguously accepted as orthodox are now being challenged across the globe. I urge everyone to acknowledge the seriousness of this and to maintain an appreciation for the value of free and open discussion. Progress is not achieved in silence, nor can meaningful consensus be reached in the absence of open debate. While I can only speak for myself, I will treat every individual in this course with the same level of respect that I give anyone else. I expect that all of you will do the same.

Noting the above, if any student thinks that their research topic is tendentious, please e-mail me directly and we can discuss whatever concerns you might have. Please do not be timid. I am interested in what you believe, not what you think others expect you to believe. This is your opportunity to research, write, and learn about almost any topic of your choice (within reason and within the context of policy research) – seize it.

Office Hours and Communication:

All office hours will be by appointment only, and they will be held via Zoom. To schedule office hours, students may e-mail the instructor or the TA directly. All e-mail communications must be sent from a valid Carleton University e-mail account. Do not hesitate to send e-mails with any questions or concerns about the course, or the course material. If students communicate with the TA via e-mail, they must CC the instructor so that there is no confusion if an issue requires escalation.

Course Materials:

Most assigned readings are available through the Carleton University Library's ARES online reserve system. Students can access ARES through the Carleton University Library website **(see link below)**. Before going through ARES, though, it is recommended that students try and find the assigned readings themselves. Learning how to navigate through the multitude of academic journals, research databases, library websites, and so forth, is a valuable skill. If the student cannot locate the reading(s) themselves, only then should they use ARES. Additionally, some assigned readings may not be posted on ARES, but links to these readings are indicated in the course outline itself.

ARES Logon: https://reserves.library.carleton.ca/ares/

Required:

Van Evera, Stephen. 2007. *A Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Recommended:

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

Bickman, Leonard and Debra J. Rog. eds. 2009. *The SAGE Handbook of Applied Social Research Methods*, Second Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Kuhn, Thomas. 1996. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, third edition. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Course Evaluation:

Course assignments and general grading criteria are outlined below. Additional information on final letter grades and the percentage equivalents are presented in the **Additional Information** section of this syllabus. In addition, please note that according to the Faculty Grading Guidelines:

"*Standing in a course is determined by the course instructor subject to the approval of the Faculty Dean. This means that grades submitted by the instructor may be subject to revision. No grades are final until they have been approved by the Dean.*"

(1) *Overview*

Assignment	Percent of Final Grade	Due Date
Participation/Pop Quizzes	**10% (or 11%)**	**N/A**
Research Statement	**10%**	**5 October**
Annotated Bibliography	**15%**	**19 October**
Literature Review	**20%**	**2 November**
Statement of Method(s)	**20%**	**16 November**
Final Research Proposal	**25%**	**7 December**

(2) *Assignment Details*

Participation/Pop Quizzes (no due date): Attendance for this course is not mandatory. As adults, students are free to do as they please. However, missing lectures without a valid reason may negatively affect a student's final grade, and it will almost certainly influence their comprehension of the topic(s) under review. Given that this course is being delivered online, and that students will likely have their cameras turned off for most of the course, two measures are being implemented to incentivize attendance. Those who do not attend class, or who are digitally present but either leave their computers for lengthy periods of time, or participate in unrelated course activities during lecture time, are those who will be most likely to see their grades suffer.

Throughout the course, there will be four pop-quizzes. Each quiz will be worth 2.5%, for an overall total of 10%. The content of the quizzes will be based on assigned readings, as well as any lecture material delivered up to the point when the quiz is administered in lecture. From the perspective of the student, the dates of these quizzes will seem completely random. Quizzes will be uploaded to Brightspace and are to be completed during lecture. Students will have approximately 10-15 minutes to complete each quiz. Any students caught collaborating will receive an immediate grade of zero on the quiz and their names will be forwarded to the department's administration, at which point additional (and likely more serious) penalties may be applied.

In addition, students can also earn grade points through participation in online discussion. Every week, a discussion question will be posted to Brightspace. Students can select the weeks that they wish to participate in, and they should answer four discussion questions throughout the

semester. Questions will be based on material delivered in lecture. Each answer will be graded out of 2.5%, for a total of 10%. Answers will be graded based on quality – meaning that they should be well-written and directly reference course material (be it from lectures and assigned/recommended readings). One of the most effective ways to maximize one's score is to write down any questions or concerns that arise when completing weekly readings, and/or to write down questions or concerns related to the material relayed during lectures. This will help students identify the most challenging parts of the material, thereby allowing them the ability to formulate original and insightful answers. The highest participation grades will be awarded to those who engage with the material in such a way that they demonstrate critical thinking skills. Discussion questions will be posted immediately after lecture is complete, and students will have 72 hours to respond to the question with their answer – i.e., answers can be submitted until 11:30 AM on the Friday following lecture. Students may not answer more than four questions throughout the semester.

At the end of the semester, students will be presented with two grades: the first will be based on an aggregated score of submitted quizzes, the second on an aggregated score of submitted discussion answers. At this point, students may choose to: (a) take the grade that they received on quizzes, or (b) take the grade that they received for online discussion. Simply completing the quizzes or submitting an answer does not guarantee a perfect score. Full marks are best achieved with preparation. Students who have attended lectures and completed the assigned readings, as well as those who listen attentively and take notes, are those who are most likely to receive the full ten percent. If any student receives a perfect score on the quizzes and on online discussion, they will be awarded a bonus of one percent (1%) on their overall final grade. The only instance in which the one percent will not be awarded, however rare it may be, is if the student receives a perfect score on all other assignments. In that case, the student will have already achieved a perfect score of 100 percent in the course.

Research Statement (5 October):

This assignment is intended to help students develop a clear understanding of the research topic they want to pursue. Completed assignments must include the following components: (1) a statement indicating the importance and purpose of their research (what is the goal of this research?; and why is this topic original, important, and relevant?); (2) a well-formulated research question (what question does this research seek to answer?); (3) a statement of the ontological perspective guiding the research (how does one perceive their connection to the world?); and (4) preliminary argument(s) and hypotheses (what does the student predict their research will reveal?).

This assignment should be 250 words in length (title and personal details – e.g., name, date, name of program, etc. – are not counted towards the final word count). Students are not expected to have a firm grasp of their topic at this point. However, keep in mind that the level of complexity of one's topic will undoubtedly affect the level of effort they will have to put into the proceeding assignments. Given the time constraints of this course, as well as those associated with the HRE (for those who are considering writing it), students should avoid selecting topics that are too complicated or broad in scope. For instance, if a student is interested in researching the effects of policies that postponed non-essential surgeries across the Commonwealth following the COVID-19 outbreak, this would require an analysis and comparison of 54 countries. An analysis of this size would increase the chances of encountering problems related to multicausality, context-conditionality, and endogeneity. It would also almost certainly require

a mixed-methods approach, which *may* be too advanced for students at this stage in their academic careers. As such, try to keep research topics relatively simple. For instance, it would be more practical to question the effects that these types of policies have in a single, or a few countries.

Students are not expected to reinvent the wheel. The cumulative goal of these assignments is to help students learn the steps involved in policy research and research proposal design.

Annotated Bibliography (19 October):

Students must seek out five publications that are related to the proposed topic in their previously submitted Research Statement. Three of the publications must be drawn from academic literature: two of the three must be articles from peer-reviewed academic journals, and one must be a relevant book on the subject. In addition, two sources must come from grey literature (**see link (a) below**). These might include policy reports, policy literature, government documents, speeches, and so forth. Oftentimes grey literature is produced by non-governmental organizations (NGOs), intergovernmental organizations (IGOs), non-profit organizations, or similar entities. Usually, the purpose of grey literature is to analyze a particular topic that is occurring 'on the ground'.

Once the student has identified the five publications that they wish to include in the bibliography, they must then cite each one *properly*. The citation style employed in all assignments is to be Chicago (Author-Date) (**see link (b) below**). Following this, students will then write a descriptive summary of each source. Students must also include a brief explanation (one to two sentences) of the ways in which they think source will contribute to their research project. The write up for each source should be 100 words. This means that the combined summaries and explanations for all sources should not exceed 500 words. Please note that the citation of the different sources does not count towards the overall word count. Finally, do not rely on article abstracts when writing summaries. Refer to specific details that are found in the text, specifically those that are most relevant for the proposed research topic. During grading, article abstracts will be checked to ensure that the student has not relied on them alone.

(a) Information on Grey Literature:
https://www.lib.sfu.ca/help/research-assistance/format-type/grey-literature#what-is-grey-literature

(b) Chicago Manual of Style (Author-Date):
https://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/tools_citationguide/citation-guide-2.html

Literature Review (3 November):

A well-written, organized, and concise literature review is the cornerstone of any successful research proposal. As such, students are expected to produce a three-to-four-page (**word count: 750 to 1000 words**) literature review, based on the sources presented in the previous assignment (i.e., the Annotated Bibliography). This literature review should investigate the ways in which the proposed topic of research is currently understood by researchers. Students are expected to engage with this literature both critically and analytically to demonstrate why the answer to their research question has not been adequately addressed by researchers thus far.

One of the most common mistakes students tend to make when writing a literature review is to summarize readings one-by-one. This is not the correct way to develop a literature review because it often results in summarization. Instead, a review of the literature will indicate to the reader what questions have already been asked, as well as which approaches, and methods have already been used to study the subject. Literature should be organized according to the different debates, theoretical perspectives, and arguments surrounding their topic of interest. The literature review is an opportunity to synthesize and transmit the most important information from discussions taking place among experts. Consider the following questions: What do researchers argue? How do their arguments differ? What are some of the strengths and weaknesses of these arguments according to those writing about the subject?

If the literature review is written correctly, the student's own argument will shine through. Revealing inconsistencies and gaps in the literature will help students justify and build support for their own argument. Students should remember to use their own research question as a guide when contextualizing information. Furthermore, the literature review will also highlight potential variables that might be related to concepts that students are studying. Identifying these variables is crucial for the next assignment (**Statement of Methods**). In sum, "your literature review discusses the best literature on your question in a way that shows how a reasoned analysis of its strengths and weaknesses leads naturally to the consideration of what you propose to do...It leads, naturally, in other words, to the introduction of your own argument" (Halperin and Heath 2012, 125).

Statement of Methodology and Method(s) (16 November):

In this assignment, students will outline the *methodology* and *method(s)* that they believe are best suited for analyzing their proposed research topics. When developing a research proposal, understanding the difference between these two concepts is of the utmost importance. Quite simply, methods are "techniques for gathering and analyzing bits of data" (Jackson 2016, 27), and methodology is "a concern with the logical structure and procedure of scientific inquiry" (Sartori 1970, 1033). In other words, methods are the tools researchers use to collect and analyze data, whereas methodology is a justification for the use of those methods.

Building on information presented in their assignments up to this point, students are expected to select an appropriate method (or methods) based on their topic, research question, ontological assumptions, units of analysis, identified variables of interest, and so on. Students are expected to determine the type of data that will be most useful for their purposes, and they must demonstrate how and why the method(s) they select will help them collect, interpret, and analyze that data. Students are not limited to any one method, and they may employ a mixed-method approach if they think their research will benefit from it. However, when it comes to the selection of methods, more is not always better. Remember, the primary objective of this assignment is to select the method(s) that is/are most appropriate for one's proposed research topics.

The Statement of Methodology and Method(s) should be between 750 and 1000 words in length. Furthermore, the assignment requires a minimum of four peer-reviewed academic sources. These sources are to be drawn from methods literature – be it relevant articles from peer-reviewed journals, from books focused on research methods, or both. These sources cannot be the same ones used in the Annotated Bibliography/Literature Review. However, students are free to incorporate previously discussed sources in addition to the four new sources if they think it will

help them achieve a greater level of clarity (note: **it almost certain will**). Like the assignments before it, the works cited is not to be included in the final word count.

Research Proposal (7 December):

In this final assignment, students will synthesize all previous course assignments into a single research proposal. The assignment also requires students to compose and include four new sections: a theoretical framework, a statement anticipating any problems one might encounter (based on the specific research they propose), a tentative research timeline, and a list of potential supervisors. Although this might seem an enormous undertaking, students should keep in mind that a rough draft of this project will be largely complete by the time they begin this assignment. With that said, students will receive feedback on their work throughout the semester. It is expected that previous assignments will be revised to reflect that feedback before they are incorporated into the proposal. Any student that simply incorporates the previous assignments, with no changes made, will have marks deducted. If a student does not agree with the feedback, or if it is not feasible to integrate some of those suggestions, the student must justify their omission. Students will have ample time throughout the semester to discuss this feedback with the instructor and teaching assistant.

Although the Research Proposal is largely based on the HRE proposal expectations, some minor changes to the template have been made (**see: HRE Guidelines for Students – Lecture 3**). The sections that must be included in this assignment are as follows:

Section 1 – Introduction (i.e., a revised research statement) (250)
Section 2 – Theoretical framework (250)
Section 3 – Literature review (750-1000)
Section 4 – Statement of methods and methodology (750-1000)
Section 5 – Prediction of potential problems + a list of potential supervisors (250)
Section 6 – Tentative research schedule (150)
Section 7 – Bibliography

The total word count should fall between 2400 and 2900 words, not including the cover page, or bibliographic and personal details. This is approximately 10 to 12 pages. While this is longer than the 5 to 10 pages required for the HRE proposal, excess content will award students a stronger understanding of the topic they wish to research. This is valuable for those writing the HRE, as they will be able to use this assignment as preliminary draft that contains a significant amount of relevant information related to their desired research topic. If students, and eventually their research supervisor, are content with this proposal, they may then revise and edit out the least valuable information.

Everything covered in this assignment will be discussed in lectures before the due date. The new sections – i.e., the theoretical framework, the prediction of potential problems + the list of potential supervisors, and the tentative research schedule – should include the following information:

(a) *Theoretical framework*: this section must include a discussion of the theories that will guide the student's research project. Specifically, information related to students' assumptions and concepts should be presented. Students should think of the theoretical framework as the borders of their analyses. Students may use any theory when building their theoretical framework, so

long as that theory is appropriate for the topic they have selected. Some examples are rational choice institutionalism, historical institutionalism, incrementalism, and public choice theory. Many of these theories will be covered in class lecture, but students are free to use whatever theories they have encountered in other courses as well. The overarching goal is to develop a theoretical framework that will delimit the type of information that is presented in their final research project. For example, a research project that uses historical institutionalism as the foundation for its theoretical framework must explain how and why path dependence and critical junctures are responsible for continuity and change. This is in stark contrast to those who would employ incrementalism, as they would focus on explaining how policy changes occur incrementally, over time.

(b) *Prediction of potential problems + a list of potential supervisors*: in this section, students should anticipate and detail any problems or issues that they might encounter during the research process. Many of the most common problems encountered are dependent on one's research topic and question, as well as on the proposed theoretical framework and methods. For example, if a student proposes the use of interviews as their primary research method, issues surrounding ethics and morality in the social sciences must be considered. There are strict rules concerning interviews and students should be aware of the processes involved with their application. Anticipating these issues is vital for completing a research project on time and without impediment.

In addition, students are also expected to provide a list of potential research supervisors. This list should include no more than three, and no less than two potential supervisors. After identifying these potential supervisors, students must also provide a brief explanation that justifies the selection of those supervisors. For instance, if a student's research topic concerns indigenous policy in Canada, it is unlikely that they would select a supervisor working in the field of international relations. Students are expected to demonstrate why their potential supervisors' expertise is aligned with their own research interests.

Keep in mind that this section is only 250 words (approximately one page double spaced). As such, students should be as clear and concise as possible. Students should avoid referencing problems and issues that are not associated with their specific research project, and they should limit the inclusion of unnecessary details. For example, if a student's potential supervisor once taught at Yale University, it is doubtful that this information will be pertinent to the discussion.

(c) *Tentative research schedule*: this should be a very brief outline of the student's research schedule. These schedules include information regarding the frequency of meetings one will have with their supervisors, as well as the anticipated time it will take the student to complete each section of the research project. For instance, if a student plans on completing their HRE in one-year, they must consider how many months will they spend writing the literature review, how long it will take to collect data, and so on. In-depth details are not required, nor are students bound to this schedule. The purpose of this section is to help the student pre-emptively organize the time in which they expect to complete the HRE so that they may maximize their efficiency.

Instructor's note on the value of the above-outlined assignments: if the student is planning to write the HRE, it is very likely that the details of their research proposal will change once they have selected and discussed their topic with their supervisor. However, the assignments in this course will provide students a firm foundation on which they can build a quality research proposal/project. This will save the student, and their supervisor, a great deal of time. As

students progress through the process, an appreciation for the value of time should present itself. If the student is not planning on writing the HRE, these assignments are nonetheless valuable. The most prestigious employers in the private sector, especially those that require a university degree, reward those who can effectively organize their thoughts and translate them into manageable project outlines. As such, all students are encouraged to complete these assignments to the best of their abilities.

Instructor's note on format and grading: All works must be submitted in Word, not PDF documents. This is to ensure that feedback can be provided. If a Word format document is not received by the stated deadline, this will result in a late penalty. Furthermore, to maintain consistency between course assignments and the HRE guidelines, all work must be double-spaced, using 12-point Times New Roman font. Margins must be no more, and no less, than 3 centimetres at the top, bottom, and sides of the page. All pages must be numbered, except for cover pages. In addition, spaces between paragraphs are to be removed using the *Line and Paragraph Spacing Tool* in Microsoft Word. Any assignments that do not follow these guidelines will be penalized.

Since the ability to organize and express ideas clearly are among the most important components of a research proposal, grammar, sentence structure, vocabulary, and other things related to writing and style will all play a role in the grading of assignments. If any student has trouble with these things, or if they think they might have trouble with them, they may book an appointment with **The Centre for Academic Support (CSAS)**. CSAS offers "equitable access to writing support services for the Carleton Community." A link to the CSAS is found below. Students may also contact the instructor or teaching assistant if they have any questions related to the guidelines stated above.

The Centre for Academic Support: https://carleton.ca/csas/

Finally, as it is stated in the description of the final assignment, students will receive feedback on their assignments throughout the semester. The content of this feedback will depend on the quality and substance of a student's work. This feedback will contain constructive criticism and suggestions that will help students improve their work. Students are expected to use this feedback to edit and revise their work. Providing quality feedback is very hard work and it is provided for the student's benefit. As such, students should not be offended by constructive criticism or suggestions. Should a student take issue with any of the feedback they receive, they are encouraged to contact the instructor or teaching assistant so that any issues can be clarified.

(3) ***Late Submission Policy***

Any assignments that are submitted after the above-stated due dates, and without valid reason for extension, will be penalized five percent (5%) per day. Furthermore, any assignment submitted seven days following the stated due date will not be accepted. This will result in an immediate score of zero (F). Please note that any assignment submitted seven days late will be penalized 35%. In such cases, even if a student manages to submit a perfectly written assignment seven days late, the maximum grade they can receive on that assignment is C.

Extensions will be granted on a case-by-case basis, and at the discretion of the course instructor. Any requests for extensions must be submitted to the instructor at least 48-hours before an assignment's indicated due date. This requirement will only be waived in the event of

emergency. Valid reasons for extension include medical or emergency situations. In many cases, this will require supporting documentation – usually in the form of a doctor's note. Given the current situation concerning COVID-19, students who encounter problems related to this may also request academic accommodation by completing and submitting Carleton's "Covid-19 – Self-Declaration for Academic Accommodation." A link directing students to this form is found here: https://carleton.ca/psychology/wp-content/uploads/COVID-19_Self-declaration.pdf

Instructor's note on late submissions: Submitting work on-time is very much an assignment in and of itself because it affects the final grade a student will receive. In the experience of the course instructor, some students believe that they can improve their work by spending more time on it after the due date. The overriding belief seems to be that the penalty they receive for late submission will be less severe than that which they would receive for submitting work of perceived lesser quality. While this is sometimes true, the assumption only holds if the student submits work of superior quality. Any penalty can have a significant impact on a student's final grade. For example, in this course, if a student scores a 89% (A) on an assignment, but submitted it one-day late, their final grade on that assignment will be 84% (A-); if a student scores a 73% (B), but submitted it one-day late, their final grade will be 68% (C+); if a student scores a 54% (D), but submitted it one-day late, they will receive a final grade of 49% (F). The situation only worsens the later the assignment is submitted.

As students progress through their academic and professional careers, the submission of late work becomes increasingly problematic. For example, if a student pursues a career in academia, they will likely have to present their work at academic or professional conferences; submit their work to academic journals for publication; or, submit written portfolios to funding agencies. Each of these activities requires a substantial amount of effort on behalf of the student. However, late submission of work in these situations does not simply result in the loss of a grade percentage. Instead, late work is completely rejected. In addition to wasting much of their own time, the individual will have lost a valuable opportunity. The same is true in the private sector, where missing a deadline may even cost an individual their job. As such, students are encouraged to submit their work on time. If one believes that an assignment requires a substantial amount of effort, the best avenue for success is to start working on that assignment as early as possible. Meeting deadlines is one of the most important skills a person can develop. Those who appreciate this have a competitive advantage over those who do not.

--

Weekly Topics and Readings:

Instructor's notes on lectures and readings: There are several of components that should be addressed when designing a research project, and there are many methods that can be used to analyze policy. However, not everything can be covered in a single semester. Therefore, weekly lectures have been designed, and assigned readings selected, to cover as much relevant material as possible. If any student is interested in a topic that is not indicated below, or if they are intrigued by a method that is not covered in the course, please do not hesitate to notify the instructor. Doing so early enough will allow him the time to find appropriate literature related to these topics or methods, which he may then incorporate into class lectures. Likewise, any relevant topics or methods that are of interest to a student, but are not covered in the course, may also be discussed during the instructor's office hours.

The assigned readings should be read in the order they are presented. They have been listed in an order that demonstrates logical flow between concepts and topics. Students may notice that some of these readings are targeted at graduate students, but their content applies to undergraduate students as well. Furthermore, in addition to *required* readings there are also *recommended* readings. Recommended readings are intended to provide additional information regarding a particular topic or method. Students are not expected to read these, nor are these readings required for success on quizzes. The only time information from the recommended readings will appear in quizzes will be when that information is discussed during a lecture in which a quiz is presented. None of this is meant to overwhelm the student, rather the point is to provide students a firm methodological foundation on which they may build logically sound policy analyses. Though it might seem like a lot of reading is assigned in this course, there are two things worth noting: (1) some sections within each of these readings are more important than others; and (2) the instructor will provide students with strategies for maximizing reading speed and efficiency during the first lecture (September 14). These strategies may be applied to academic readings in any course, and they should help students identify which parts of a reading are most relevant.

Week 1 (September 14) – Introduction to Course

Required (27 pages):

Kraft, Michael E., and Scott R. Furlong. 2007. "Public Policy and Politics," Chapter 1 in Michael E. Kraft and Scott R. Furlong *Public Policy: Politics, Analysis, and Alternatives*. Washington, DC: CQ Press.

Recommended:

Mill, John Stuart. 1975. "On the Liberty of Thought and Discussion," Chapter 2 in David Spitz, ed. *John Stuart Mill, On Liberty: Annotated Text Sources and Background Criticism*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton and Company.

Ménard, Marc. 2016. "The Art of Debating in Politics," Chapter 5 in *Political Argument: A Guide to Research, Writing, and Debating*. Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.

Week 2 (September 21) – Thinking About Policy Research Scientifically

Required (approx. 67 pages):

Kraft, Michael E., and Scott R. Furlong. 2007. "Policy Analysis: An Introduction," Chapter 4 in Michael E. Kraft and Scott R. Furlong *Public Policy: Politics, Analysis, and Alternatives*. Washington, DC: CQ Press.

Majchrzak, Ann, and M. Lynne Markus. 2014. "Make a Difference with Policy Research," Chapter 1 in Ann Majchrzak and M. Lynne Markus, *Methods for Policy Research: Taking Socially Responsible Action*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Fay, Brian. 2017. "Philosophy of Social Science," *Encyclopedia Britannica*. https://www.britannica.com/topic/philosophy-of-social-science. Accessed 22 July 2021.

Hay, Colin. 2011. "Political Ontology," Chapter 23 in Robert E. Goodin, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Science*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Recommended:

Canadian Policy Research Networks. *Evaluating Policy Research*, by Caroline Pestieau, Research Paper W|22, December 2003. Ottawa, ON: http://oaresource.library.carleton.ca/cprn/24336_en.pdf

Gunnell, John G. 1995. "Realizing Theory: The Philosophy of Science Revisited," *The Journal of Politics*. 57, no. 4: 923-940.

Jackson, Thaddeus. 2016. "Philosophical Wagers," Chapter 2 in Thaddeus Jackson, *The Conduct of Inquiry in International Relations: Philosophy of Science and its Implications for the Study of World Politics*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Pierce, Roger. 2008. "The Philosophy and Principles of Research," Chapter 3 in Roger Pierce *Research Methods in Political Science: A Practical Guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Week 3 (September 28) – The Key Components of a Research Proposal/Project

Required (approx. 72 pages):

Arthur Kroeger College of Public Affairs. 2021. *PAPM 4908 Honours Research Essay: Guidelines for Students*. Ottawa: Carleton University. https://carleton.ca/bpapm/wp-content/uploads/PAPM-Student-Guidelines-2020.pdf

Van Evera, Stephen. 2007. "What is a Political Science Dissertation?" Chapter 3 in Stephen Van Evera, *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Van Evera, Stephen. 2007. "The Dissertation Proposal," Chapter 5 in Stephen Van Evera, *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Maxwell, Joseph A. 2009. "Designing a Qualitative Study," Chapter 7 in Leonard Bickman and Debra J. Rog, eds. *The SAGE Handbook of Applied Social Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Van Evera, Stephen. 2007. "Helpful Hints on Writing a Political Science Dissertation," pp. 108 – 109 in Stephen Van Evera, *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Van Evera, Stephen. 2007. "How to Write a Paper," Appendix in Stephen Van Evera, *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Recommended:

Arthur Kroeger College of Public Affairs. 2021. *PAPM 4908 Honours Research Essay: Supervisors' Guidelines*. Ottawa: Carleton University. https://carleton.ca/bpapm/wp-content/uploads/PAPM-Supervisor-Guidelines-2020-.pdf

Week 4 (October 5) – Concepts, Theory, and How to Construct a Theoretical Framework

Required (approx. 73 pages):

Pollock III, Philip H. 2005. "Measurement of Concepts," Chapter 1 in Philip H. Pollock III, *The Essentials of Political Analysis*, Second Edition. Washington, DC: CQ Press.

Van Evera, Stephen. 1997. "Hypotheses, Laws, and Theories: A User's Guide," Chapter 1 in Stephen Van Evera, *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. "Improving Theory," pp. 19 – 23 (section 1.2.2.) in Gary King, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Grant, Cynthia, and Azadeh Osandoo. 2016, "Understanding, Selecting, and Integrating a Theoretical Framework in Dissertation Research: Creating the Blueprint for Your "House"," *Administration Issues Journal* 4, no. 2: 12-26. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1058505.pdf

Recommended:

Waltz, Kenneth. 1979. "Laws and Theories," Chapter 1 in Kenneth Waltz, *Theory of International Politics*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press Inc.

Week 5 (October 12) – Literature Review

Required (approx. 89 pages):

Efron, Sara Efrat, and Ruth David. 2019. "What is a Literature Review?" Chapter 1 in Sara Efrat Efron and Ruth David, *Writing the Literature Review: A Practical Guide*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Efron, Sara Efrat, and Ruth David. 2019. "Locating and Organizing Research Sources," Chapter 4 in Sara Efrat Efron and Ruth David, *Writing the Literature Review: A Practical Guide*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Pierce, Roger. 2008. "Critically Evaluating Published Research," Chapter 6 in Roger Pierce *Research Methods in Political Science: A Practical Guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Efron, Sara Efrat, and Ruth David. 2019. "Structuring and Organizing the Literature Review," Chapter 7 in Sara Efrat Efron and Ruth David, *Writing the Literature Review: A Practical Guide*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Pierce, Roger. 2008. "Completing a Literature Review: Accessing Published (β) Information," Chapter 8 in Roger Pierce *Research Methods in Political Science: A Practical Guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Recommended:

Pierce, Roger. 2008. "Evaluating Information: Validity, Reliability, Accuracy, Triangulation," Chapter 7 in Roger Pierce *Research Methods in Political Science: A Practical Guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Week 6 (October 19) – Methodology and Methods

Required (approx. 97 pages):

Kothari, C.R. 2004. "Research Methodology: An Introduction," Chapter 1 in C.R. Kothari, *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques*, second revised edition. Daryaganj, ND: New Age International Publishers.

Pierce, Roger. 2008. "Qualitative Versus Quantitative Methods: A Relevant Argument?" Chapter 4 in Roger Pierce *Research Methods in Political Science: A Practical Guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. "The *Science* in Social Science," Chapter 1 in Gary King, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Tashakkori, Abbas, and Charles Teddlie. 2009. "Integrating Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches to Research," Chapter 9 in Leonard Bickman and Debra J. Rog, eds. *The SAGE Handbook of Applied Social Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Recommended:

Pierce, Roger. 2008. "Evaluating Information: Validity, Reliability, Accuracy, Triangulation," Chapter 7 in Roger Pierce *Research Methods in Political Science: A Practical Guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Mackenzie, Noella, and Sally Knipe. 2006. "Research Dilemmas: Paradigms, Method and Methodology," *Issues in Educational Research* 16, no. 2: 193-205.

Fall Break (October 25 to 29) – No Class

Week 7 (November 2) – Comparative Methods for Policy Analysis

Required (approx. 83 pages):

Peters, Guy B. 2020. "The Comparative Method and Comparative Policy Analysis," Chapter 1 in Guy B. Peters and Guillaume Fontaine, eds. *Handbook of Research Methods and Applications in Comparative Policy Analysis*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Steinmetz, Jay. 2021. "Comparative Politics," Chapter 8 in Jay Steinmetz, *Politics, Power, and Purpose: An Orientation to Political Science*. https://fhsu.pressbooks.pub/orientationpolisci/chapter/chapter-9-public-law-and-pre-law-training/. Accessed 27 July 2021.

Van Evera, 2007. "What are Case Studies? How Should They be Preformed?" Chapter 2 in Stephen Van Evera, *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Gerring, John. 2007. "What Is a Case Study and What Is It Good For?," *American Political Science Review*, 98, no. 2 (May): 341-354.

Anckar, Carsten. 2020. "The Most-Similar and Most-Different Systems Design in Comparative Policy Analysis," Chapter 3 in Guy B. Peters and Guillaume Fontaine, eds. *Handbook of Research Methods and Applications in Comparative Policy Analysis*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Recommended:

Lane, Ruth. 1997. "The Science and the Art of Comparative Politics," pp. 1 – 12 in Ruth Lane, *The Art of Comparative Politics*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Yin, Robert K. 2009. "How to do Better Case Studies: (With Illustrations from 20 Exemplary Case Studies)," Chapter 8 in Leonard Bickman and Debra J. Rog, eds. *The SAGE Handbook of Applied Social Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Week 8 (November 9) – Ethnography, Interviewing, and Focus Groups

Required (approx. 86 pages):

Hammersley, Martyn, and Paul Atkinson. 2019. "What is Ethnography?" Chapter 1 in Martyn Hammersley and Paul Atkinson, *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*, Fourth Edition. New York, NY: Routledge.

Wood, Elisabeth Jean. 2007. "Field Research," Chapter 5 in Charles Boix and Susan C. Stokes eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*. Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.

Warren, Carol A. B. 2001. "Qualitative Interviewing," Chapter 4 in Jaber F. Gubrium and James A. Holstein. eds. 2001. *Handbook of Interview Research: Context and Method*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Stewart, David W., Prem N. Shamdasani, and Dennis W. Rook. 2009. "Group Depth Interviews: Focus Group Research," Chapter 18 in Leonard Bickman and Debra J. Rog, eds. *The SAGE Handbook of Applied Social Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Recommended:

Fetterman, David M. 2009. "Ethnography," Chapter 17 in Leonard Bickman and Debra J. Rog, eds. *The SAGE Handbook of Applied Social Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Hammersley, Martyn, and Paul Atkinson. 2019. "Oral Accounts and the Role of Interviewing," Chapter 5 in Martyn Hammersley and Paul Atkinson, *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*, Fourth Edition. New York, NY: Routledge.

Gubrium, Jaber F., and James A. Holstein. eds. 2001. *Handbook of Interview Research: Context and Method*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Krueger, Richard A., and Mary Anne Casey. 2000. "Overview of Focus Group," Chapter 1 in Richard A. Krueger and Mary Anne Casey, *Focus Groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Week 9 (November 16) – Textual Analysis (Discourse versus Content)

Required (approx. 100 pages):

McKee, Alan. "What is Textual Analysis?" Chapter 1 in Alan McKee, *Textual Analysis: A Beginner's Guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Hardy, Cynthia, Bill Harley, and Nelson Phillips. "Discourse Analysis and Content Analysis: Two Solitudes?" *Qualitative Methods* (Spring 2004): 19-22. https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/144874836.pdf. Accessed 27 July 2021.

Burnham, Peter, Karin Gilland Lutz, Wyn Grant, and Zig Layton-Henry. 2008. "Discourse Analysis and Other Methods," pp. 248 – 264 in Peter Burnham, Karin Gilland Lutz, Wyn Grant, and Zig Layton-Henry, *Research Methods in Politics*, Second Edition. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Johnstone, Barbara. 2008. "Discourse Structure: Parts and Sequences," Chapter 3 in Barbara Johnstone, *Discourse Analysis*, Second Edition. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Recommended:

Walby, Kevin, and Mike Larsen. 2011. "Access to Information and Freedom of Information Requests: Neglected Means of Data Production in the Social Sciences," *Qualitative Inquiry* 18, no. 1: 31-42.

Week 10 (November 23) – Quantitative Methods (focus on Survey Research and Linear Regression)

Required (approx. 110 pages):

Breunig, Christian, and John S. Ahlquist. 2014. "Quantitative Methodologies in Public Policy," Chapter 6 in Isabelle Engeli and Christine Rothmayr Allison, eds. *Comparative Policy Studies: Conceptual and Methodological Challenges*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Nardi, Peter M. 2006. "Developing a Questionnaire," Chapter 4 in Peter M. Nardi, *Doing Survey Research: A Guide to Quantitative Methods*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Sapford, Roger. 2007. "The Theory of Sampling," Chapter 3 in Roger Sapford, *Survey Research*, Second Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Shivley, W. Phillips. 2013. "Introductions to Statistics: Measuring Relationships for Interval Data," Chapter 8 in W. Phillips Shivley, *The Craft of Political Research*, ninth edition. Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Recommended:

Roberts, Lance W., Karen Kampen, and Tracey Peter. 2010. *The Statistics Coach: Learning Through Practice*. **(For students who want a crash course in SPSS statistical software)**

Week 11 (November 30) – Common Problems in Policy Research and How to Select a Supervisor

Required (approx. 50 pages):

Research Ethics:

Van Evera, Stephen. 2007. "Professional Ethics," Chapter 6 in Stephen Van Evera, *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Common Research Issues and Some Solutions:

Badiru, Adedeji B., Christina F. Rusnock, and Vhance V. Valencia. "On the Personal Aspects of Research," Chapter 9 in Adedeji B. Badiru, Christine F. Rusnok, and Vhance V. Valencia, *Project Management for Research: A Guide for Graduate Students*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Badiru, Adedeji B., Christina F. Rusnock, and Vhance V. Valencia. "Scheduling," Chapter 6 in Adedeji B. Badiru, Christine F. Rusnok, and Vhance V. Valencia, *Project Management for Research: A Guide for Graduate Students*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Badiru, Adedeji B., Christina F. Runsock, Vhance V. Valencia. 2016. "Time Management," Chapter 8 in Adedeji B. Badiru, Christina F. Runsock, and Vhance V. Valencia, *Project Management for Research: A Guide for Graduate Students*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Selecting a Research Supervisor:

Badiru, Adedeji B., Christina F. Runsock, Vhance V. Valencia. 2016. "Choosing Your Advisor and Committee," Chapter 4 in Adedeji B. Badiru, Christina F. Runsock, and Vhance V. Valencia, *Project Management for Research: A Guide for Graduate Students*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

The University of British Colombia. n.d. "Choosing a Supervisor," UBC Graduate and Post Doctoral Studies. https://www.grad.ubc.ca/handbook-graduate-supervision/choosing-supervisor Accessed 28 July 2021.

The University of British Colombia. n.d. "Supervisor Expectations," UBC Graduate and Post Doctoral Studies. https://www.grad.ubc.ca/handbook-graduate-supervision/supervisor-expectations. Accessed 23 July 2021.

Week 12 (December 7) – The Value of Your Research and Things to Think About Moving Forward

Required (approx. 46 pages):

Badiru, Adedeji B., Christina F. Runsock, Vhance V. Valencia. 2016. "Communicating Your Work," Chapter 11 in Adedeji B. Badiru, Christina F. Runsock, and Vhance V. Valencia, *Project Management for Research: A Guide for Graduate Students*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Sharpe, Angela L. 2007. "Working With the Federal Government," Chapter 16 in Melissa K. Welch-Ross and Lauren G. Fasig, eds. *Handbook on Communicating and Disseminating Behavioral Science*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Smith, Catherine F., 2019. "Brief, Opinion, Resolution: Inform Policy Makers," Chapter 8 in Catherine F. Smith, *Writing Public Policy: A Practical Guide to Communication in the Policy Making Process,* fifth edition. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Chamorro-Premuzic, Tomas. 2020. "Should You Go to Graduate School?" *Harvard Business Review*. https://hbr.org/2020/01/should-you-go-to-graduate-school. Accessed 23 July 2021.

Additional Information

(1) ***Intellectual Property***

Materials created for this course remain the intellectual property of the author(s). They are intended for personal use and may not be reproduced or redistributed without prior written consent of the author(s). This means, to protect intellectual property, no audio and/or video recording of course lectures, either in whole or in part, is permitted without the instructor's explicit permission. No other course material of any kind may be distributed or shared in the absence of the instructor's explicit permission.

(2) *Final Grades*

As per the Carleton University Undergraduate Calendar, letter grades are assigned based on the following percentages:

	+		–
A	90-100	85-89	80-84
B	77-79	73-76	70-72
C	67-69	63-66	60-62
D	56-59	53-56	50-52
F	Below 50		

(3) *Plagiarism*

The University Senate defines plagiarism as "presenting, whether intentional or not, the ideas, expression of ideas or work of others as one's own." This can include:

- reproducing or paraphrasing portions of someone else's published or unpublished material, regardless of the source, and presenting these as one's own without proper citation or reference to the original source;
- submitting a take-home examination, essay, laboratory report or other assignment written, in whole or in part, by someone else;
- using ideas or direct, verbatim quotations, or paraphrased material, concepts, or ideas without appropriate acknowledgment in any academic assignment;
- using another's data or research findings;
- failing to acknowledge sources through the use of proper citations when using another's works and/or failing to use quotation marks;

Plagiarism is a serious offence which cannot be resolved directly with the course's instructor. The Associate Deans of the Faculty conduct a rigorous investigation, including an interview with the student, when an instructor suspects a piece of work has been plagiarized. Penalties are not trivial. They may include a mark of zero for the plagiarized work or a final grade of "F" for the course.

More information on the University's Academic Integrity Policy can be found at: https://carleton.ca/registrar/academic-integrity/

(4) *Academic Accommodations*

Pregnancy

Please contact your instructor with any requests for academic accommodation during the first two weeks of class, or as soon as possible after the need for accommodation is known to exist. For more details, visit the Equity Services website: carleton.ca/equity/wp-content/uploads/Student-Guide-to-Academic-Accommodation.pdf

Religious obligation

Please contact your instructor with any requests for academic accommodation during the first two weeks of class, or as soon as possible after the need for accommodation is known to exist.

For more details, visit the Equity Services website: carleton.ca/equity/wp-content/uploads/Student-Guide-to-Academic-Accommodation.pdf

Students with Disabilities

If you have a documented disability requiring academic accommodations in this course, please contact the Paul Menton Centre for Students with Disabilities (PMC) at 613-520-6608 or pmc@carleton.ca for a formal evaluation or contact your PMC coordinator to send your instructor your Letter of Accommodation at the beginning of the term. You must also contact the PMC no later than two weeks before the first in-class scheduled test or exam requiring accommodation (if applicable). After requesting accommodation from PMC, meet with your instructor as soon as possible to ensure accommodation arrangements are made.

Survivors of Sexual Violence

As a community, Carleton University is committed to maintaining a positive learning, working and living environment where sexual violence will not be tolerated, and is survivors are supported through academic accommodations as per Carleton's Sexual Violence Policy. For more information about the services available at the university and to obtain information about sexual violence and/or support, visit: carleton.ca/sexual-violence-support

Student Activities

Carleton University recognizes the substantial benefits, both to the individual student and for the university, that result from a student participating in activities beyond the classroom experience. Reasonable accommodation must be provided to students who compete or perform at the national or international level. Please contact your instructor with any requests for academic accommodation during the first two weeks of class, or as soon as possible after the need for accommodation is known to exist. https://carleton.ca/senate/wpcontent/uploads/Accommodation-for-Student-Activities-1.pdf

For more information on academic accommodation, please contact the departmental administrator or visit: students.carleton.ca/course-outline