226: Quantitative Methods in Politics and Sociology
Reading list for 2012-13

Course Provider: Dr Stephen Fisher, Trinity College
stephen.fisher@trinity.ox.ac.uk

Rubric:
Candidates will be expected to show an understanding of applications of quantitative methods in politics and sociology including the following. The principles of research design in social science: data collection; the logic of causal inference; and comparative method. Major statistical methods and concepts: types of random variables; independence, correlation and association; sampling theory; hypothesis testing; linear and non-linear regression models; event-history analysis; and time-series. Candidates will be expected to interpret statistical information and show familiarity with major methodological debates in political science and sociology.

Aims and Objectives:
To enable students to engage critically with the quantitative social science literature, assess the quality of the research design, data, methodology and conclusions from a piece of social science research; to understand the nature and relevance of statistical concepts and methods that are commonly used in social science; and to interpret statistical information of varying degrees of sophistication. No formal training in mathematics is required.

Course Assessment:
The course will be assessed by means of a three-hour unseen examination according to the provisions established in the *Examination Decrees and Regulations*, a copy of which will be issued to each undergraduate student in the Politics Department. Further details will be available in the *PPE Handbook*, and *Essential Information for Students*, copies of which will also been issued to each undergraduate and are also available on the Politics Department's web-site. The exam will have two parts: A and B. Candidates will be expected to answer one of the two questions available in part A which will test their ability to interpret the results of a quantitative research project. Part B will comprise essay questions. Candidates will be expected to do 3 questions from part B.

Candidates will be assessed on understanding of theory and primarily empirical applications, not on the ability to manipulate equations or perform statistical calculations. There may, however, be a few occasions where candidates need or wish to do some very basic, typically just arithmetic, calculations and so calculators are permitted in the examination and you have to provide your own. University guidelines on the specification of calculators apply.

Teaching Arrangements:
The teaching will be a mixture of lectures, classes and tutorials. Students may wish to attend the general statistics lectures by Prof. Catherine de Vries, held on Tuesdays 3-5 in Exam Schools in Michaelmas Term. There will be four two-hour classes for the first four weeks of Michaelmas term that go over the basic statistical theory. These will be practical classes with accompanying reading and exercises. Finally there will be 4 tutorials in Michaelmas term, 2 tutorials in Hilary term and a 2 hour revision class in Trinity Term. The tutorials will build on the work done in the classes and cover a selection of the part B topics.

Class topics (in preparation for part A of the exam):
1. Introduction and overview of key concepts
2. Sampling, hypothesis testing and intro to regression
3. OLS regression and extensions
4. Categorical data and logistic regression

Tutorial topics (in preparation for part B of the exam):

1. Survey sampling and opinion polls
2. Experiments in social science
3. Measuring aspects of democracy
4. Path analysis and causal inference
5. Association between categorical variables
6. Time-Series and public opinion
7. Event history analysis and government duration
8. Selection bias and matching
9. Age, period and cohort effects
10. Contextual effects and multi-level modelling

Items marked with a * are particularly recommended. Library codes are for the Social Science Library in Manor Road.

Background, introductory and general texts:

*Agresti, A. and Finlay, B. (1997) *Statistical Methods for the Social Sciences*. Prentice Hall. H62.AGR

Angrist, Joshua D, and Jorn-Steffen Pischke. 2008. *Mostly Harmless Econometrics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Box-Steffensmeier, Janet M, Henry E Brady, and David Collier. 2008. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, USA. JA71.OXF 2008 online here. Chapter 1

*Kellstedt, Paul M, and Guy D Whitten. 2009. *The fundamentals of political science research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. JA86.KEL 2009

King, G., Keohane, R. and Verba, S. (1994) *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton University Press. H61.KIN

Wonnacott, T.H., and Wonnacott R.J. (1990) *Introductory Statistics*. Wiley. QA276.12.WON

Wooldridge, Jeffrey M. (2009) *Introductory Econometrics: A Modern Approach, 4th Edition*. South Western College. (earlier editions should do). HB139.WOO 2009

Topic 1. Survey sampling and opinion polls

Introduction: This topic covers the practical and theoretical considerations involved in the choice of survey and polling methods and how these may affect results. It is important to get an understanding of the potential biases arising from sample selection, differential response rates etc. In light of these considerations, students should be able to evaluate the relative merits of different modes of data collection (face to face, telephone, internet), different sampling techniques (probability vs. quota samples) and different methods (e.g. weighting) to correct for bias when it occurs. You should also be aware of the particular debates of the effects of polling methodologies on opinion polls at recent British general elections.

Background reading:

*Groves, Robert M et al. 2011. *Survey Methodology*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley. Chapters 1-9 (you can skip the most technical or detailed bits, focus on the main concepts)

Box-Steffensmeier, Janet M, Henry E Brady, and David Collier. 2008. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, USA. JA71.OXF 2008 online here. Chapter 16

Questions:

Q. How might the mode of data collection affect the findings of opinion polls?

Q. What explains the error in the polls at the British General Election of 2010?

Topic readings:

Baker, Ken, John Curtice and Nick Sparrow (2002) Internet Poll Trial Reserch Report. http://www.icmresearch.co.uk/white-papers/internet-poll-trial.pdf

Curtice, John, and Nick Sparrow. 2010. "The past matters: Eliminating the pro-Labour bias in British opinion polls." *International Journal of Market Research* 52(2). http://www.ijmr.com/articles/TOC.asp?ArticleID=91681

Curtice, John, and Nick Sparrow. 2010. "Too clever by half? The impact of weighting and ad...." *International Journal of Market Research* 52(5): 678–686.

Moon, Nick. 2010. "The changing opinion poll landscape." *International Journal of Market Research* 52(5).

Pickup, Mark et al. 2011. "Why Did the Polls Overestimate Liberal Democrat Support? Sources of Polling Error in the 2010 British General Election." *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion & Parties* 21(2): 179–209. http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/17457289.2011.563309

Sanders, D et al. 2007. "Does Mode Matter For Modeling Political Choice? Evidence From the 2005 British Election Study." *Political Analysis* 15(3): 257–285. http://pan.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/abstract/mpl010v2.

*Yeager, D S et al. 2011. "Comparing the Accuracy of RDD Telephone Surveys and Internet Surveys Conducted with Probability and Non-Probability Samples." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 75(4): 709–747. http://poq.oxfordjournals.org/content/75/4/709.short

Whiteley, Paul et al. 2010. "Polling and forecasting the general election of 2010." *International Journal of Market Research* 52(5).

Topic 2: Experiments in Social Science

Introduction: The use of experiments in social science is becoming increasingly common. Advocates of the experimental approach point to the high internal validity of experiments helping researchers to gain a better understanding of causal mechanisms. However, there are worries that experiments have limited usefulness because of their low external validity i.e. their inapplicability to the real world. Students should be able to discuss the pros and cons of experimental research as compared to observational studies, and also the costs and benefits of different experimental designs, especially field and lab experiments. They should demonstrate an awareness of how experiments have been used in social science and what can practically be done to try and maximise both internal and external validity.

Background Readings:

*Angrist, Joshua D, and Jorn-Steffen Pischke. 2008. *Mostly Harmless Econometrics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Chapter 2

*Box-Steffensmeier, Janet M, Henry E Brady, and David Collier. 2008. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, USA. JA71.OXF 2008 online here. Chapters 14 and 15.

*Kellstedt, Paul M, and Guy D Whitten. 2009. *The fundamentals of political science research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 4. JA86.KEL 2009

Questions:

Q: There is no causation without manipulation. Is this right, and what research design implications does it have?

Q: External validity is the Achilles heel of experimentation. Discuss

Topic Readings:

Bond, Robert M et al. 2012. "A 61-million-person experiment in social influence and political mobilization." *Nature* 489(7415): 295–298. http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v489/n7415/abs/nature11421.html

Green, Donald P, and Alan S Gerber. 2010. "Introduction to Social Pressure and Voting: New Experimental Evidence." *Political Behavior* 32(3): 369–386. http://www.springerlink.com/content/36j43207213p5p63/

Imai, Kosuke et al. 2011. "Unpacking the Black Box of Causality: Learning about Causal Mechanisms from Experimental and Observational Studies." *American Political Science Review* 105(04): 765–789. http://www.journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0003055411000414

Iyengar, S (2003) "Experimental Designs for Political Communications Research: From Shopping Malls to the Internet" pcl.stanford.edu/common/docs/research/iyengar/2002/expdes2002.pdf

Sekon, Jasjeet S, and R Titiunik. 2012. "When Natural Experiments Are Neither Natural nor Experiments." *American Political Science Review* 106(01): 35–57. http://www.journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0003055411000542

Topic 3: Measuring Aspects of Democracy

Introduction: A major challenge facing social scientists is how to construct suitable measures of complex phenomena, such as democracy, for use in empirical research. The topic covers key issues with measurement, especially validity and reliability, and also the construction of composite measures and the identification of multiple dimensions in multivariate data (by principle components analysis, factor analysis etc.). Debates over the measurement of the level of democracy and also the patterns of democratic institutions (in Lijphart) are used as important examples.

Background Reading:

Babbie, Earl (1995). *The Practice of Social Research*. London: Wadsworth. Chapters 5 and 6. H62.BAB

***** Carmines, E and R Zeller (1979) *Reliability and Validity Assessment* Thousand Island: Sage (including the appendix on Factor Analysis). H62.CAR

*Kellstedt, Paul M, and Guy D Whitten. 2009. *The fundamentals of political science research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 5. JA86.KEL 2009

Questions:

Q: Is there a coherent way to measure the quality of democracy?

Q: Does Lijphart show us that democracies can differ in at most two ways?

***Topic Readings*:**

Bollen, Kenneth A. (1980) Issues in the Comparative Measurement of Political Democracy. *American Sociological Review* 45(2): 370-90. http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/2095172.pdf

*Bollen, Kenneth Alan. 2009. "Liberal Democracy Series I, 1972–1988: Definition, measurement, and trajectories." *Electoral Studies* 28(3): 368–374. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0261379409000456

*Box-Steffensmeier, Janet M, Henry E Brady, and David Collier. 2008. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, USA. JA71.OXF 2008 online here . Chapter 5 and skim through Chpt 6

Jackman, R. W. and Miller, R. A. (1996). A Renaissance of Political Culture? *American Journal of Political Science* 40(3): 632-659.

http://www.jstor.org/sici?sici=0092-5853(199608)40%3A3%3C632%3AAROPC%3E2.0.CO%3B2-3

*Lijphart, A. (1999) *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-six Countries*. New Haven: Yale University Press. esp chapter 14. JC421.LIJ

Muller, E. and Seligson, M. (1994). Civic culture and democracy: the question of causal relationships. *American Political Science Review*, 88(3): 635-652.

http://www.jstor.org/sici?sici=0003-0554(199409)88:3%3C635:CCADTQ%3E2.0.CO;2-V

*Munck, Gerardo L. and Jay Verkuilen (2002) 'Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy: Evaluating Alternative Indices' *Comparative Political Studies* 35(1):5-34.

Topic 4: Causal Inference, Path Analysis and Instrumental Variables

Introduction: Much social science research aims to identify causal links between variables. This topic focuses on causal modelling of observational, as opposed to experimental data. Whilst it is fairly straightforward to demonstrate association between variables, demonstrating causality is more problematic. It requires, among other things, the elimination of possible alternative causes and correct specification of the direction of the causal link. Path analysis is one technique which can be used to model complex relationships between variables and develop causal theories including appropriate control variables. Students should be aware of the difficulties associated with causal modelling in the social sciences, especially endogeneity and the difficulty of distinguishing cause and effect. They should be familiar with the key principles, benefits and drawbacks of the Neyman-Rubin model, regression discontinuity designs, and the Instrumental Variables (IV) approach to tackling endogeneity.

Background readings:

*Angrist, Joshua D, and Jorn-Steffen Pischke. 2008. *Mostly Harmless Econometrics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Chapters 4, 5 and 6.

* Agresti and Finlay (1999) *Statistical Methods for the Social Sciences* 3rd edition

Chapter 10 (Introduction to Multivariate Relationships) and pp.624-629 (Path Analysis). H62.AGR

Box-Steffensmeier, Janet M, Henry E Brady, and David Collier. 2008. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, USA. JA71.OXF 2008 online here . Chapter 10 (skim), 11, 13 and 17 (skim technical bits).

*Kellstedt, Paul M, and Guy D Whitten. 2009. *The fundamentals of political science research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 3 and 4. JA86.KEL 2009

Questions:

Q. Compare and contrast path analysis, the Neyman-Rubin model, regression discontinuity designs, and the Instrumental Variables (IV) approach to causal inference for observational studies.

Topic readings:

*Cox, D.R. and N. Wermuth (2001) 'Some Statistical Aspects of Causality' *European Sociological Review*, 17: 65-74

http://esr.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/reprint/17/1/65

Imai, Kosuke et al. 2011. "Unpacking the Black Box of Causality: Learning about Causal Mechanisms from Experimental and Observational Studies." *American Political Science Review* 105(04): 765–789. http://www.journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0003055411000414

Kuha, Jouni, and John H Goldthorpe. 2010. "Path analysis for discrete variables: the role of education in social mobility." *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series A: Statistics in Society* 173(2): 351–369. http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-985X.2009.00620.x/full

Topic 5: Association Between Categorical Variables

Introduction*:* Social scientists are often interested in tracing changes in the strength of the relationship between two categorical variables, such as social class and vote, over time. The conclusions reached will be sensitive to the measure of association used and, in particular, whether it controls for fluctuating marginals i.e. the possibility that it is the distribution of the variables across different categories, rather than the relationship between them, that is changing over time. Students should be aware of the methodological issues surrounding the measurement of association between categorical variables and be able to demonstrate how the use of alternative techniques, including odds ratios and logistic regression, can affect results. They should do this with reference to existing debates surrounding either the possible decline in class voting or the erosion of class inequalities in education.

***Background Reading*:**

*Agresti, Alan (1996) *An Introduction to Categorical Data Analysis.* New York: John Wiley and Sons. Chapters 1 and 2. QA278.AGR

Questions:

Q How has the use of odds ratios changed our understanding of class dealignment?

Topic Reading:

a) Class voting

*Crewe, Ivor (1986) On the death and resurrection of class voting: some comments on How Britain Votes, *Political Studies*, 34, 620-38.

*Evans, Geoffrey (ed) (1999) *The End of Class Politics*? *Class Voting in Comparative Context* . Oxford: Oxford University Press. Especially chapter by Nieubeerta and de Graaf and the Conclusion. JF1001.END

*Heath, Anthony, Roger Jowell and John Curtice (1985) *How Britain Votes*. Oxford: Pergamon. Chapters 2 and 3. JN956.HEA

*Heath, Anthony, Roger Jowell and John Curtice (1987) Trendless fluctuation: a reply to Crewe. *Political Studies*, 35, 256-77

http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/journal/119472228/abstract

*Marshall, Gordon and Adam Swift (1999) On the Meaning and Measurement of Inequality. *Acta Sociologica*, 42: 241-250. http://asj.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/42/3/241

Topic 6: Time Series Analysis of Public Opinion

Introduction: Public opinion is a key factor in poltical science; researchers are interested in studying trends in opinion over time and the effect on public opinion of political events. Analysing data over time presents particular challenges for researchers compared with cross-sectional data. Students should gain an awareness of some of the issues involved in analysing time series data including different techniques for modelling the impact of exogenous "shocks" or events. They should be able to discuss these issues with reference to empirical examples.

Background Reading:

Angrist, Joshua D, and Jorn-Steffen Pischke. 2008. *Mostly Harmless Econometrics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Chapter 5

*Kellstedt, Paul M, and Guy D Whitten. 2009. *The fundamentals of political science research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Sections 11.7 and 12.2. JA86.KEL 2009

*Box-Steffensmeier, Janet M, Henry E Brady, and David Collier. 2008. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, USA. JA71.OXF 2008 online here. Chapter 19 and 20

***** Kennedy, Peter (1998) *A Guide to Econometrics*. MIT Press. Chapter 17. HB139.KEN

*Wooldridge, Jeffrey M. (2009) *Introductory Econometrics: A Modern Approach, 4th Edition*. South Western College. (earlier editions should do) Part 2: Regression Analysis with Time Series Data. HB139.WOO 2009

Questions:

Q. How should we model the effect of political events on public opinion?

Topic Reading:

Sanders, D (1999) "Conservative Incompetence, Labour Responsibility and the Feel Good Factor: Why the Economy Failed to Save the Conservatives in 1997" *Electoral Studies*, 18: 251-70. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=ArticleURL&_udi=B6V9P-3W19G62-7&_user=126524&_rdoc=1&_fmt=&_orig=search&_sort=d&view=c&_version=1&_urlVersion=0&_userid=126524&md5=bf7d3a46146370fecd9a02964b2703f4

Topic 7: Event History Analysis and Government Duration

Introduction: Often social scientists have the objective of studying how long it takes for a certain event such as the fall of a regime or the collapse of a governing coallition to occur; they are interested not just in whether the event occurs but when. Ordinary regression techniques are unsuitable for studying duration or survival for a number of reasons and specialist event history models have been developed to take account of this. Students should be aware of the methodological issues surrounding the study of duration data and how these are dealt with in event history analysis. They should be able to discuss the advantages of using event history analysis in the context of modelling government duration.

Background Reading:

Beck, N (1998) "Modelling Space and Time: The Event History Approach" in E Scarborough and E Tanenbaum eds. *Research Strategies in the Social Sciences: A Guide to New Approaches.* Oxford: OUP. H62.REA

*Box-Steffensmeier, Janet M, Henry E Brady, and David Collier. 2008. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, USA. JA71.OXF 2008 online here. Chapter 23

* Box-Steffensmeier, Janet M. and Bradford Jones (1997) "Time is of the Essence: Event History Models in Political Science" *American Journal of Political Science* 41: 1414-61.

http://www.jstor.org/sici?sici=0092-5853(199710)41:4%3C1414:TIOTEE%3E2.0.CO;2-U

Questions:

Q. "Students would now be taken out and shot for using simple OLS regressions to analyse cabinet duration" (Laver, 2003). Discuss

Topic Reading:

* Alt, J and G King (1994) "Transfers of Governmental Power: The Meaning of Time Dependence" *Comparative Political Studies,* 27: 190-210.

http://cps.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/27/2/190

Browne, E., J Frendreis and D Gleiber (1986) "The Process of Cabinet Disolution – An Exponential Model of Duration and Stability in Western Democracies" *American Journal of Political Science,* 30: 628-50. http://www.jstor.org/sici?sici=0092-5853(198608)30%3A3%3C628%3ATPOCDA%3E2.0.CO%3B2-Q

Diermeir, D and R Stevenson (1999) "Cabinet Survival and Competing Risks" *American Journal of Political Science* 43: 1051-98.

http://www.jstor.org/sici?sici=0092-5853(199910)43%3A4%3C1051%3ACSACR%3E2.0.CO%3B2-O

* King, G., Alt, J.E., Burns, N.E. and Laver, M. (1990) "A Unified Model of Cabinet Dissolution in Parliamentary Democracies," *American Journal of Political Science,* 34(3): 846-871.

http://www.jstor.org/sici?sici=0092-5853(199008)34%3A3%3C846%3AAUMOCD%3E2.0.CO%3B2-W

* Laver, M (2003) "Government Termination" *Annual Review of Political Science,* 6: 23-40.

http://arjournals.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev.polisci.6.121901.085530

*Strom, Kaare (1988) "Contending Models of Cabinet Stability", *American Political Science Review,* 82: 923-30.

Warwick P and S Easton (1992) "The Cabinet Stability Controversy: New Perspectives on a Classic Problem" *American Journal of Poltiical Science,* 36: 122-46.

http://www.jstor.org/sici?sici=0092-5853(199202)36%3A1%3C122%3ATCSCNP%3E2.0.CO%3B2-5

Topic 8: Selection Bias and matching

***Introduction*:** One of the biggest problems in using statistical techniques in social science is that people are not randomly selected into trial and control groups. Instead, in many cases, people select themselves into various groupings that are of interest. For example, if we are interested in knowing whether alliance ties between two countries effects the probability of escalation to war, we need to take into account both the fact that states choose whether to ally

or not and they can choose whether to avoid getting into a situation where war might erupt. Students should be able to discuss, with reference to empirical examples, the potential problems caused by self selection and possible strategies for dealing with these problems.

Background:

* Angrist, Joshua D, and Jorn-Steffen Pischke. 2008. *Mostly Harmless Econometrics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Chapters 2 and 3.3.

Berk, RA 1983. "An Introduction to Sample Selection Bias in Sociological Data" *American Sociological Review* 48: 386-398. http://www.jstor.org/sici?sici=0003-1224(198306)48%3A3%3C386%3AAITSSB%3E2.0.CO%3B2-I

Manski, Charles 1995. *Identification Problems in the Social Sciences*. Harvard University Press. Esp. "Anatomy of the Selection Problem" chapter. H62.MAN

* Kennedy, Peter (1998) *A Guide to Econometrics*. MIT Press. Chapter 16. HB139.KEN

Questions:

Q. To what extent can selection bias be adequately adjusted for in social research?

Topic readings:

Geddes, Barbara. 1990. "How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics." *Political Analysis* 2(1): 131–150. http://pan.oxfordjournals.org/content/2/1/131.short

Henderson, John, and Sara Chatfield. 2011. "Who Matches? Propensity Scores and Bias in the Causal Effects of Education on Participation." *The Journal of Politics* 73(03): 646–658. http://www.journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0022381611000351

Iacus, S M, G King, and G Porro. 2012. "Causal Inference without Balance Checking: Coarsened Exact Matching." *Political Analysis* 20(1): 1–24. http://pan.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/doi/10.1093/pan/mpr013

Sekhon, J. S. (2009), 'Opiates for the matches: Matching methods for causal inference', *Annual Review of Political Science* 12.

Topic 9: Age, Period and Cohort Effects

Introduction: Generational theories are often cited as the reason for the large age differences that one sees in a variety of socio-political attitudes. Change over time is also often accounted for by the replacement of older generations with newer generations that hold different views. Presenting convincing evidence for these ideas is difficult however due to the inherent under-identifiability of models that attempt to include changes due to age effects, period effects and generational effects. Students should be able to explain this fundamental problem with reference to real examples, and be able to explore the merits of possible 'solutions' to these kind of under-identified models.

Background Reading:

* Glenn, N.D. (1976), 'Cohort analysts' futile quest: statistical attempts to separate age, period and cohort effects', *American Sociological Review,* 41: 900-904. http://www.jstor.org/sici?sici=0003-1224(197610)41%3A5%3C900%3ACAFQSA%3E2.0.CO%3B2-R

Glenn, N.D. (2005, 2nd edition), *Cohort Analysis*. Sage.

* Firebaugh, G. (1989), 'Methods for estimating cohort replacement effects', *Sociological Methodology*, 19, 243-262. http://www.jstor.org/sici?sici=0081-1750(1989)19%3C243%3AMFECRE%3E2.0.CO%3B2-8

* Rodgers, W.L. (1982), 'Estimable functions of age, period and cohort effects', *American Sociological Review*, 47: 774-787. http://www.jstor.org/sici?sici=0003-1224(198212)47%3A6%3C774%3AEFOAPA%3E2.0.CO%3B2-R

Questions

Q. What is meant by the age-period-cohort identification problem? How successful are the various strategies used to solve it?

Topic Readings:

* Alwin, D.F. and Krosnick, J.A. (1991), 'Aging, cohorts and the stability of socio-political orientations over the life span', *American Journal of Sociology*, 97: 169-195.

http://www.jstor.org/sici?sici=0002-9602(199107)97:1%3C169:ACATSO%3E2.0.CO;2-S

* Abramson, P.R. and Inglehart, R. (1992), 'Generational replacement and value change in eight West European societies', *British Journal of Political Science*, 22: 183-228. http://www.jstor.org/sici?sici=0007-1234(199204)22%3A2%3C183%3AGRAVCI%3E2.0.CO%3B2-1

Converse, P.E. (1976) *The Dynamics of Party Support: cohort-analysing party identification*. Beverly Hills: Sage. JK2271.CON

* Heath, A.F. and Martin, J. (1996), 'Changing attitudes towards abortion: life-cycle, period and cohort effects', in Taylor, B. and Thomson, K. (eds). *Understanding Change in Social Attitudes*. Aldershot: Dartmouth. HM101.UND

Neundorf, A. (2010), 'Democracy in transition: A micro perspective on system change in post-Soviet societies' *Journal of Politics*, 72: 1096 -1108.

* Russell, A.T., Johnston, R.J. and Pattie, C.J. (1992), 'Thatcher's children: exploring the links between age and political attitudes', *Political Studies*, XL: 742-756. http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/journal/119322453/abstract

Tilley, J (2002) 'Political Generations and Partisanship in the UK, 1964-1997', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A* 165: 121-135.

http://www.jstor.org/sici?sici=0964-1998(2002)165%3A1%3C121%3APGAPIT%3E2.0.CO%3B2-5

Tilley, J (2003) 'Party Identification in Britain: Does Length of Time in the Electorate Affect Strength of Partisanship?', *British Journal of Political Science* 33: 332-344.

Topic 10: Contextual Effects and Multi-Level Modelling

Introduction: As well as looking at the behaviour of individual actors, social scientists are interested in contextual effects i.e. effects on individuals' behaviour which arise from their social interaction within an environment. Multi-level models have developed to enable researchers to separate out and identify the relative importance of individual level and contextual factors in determining behaviour. Students should demonstrate an awareness of both the theoretical importance of contextual effects and the way in which multi level modelling enables reserachers to identify their presence empirically. They should do this with reference to empirical examples taken from research looking at possible contextual effects on vote choice.

Background Reading:

Box-Steffensmeier, Janet M, Henry E Brady, and David Collier. 2008. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, USA. JA71.OXF 2008 online here. Chapter 26

Hauser, R M (1974) "Contextual Analysis Revisited" *Sociological Methods and Research*, 2: 365-375. http://smr.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/2/3/365

* Snijders, T and Bosker R (1999) *Multilevel Analysis: An Introduction to Basic and Advanced Multilevel Modelling*. London: Sage. QA278.SNI

Questions:

Q: How has the availability of techniques for multi-level modelling advanced our understanding of class voting in Britain?

Topic Readings:

***** Andersen, R and A Heath (2002) "Class Matters: The Persisting Effects of Contextual Social Class on Individual Voting in Britain 1964-1997 *European Sociological Review*, 18: 125-38. http://esr.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/reprint/18/2/125

Fisher, S (2000) "Class Contextual Effects on the Conservative Vote in 1983" *British Journal of Political Science*, 30: 347-382. http://www.jstor.org/sici?sici=0007-1234(200004)30%3A2%3C347%3ACCEOTC%3E2.0.CO%3B2-3

Johnston, R et al (2000) "The Neighbourhood Effect and Voting in England and Wales: Real or Imagined?" *British Elections and Parties Review* 10: 47-63. JN956.BRI

Jones, K., R Johnston and C Pattie (1992) "People, Places and Regions: Exploring the Use of Multi-Level Modelling in the Analysis of Electoral Data" *British Journal of Political Science*, 22: 343-380. http://www.jstor.org/sici?sici=0007-1234(199207)22%3A3%3C343%3APPARET%3E2.0.CO%3B2-C

* Kelley, J and I McAllister (1985) "Social Context and Electoral Behaviour in Britain" *American Journal of Political Science*, 29: 564-86. http://www.jstor.org/sici?sici=0092-5853(198508)29%3A3%3C564%3ASCAEBI%3E2.0.CO%3B2-5