

GV915-7-SU

Applied Research Design 2018 – 2019

Lecturer and Module Supervisor Dr. Ana Carolina Garriga

E-mail: carolina.garriga@essex.ac.uk

Room: 5A.108

Office Hours: Wednesday, 10am to 12pm
5B.308

Module Administrator

govpgquery@essex.ac.uk

Module available for Study Abroad students: Yes No

ASSESSMENT: This module is assessed by 100% coursework

INSTANT DEADLINE CHECKER –

Assignment Title	Due Date	Coursework Weighting*	Feedback Due
Replication proposal (memo)	Week 31. The day before the session before 9.45 am	10%	Week 32
Replication proposal (class presentation)	Week 31	10%	The day of the presentation
Replication report (memo)	Week 34. The day before the session by 9.45 am	20%	Week 36
Replication report (class presentation)	Week 34	15%	The day of the presentation
Participation	Weeks 31 and 34	5%	Week 39
Replication paper	Week 36 The day of the session before 9.45 am	40%	Week 40

TOP READS

- Online resources: articles and replication materials. See reading list.
- Peers' replication proposals and replication reports.

MODULE DESCRIPTION

This module prepares students to replicate and expand published research. Replication consists on reproducing the empirical test presented in a study, with the data and modeling choices the author(s) used. It also involves analyzing the data accuracy and appropriateness of the modeling choices. For this module, expanding extant empirical research means that, after replicating the study, students should introduce a theory-informed modification that would allow them to build upon that study. This exercise intends to deepen the students'

understanding and critical evaluation of research strategies, to highlight the importance of transparency on our own research, and to foster the idea that scientific knowledge is a social enterprise.

GV914 is a prerequisite for taking this module.

MODULE STRUCTURE AND TEACHING

The module consists of three meetings (Weeks 30, 31 or 32, and 34 or 35)*, and student's independent work between Weeks 30 and 37. Throughout the module, students will replicate and extend a recent research article. The article must have been published in the past five years in a major political science journal.

For this module, **replication** includes but it is not limited to the re-estimation of models using the data and codes provided by the authors. Students should consult original sources of the data, and/or use alternative operationalization for key variables, and/or use alternative estimation techniques to assess the robustness of the findings to other operationalization and/or measurement and/or modeling choices. Students analyze the robustness and/or limits of generalization of the results being replicated.

For the **extension** component of this module, students should propose an additional hypothesis grounded on the theory, and test it. The hypothesis could propose a conditional effect (an interaction), a differential effect for larger or different samples or in subsamples, a different effect after the removal of outliers, the test for selection effects, or the inclusion of third variables that could be affecting the relationship of interest, among other innovations. This component is not a mechanical data-mining exercise. Students should theoretically justify the inclusion of this hypothesis or of any empirical innovations.

Students are allowed to work in pairs. Groups should present a single (joint) replication proposal, replication report, and replication paper, and should divide the class presentation responsibilities. However, co-authored replication exercises should include two innovations/hypothesis instead of one.

* The order of presenters, and date of presentation will be announced in Week 30.

ASSESSMENT

This module is assessed by 100% coursework mark. Coursework includes a replication proposal (20%), a replication report (35%), comments on colleagues' replication projects (5%), and a replication paper (40%).

Students are allowed to work in pairs. Groups should present a single (joint) replication proposal, replication report, and replication paper, and should divide the class presentation responsibilities. However, co-authored replication exercises should include two innovations/hypothesis instead of one. Mark for the written component of the assignments will be the same for both coauthors, but marks for class presentations and participation will be based on individual performance.

Replication proposal (20%)

- After carefully reading the materials assigned for Week 30, students will select a paper to replicate. Students can use one of the recommended articles listed under “Readings” or can propose any other article published in the past 5 years in a major political science journal. Please, make sure that all the data and codes for these papers are available from the authors and/or journal before proposing the article.

This assignment consists of two parts:

1. Memo (10%): Students should distribute a short paper including the following information:

- Article’s bibliographical information and abstract.
- Link to the data and supplementary materials for the article.
- Link to codes/do files employed in the article.
- A justification of the choice of this article.
- A brief explanation of potential extensions for this article. Focus on the (potential) theoretical implications or importance of the proposed extensions.
- PDF of the article.

The memo should be **BOTH uploaded on FASER and posted on the module’s Moodle board** the day before the session. The rest of the class is required to read the memo associated with the presentation before class.

2. Class presentation (10%): Students should prepare a 12-minute presentation explaining:

- The theoretical background of the paper they are analyzing (to what debates, line/s of research, bigger question/s this article is speaking to).
- A brief explanation of the article’s theory and empirical test.
- A justification of the choice of this article.
- A brief explanation of potential extensions for this article. Focus on the (potential) theoretical implications or importance of the proposed extensions.

The purpose of this assignment is two-fold: First, it gives students the opportunity to defend the selected article and its potential for replication and extension, and to receive (and provide) advice from (to) the rest of the class. Second, it socializes students in the norms of professional presentations and contribution to the work of peers.

Replication report (25%)

- This is a draft of what would constitute the replication paper (see the description below). For this assignment, the main elements of the paper should be present, including the full replication of the article’s models (and comments on how successful this replication was, or issues found regarding the robustness of results). Students should include preliminary results for the extension, and preliminary remarks instead of conclusions.

This assignment consists of two parts:

1. Memo (20%): Students should distribute a paper including introduction, literature review, theory, justification of the extension, research design and results of the replication, preliminary results for the extension, and preliminary remarks (instead of conclusions, bullet points are acceptable). Although these sections will closely follow the original paper, students are required to write them – **DO NOT COPY AND PASTE.**

Plagiarism standards also apply to this assignment. If in doubt, follow the examples listed in Week 30.

The memo should be **BOTH uploaded on FASER and posted on the module's Moodle board** the day before the session. The rest of the class is required to read the memo associated with the presentation before class.

2. Class presentation (15%): Students should prepare a 10-minute presentation including:

- The research question, article's theory and extensions to/implications of the theory to be tested.
- A brief explanation of the replication exercise, robustness of results.
- The empirical innovation.
- Preliminary remarks (bullet points are acceptable).
- **Format:** students can choose whether to prepare a power point presentation or a poster. Please inform the instructor how you plan to deliver the presentation to get advice for a successful presentation.

Replication paper (40%)

- A research paper is required for the module. The paper will include the replication of a recently published article in a major political science outlet in the past five years.
- **Format:** 7,000 to 111,000 words (including tables and figures, excluding references), figures and tables in the text, close to the corresponding discussion, 1-inch margin, font size 12, double-spaced. Documents shorter than 7,000 words will lose 10% of the grade. I will not read 11,000 words.
- **Send to the instructor** before 9.45 am the day of session, in Week 36.
- **Content:** The paper should follow the basic structure of an empirical study in political science, building on the article replicated, and justifying and testing an extension or implication of the original theory. Because this is a replication exercise, I expect the introduction, literature review, and theory sections to be shorter than in a "normal" article, and the empirical section to be more detailed, specifying all the analyses you performed. Furthermore, the conclusions should focus on the replication and extension components.
- **Replication component:** The purpose of this exercise should include but it is NOT limited to the re-estimation of models using the data and codes provided by the authors. Students should compare original sources of the data with the data used in the original analyses, and/or use alternative operationalization for key variables, and/or use alternative estimation techniques to assess the robustness of the findings to other operationalization and/or measurement and/or modeling choices. The paper should include comments on the article's data accuracy and appropriateness of the modeling choices, and on the robustness and/or limits of generalization of the results.

Students are required to include a description of all the replication analyses performed. This includes reporting findings such as differences between original sources of the data and the data made available by the authors, how measurement choices (such as dichotomization or categorization of variables) or alternative estimation techniques affect results, and including comments or concerns regarding the results' robustness.

- **Extension component:** Based on the theory, students should propose an additional hypothesis, and test it. The hypothesis could propose a conditional effect (an interaction), a differential effect for larger or different samples or in subsamples, a different effect after the removal of outliers, the test for selection effects, or the inclusion of third variables that could be affecting the relationship of interest (included as additional controls or as instruments), among other innovations. This component is not a mechanical data-mining exercise. Students should theoretically justify the inclusion of this hypothesis or of any empirical innovations.

Although introduction, literature review, theory, and research design will closely follow the original paper, students are required to write them – **DO NOT COPY AND PASTE or slightly paraphrase the original paper. Plagiarism standards also apply to this assignment.** If in doubt, follow the examples listed in Week 30.

Participation (5%)

- Students are expected to come to class prepared to comment on their peers' presentations, and to make meaningful contributions. If a student misses one session, the participation mark for that session will be 0 unless the student sends written comments to the classmates scheduled to present in that session, within 4 days after the session, with copy to the instructor.

STUDY ABROAD ASSESSMENT

This module is open to foreign students who took GV914.

COURSEWORK SUBMISSION

How to submit your essay using FASER

You will be able to access the online submission system via your myEssex portal or via <https://FASER.essex.ac.uk>. FASER allows you to store your work-in-progress. This facility provides you with an ideal place to keep partially completed copies of your work and ensures that no work, even drafts, is lost. If you have problems uploading your coursework, you should contact ltt@essex.ac.uk. You may find it helpful to look at the FASER guide <http://www.essex.ac.uk/it/elearning/faser/default.aspx>. If you have any questions about FASER, please contact your administrator or refer to the handbook.

Under NO circumstances is your coursework to be emailed to the administrators or the lecturer. This will NOT be counted as a submission.

Coursework deadline policy for undergraduates

There is a single policy at the University of Essex for the late submission of coursework in undergraduate courses. Essays must be uploaded before 09.45 on the day of the deadline.

All coursework submitted after the deadline will receive a mark of zero. The mark of zero shall stand unless the student submits satisfactory evidence of extenuating circumstances that indicate that the student was unable to submit the work prior to the deadline. For further information on late submission of coursework and extenuating circumstances procedures please refer to <http://www.essex.ac.uk/students/exams-and-coursework/ext-circ.aspx>.

Essay feedback will be given via FASER.
ALL submissions should be provided with a coversheet (Available from Moodle).

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is a very serious academic offence and whether done wittingly or unwittingly it is your responsibility. **Ignorance is no excuse!** The result of plagiarism could mean receiving a mark of zero for the piece of coursework. In some cases, the rules of assessment are such that a mark of zero for a single piece of coursework could mean that you will fail your degree. If it is a very serious case, you could be required to withdraw from the University. It is important that you understand right from the start of your studies what good academic practice is and adhere to it throughout your studies.

The Department will randomly select coursework for plagiarism checks and lecturers are very good at spotting work that is not your own. **Plagiarism gets you nowhere; DON'T DO IT!**

Following the guidance on referencing correctly will help you avoid plagiarism.

Please familiarise yourself with the University's policy on academic offences:
<http://www.essex.ac.uk/about/governance/policies/academic-offences.aspx>.

Extenuating circumstances for late submission of coursework

The university has guidelines on what is acceptable as extenuating circumstances for later submission of coursework. If you need to make a claim, you should upload your coursework to FASER and submit a late submission of coursework form which can be found here: <http://www.essex.ac.uk/students/exams-and-coursework/late-submission.aspx>. This must be done within seven days of the deadline. FASER closes for all deadlines after seven days. The Late Submissions committee will decide whether your work should be marked and you will be notified of the outcome.

If you experience significant longer-term extenuating circumstances that prevent you from submitting your work either by the deadline or within seven days of the deadline, you should submit an Extenuating Circumstances Form for the Board of Examiners to consider at the end of the year <http://www.essex.ac.uk/students/exams-and-coursework/ext-circ.aspx>.

Extensions

PGT students may apply for an extension if they have a deadline approaching that they know they will not be able to meet. ONLY the Graduate Director has authority to grant extensions. Extensions are only approved IN ADVANCE of the deadline. Students must apply to the Graduate Director, via the Graduate Administrator, using the Extension form available on Moodle or from the Graduate Administrator. You MUST provide a reason for the request and EVIDENCE that supports your application.

READINGS

Week 30: On replication

Required readings:

The role of replication in graduate training:

- King, Gary. 1995. Replication, Replication. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 28: 444–452. <http://gking.harvard.edu/files/gking/files/replication.pdf>
- Janz, Nicole. 2016. "Bringing the Gold Standard into the Classroom: Replication in University Teaching." *International Studies Perspectives* 17 (4): 392-407. <https://academic.oup.com/isp/article/17/4/392/2528285>

The importance of replication for research:

- Replication Forum. 2016. *International Studies Perspectives* 17(4). **Read pages 361 – 391, 439-44.**
- Symposium on data access and research transparency. 2014. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 47(1).
- Dafoe, Allan. 2013. "Science Deserves Better: The Imperative to Share Complete Replication Files." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 47: 60-66.

Some high-profile examples:

- Broockman, David, Joshua Kalla, and Peter Aronow. 2015. Irregularities in Lacour (2014). http://stanford.edu/~dbroock/broockman_kalla_aronow_lg_irregularities.pdf
- Janz, Nicole. 2014. Replication scandal: We might not need austerity measures after all <https://politicalsciencereplication.wordpress.com/2013/04/17/replication-scandal-we-might-not-need-austerity-measures-after-all/>

Examples:

- Bell, Mark and Nicholas Miller. 2015. Questioning the Effect of Nuclear Weapons on Conflict. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(1):74-92.
- Chapman, Terrence L., and Stephen Chaudoin. 2013. "Ratification Patterns and the International Criminal Court." *International Studies Quarterly* 57: 400-09.
- Haber, Stephen, and Victor Menaldo. 2011. "Do Natural Resources Fuel Authoritarianism? A Reappraisal of the Resource Curse." *American Political Science Review* 105: 1-26.
- Tomz, Michael, Judith L. Goldstein, and Douglas Rivers. 2007. "Do We Really Know That the WTO Increases Trade? Comment." *American Economic Review* 97: 2005-18.

Recommended readings:

- Baker, Monya. 2016. "Is There a Reproducibility Crisis? A Nature survey lifts the lid on how researchers view the 'crisis rocking science and what they think will help" *Nature* 533 (7604):452–54.
- Bollen, Kenneth, John T. Cacioppo, Robert M. Kaplan, Jon A. Krosnick, James L. Olds, and Heather Dean. 2015. "Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences Perspectives on Robust and Reliable Science." *Report of the Subcommittee on Replicability in Science Advisory Committee to the National Science Foundation Directorate for Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences.*
- Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce, Nils Petter Gleditsch, Patrick James, Gary King, Claire Metelits, James Lee Ray, Bruce Russett, Håvard Strand, and Brandon Valeriano. 2003. "Symposium on Replication in International Studies Research." *International Studies Perspectives* 4: 72-107.

- Camerer, Colin F., Anna Dreber, Eskil Forsell, Teck-Hua Ho, Jürgen Huber, Magnus Johannesson, and Michael Kirchler, et al. 2016. "Evaluating Replicability of Laboratory Experiments in Economics." *Science* 351: 1433–1436.
- Coppock, Alexander. 2018. "Generalizing from Survey Experiments Conducted on Mechanical Turk: A Replication Approach." *Political Science Research and Methods*: 1-16.
- Dunning, Thad. 2016. "Transparency, Replication, and Cumulative Learning: What Experiments Alone Cannot Achieve." *Annual Review of Political Science* 19: 541-563.
- Gilbert, Daniel T., Gary King, Stephen Pettigrew, and Timothy D. Wilson. 2016. "Comment on 'Estimating the Reproducibility of Psychological Science'." *Science* 351: 1037-1038.
- Gleditsch, Nils Petter, Ragnhild Nordås, and Henrik Urdal. 2017. "Peer Review and Replication Data: Best Practice from Journal of Peace Research." *College & Research Libraries* 78.
- King, Gary. 2006. "Publication, Publication." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 39: 119–25.

Week 31: Replication proposal

Required readings:

- Peers' replication proposal memos

Week 34: Replication report

Required readings:

- Peers' replication proposal memos

RECOMMENDED PAPERS FOR REPLICATION (*) (**) (***)

(*) These are papers that address current debates, or use interesting/new data, or that have potential for publishable replication or extension.

(**) Students can propose a different article, as long as the article was published **in the past five years in a major political science journal**, and the authors made available data and codes for replication.

(***) Even for recommended papers, **it is the student's responsibility** to make sure that all the data and codes for these papers are available from the authors and/or journal before proposing the article.

- Campello, Daniela, and Cesar Zucco Jr. 2016. "Presidential Success and the World Economy." *The Journal of Politics* 78: 589-602.
- Chapman, Terrence, Songying Fang, Xin Li, and Randall W. Stone. 2017. "Mixed Signals: IMF Lending and Capital Markets." *British Journal of Political Science* 47: 329-49.
- Copelovitch, Mark, Christopher Gandrud, and Mark Hallerberg. 2018. "Financial Data Transparency, International Institutions, and Sovereign Borrowing Costs." *International Studies Quarterly* 62: 23-41.
- DiGiuseppe, Matthew. 2015. "Guns, Butter, and Debt: Sovereign Creditworthiness and Military Expenditure." *Journal of Peace Research* 52: 680-93.
- Doyle, David. 2015. "Remittances and Social Spending." *American Political Science Review* 109: 785-802.
- Dreher, Axel, Jan-Egbert Sturm, and Jakob de Haan. 2008. "Does High Inflation Cause Central Bankers to Lose Their Job? Evidence Based on A New Data Set." *European Journal of Political Economy* 24: 778-87.

- Dreher, Axel, Jan-Egbert Sturm, and James Raymond Vreeland. 2015. "Politics and IMF Conditionality." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(1):120-146.
- Fearon, James, and David Laitin. 2003. "Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War." *American Political Science Review* 97(1): 75-90.
- Fearon, James. 2004. "Why Do Some Civil Wars Last So Much Longer Than Others?" *Journal of Peace Research* 41(3): 275-301
- Gelpi, Christopher, Grieco, Joseph, 2014. "Presidential Performance in International Conflicts and Domestic Legislative Success, 1953-2001." *American Journal of Political Science* 59:440-456.
- Hong, Mi Hwa, and Gary Uzonyi. 2018. "Deeper Commitment to Human Rights Treaties: Signaling and Investment Risk Perception." *International Interactions*: 1-25.
- Jensen, Nathan. 2012. "Fiscal Policy and the Firm: Do Low Corporate Tax Rates Attract Multinational Corporations?" *Comparative Politics Studies* 45:1004-1026.
- Jones, Benjamin T. 2017. "Altering Capabilities or Imposing Costs? Intervention Strategy and Civil War Outcomes." *International Studies Quarterly* 61: 52-63.
- Kim, Moonhawk, Amy H. Liu, Kim-Lee Tuxhorn, David S. Brown, and David Leblang. 2015. "Lingua Mercatoria: Language and Foreign Direct Investment." *International Studies Quarterly* 59: 330-43.
- Knutsen, Carl Henrik, and Håvard Mokleiv Nygård. 2015. "Institutional Characteristics and Regime Survival: Why Are Semi-Democracies Less Durable Than Autocracies and Democracies?." *American Journal of Political Science* 59: 656-70.
- Leblang, David. 2015. "Harnessing the Diaspora: Dual Citizenship, Migrant Return Remittances." *Comparative Political Studies*.
- Lyall, Jason. 2010. "Do Democracies Make Inferior Counterinsurgents? Reassessing Democracy's Impact on War Outcomes and Duration." *International Organization* 64(1):167-192.
- Moon, Chungshik. 2015. "Foreign Direct Investment, Commitment Institutions, and Time Horizon: How Some Autocrats Do Better than Others." *International Studies Quarterly* 59: 344-56
- Nielsen, Richard A., and Beth A. Simmons. 2015. "Rewards for Ratification: Payoffs for Participating in the International Human Rights Regime?." *International Studies Quarterly* 59: 197-208.
- Steinberg, David A., and Krishan Malhotra. 2014. "The Effect of Authoritarian Regime Type on Exchange Rate Policy." *World Politics* 66: 491-529.
- Tyburski, Michael D. 2014. "Curse or Cure? Migrant Remittances and Corruption." *The Journal of Politics* 76: 814-24.
- von Soest, Christian, and Michael Wahman. 2015. "Not All Dictators are Equal: Coups, Fraudulent Elections, and the Selective Targeting of Democratic Sanctions." *Journal of Peace Research* 52: 17-31.
- Vreeland, James Raymond. 2008. "The Effect of Political Regime on Civil War: Unpacking Anocracy." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 52(3):401-425
- Wellhausen, Rachel L. 2015. "Bondholders vs. Direct Investors? Competing Responses to Expropriation." *International Studies Quarterly* 59: 750-64.
- Wright, Joseph, Erica Frantz, and Barbara Geddes. 2015. "Oil and Autocratic Regime Survival." *British Journal of Political Science* 45: 287-306.