Course Description:

This course is an introduction to research methods in the social sciences, with a focus on impact evaluation and experiments. Students will learn how to robustly design a research projects starting from specific research questions and select an appropriate methodology to collect the data.

Teaching Method:

This course is participatory, students are expected to read required materials prior to class meetings, prepare questions and notes, and actively participate in classroom experiments.

SCHEDULE OF TOPICS

Topic 1	**Introduction: the scientific approach and doing research in the Social Sciences**
Topic 2	**Data Types, Data Sources and Causal inference** • Gertler, Paul J., Sebastian Martinez, Patrick Premand, Laura B. Rawlings, Christel M.J. Vermeersch. 2016. *Impact Evaluation in Practice*. Second edition. World Bank Publications. Ch 3 and 16
Topic 3	**How to evaluate: Randomized assignment, Instrumental variables, Matching, Difference-in-Differences, Randomized Control Trials** • Gertler, Paul J., Sebastian Martinez, Patrick Premand, Laura B. Rawlings, Christel M.J. Vermeersch. 2011. Impact Evaluation in Practice. World Bank Publications. Ch. 4-8 • Anglemyer A, Horvath HT, Bero L. 2013. Healthcare outcomes assessed with observational study designs compared with those assessed in randomized trials". Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2014, 1Issue 4. Art. No.: MR000034. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.MR000034.pub2.
Topic 4	**Observing the behaviour of economic agents: rational models and behavioural economics. Why economic experiments?**
Topic 5	**Choices under risk and measuring risk aversion** • *Experiments*: investment game; Holt & Laury • *Reading*: Dohmen, T., Falk, A., Huffman, D., Sunde, U., Schupp, J., & Wagner, G. G. (2011). "Individual risk attitudes: Measurement, determinants, and behavioral consequences." Journal of the European Economic Association, 9(3): 522-550

Topic 6	**Strategic risk and social preferences** • *Experiment*: dictator and ultimatum games • *Reading*: Thaler, R.H. (1988) "Anomalies: The ultimatum game." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 2: 195–206
Topic 7	**Public good games and the voluntary contribution mechanism** • *Experiment*: repeated public good game • *Reading*: Fischbacher, U., Gächter, S., & Fehr, E. (2001). "Are people conditionally cooperative? Evidence from a public goods experiment." *Economics letters* 71(3): 397-404
Topic 8	**Toolbox for designing an experiment**
Topic 9	**Students' Presentations**

Weekly Readings

Part of the readings for this course are listed above and will be made available to students via a course website, others will be suggested during the course.

REQUIREMENTS AND GRADING

The class requirements include: in class participation and discussion; a research design paper based on anticipated (or hypothetical) research project and a presentation of your research design during the last week of classes.

Grading Summary:

Final grades will be determined as follows:
40%	Research Design Paper
40%	Research Design Presentation
20%	Participation

Non-Attending Students:
30%	Research Design Paper
70%	Oral Exam

Non-attending students shall contact Prof Marazzi or Prof Piano Mortari well ahead of the exam date to receive instructions on textbooks and materials for preparing the oral exam.

If you miss more than 20% of the classes (i.e. 4 lectures) you will be labelled as a Non-attending student

Research Design Paper, Presentation:
At the end of the semester, you will write a research design paper based on an anticipated research project. Part of this paper will include drafting a data collection instrument that uses at least one of the methods learned in the course. You will present the research design during the last week of the course.

Deadlines:
- **Research Design Abstract due via e-mail: around 10 days before the presentation week (exact date will be announced in class)**
- **Research Design Presentations: last week of the course**
- **Research Design Paper: around 7 days before the chosen exam call (details will follow during the course)**

Participation:
You are expected to attend all course sessions. This is your opportunity to ask questions, discuss readings and other course material, and engage in activities that will deepen your understanding of course topics. Your participation grade will be based on: 1) attendance; and 2) the quality of your participation, including demonstrating you have thoughtfully completed the reading. We expect students to come prepared, and to be respectful, attentive, and actively engaged. In classroom discussions and activities are an integral part of this course, intended to be additional learning opportunities. If you must be absent at any point, please notify me via email as soon as possible, ideally before that course session begins.

Grade Determination:
Writing and public speaking are essential to success in many careers. Students will be held to professional standards. Students should not submit first drafts and should carefully proof read all work. The following factors will be considered in evaluating student assignments:

- **Content:** Responds to the assignment's questions. Develops and supports a central thesis. Provides a focused argument throughout the essay/talk.
- **Clarity and Presentation:** Writes/speaks clearly by: developing a coherent, well- organized argument; arranging sentences in a logical and coherent manner; using correct punctuation, spelling, and grammar; and providing correct citations in the APA format.
- **Comprehensiveness:** Reviews the relevant literature and material, shows an in-depth understanding of the topic, and critiques differing points of view on the topic.
- **Creativity:** Draws the reader/listener in and engages him/her in the topic. Makes an original contribution to the topic. Presents material in an interesting and unique way that elucidates the ideas.
- **Accuracy:** Free of obvious errors. All facts are derived from assigned course material and properly cited.

CLASS POLICIES

Plagiarism

You are encouraged to form study groups to review course material and discuss general approaches for assignments. However, you are expected to complete assignments independently. Plagiarism of published work is an ethical violation. Any two assignments that are submitted

containing the same sentences will be considered a breach. In written work (including overheads or handouts used in presentations), words drawn from others should be indicated by quotation marks and ideas drawn from others should refer to their source. If you are unsure about what needs to be cited, please talk with us.

NOTE: If you are an **Erasmus or a non-Global Governance student** who would like to attend oneor more courses in the Global Governance programme, please be aware that, **before enrolling in thecourse**, you should have read the code of conduct and the procedural rules characterizing our programme. We assume that, if you enrol in the course, **you have read and accepted all Global Governance values and rules**. Notice that attendance is required from the very first lesson and you need to attend at least 80% of the course to be considered an attending student.

Description of the methods and criteria for testing learning
The examination assesses the student's overall preparation, ability to integrate the knowledge of the different parts of the program, consequentiality of reasoning, analytical ability and clarity of presentation, in accordance with the Dublin descriptors (1. knowledge and understanding; 2. applying knowledge and understanding; 3. making judgements; 4. learning skills; 5. communication skills).
The examination will be graded according to the following criteria:
Unsuitable: important deficiencies and/or inaccuracies in the knowledge and understanding of the topics; the topics are exposed in an incoherent manner and with inappropriate language.
18-20: barely sufficient knowledge and understanding of most of the topics, with some missing items; sufficient capacity for analysis; the topics are sometimes exposed in an inconsistent manner and with inappropriate/technical language;
21-23: basic knowledge and understanding of most of the topics; ability to analyze and synthesize correctly with sufficiently coherent logical argumentation, with possibly some inaccuracy in the technical language.
24-26: good knowledge and understanding of most of the topics; good analytical and synthetic skills with rigorously expressed arguments, though with possibly a few inaccuracies in the technical language.
27-29: complete knowledge and understanding of the topics; good capacity for analysis and synthesis. Arguments presented in a rigorous manner and with appropriate/technical language, with only minor inaccuracies.
30-30L: very good level of knowledge and thorough understanding of topics. Excellent analytical and synthetic skills and independent judgement. Arguments expressed in an original manner and in appropriate technical language.