

Conduct of Inquiry

POS 6736: Class Number: 21493

Class Periods: Wednesday 8-10 periods; 3:00 pm to 6:00 pm ET

Location: MAT 0005

Academic Term: Spring 2024

Instructor:

Michael D. Martinez
martinez@ufl.edu
(352) 273-2363
209 Anderson Hall

Office Hours: Tuesdays, 2:00 – 4:00 pm (ET) and by appointment
Office Hour appointments available at <https://calendly.com/martinez-uf>

Office hours will be in person, via Zoom, or by phone
Zoom id <https://ufl.zoom.us/my/mdmartinez>

Course Description

Why do we call our discipline "political science"? What kinds of research do political scientists do, and how do they communicate that knowledge to one another? How do we know what we think we know? How do we measure political phenomena? How would we know if a new public policy "worked"? Are polls still able to predict election outcomes with the samples they can get? How do we analyze data, and what are good data to analyze? What ethical standards guide (or should guide) our research?

This course provides graduate students with an introduction to research design in political science. We will cover the fundamentals of the research process starting with the formulation of research questions and the construction of research puzzles. We will then cover theory building, the derivation of hypotheses, and discuss methodological approaches.

The aim of most empirical research methods is to draw inferences, that is, use the things we know to learn about the things we do not know. We will discuss a variety of the methods social scientists use to draw inferences about politics. These include large-N quantitative analysis, small-n case studies, and experimental approaches. We will devote considerable attention to the strengths and weaknesses of the different methodological approaches we cover. This will better prepare you to critically evaluate scholarly work and equip you to undertake original research.

Expectations and Assessments

- **Attend and participate in seminar (10% cumulative).** Every person should come to seminar prepared to comment on the assigned readings, and help others to understand the concepts presented in the readings and assignments. Research is not a spectator sport, so you should expect me to ask for your contributions on a regular basis. Some time in seminar will be devoted to lecture, but your participation in this course is expected to be that of an "active learner". **Any absence from seminar requires a prompt explanation.** Multiple absences seriously jeopardize the prospect for successful completion of the course. Participation is evaluated with respect to listening, preparation, quality of contributions, impact on the class, and frequency.

	Strong	Needs Development	Unsatisfactory
Listening	Actively and respectfully listens to peers and instructor	Respectful but not engaged by comments of others	Projects lack of interest or disrespect for others (including browsing other materials during class, or leaving class without explanation)
Preparation	Arrives fully prepared with all assignments completed, and notes on reading, observations, and questions	Sometimes arrives with only superficial preparation	Arrives unprepared, and little evidence of having completed or thought about assigned material
Quality of contributions	Comments are relevant and reflect understanding of assignments, previous remarks of other students, and insights about assigned material	Comments occasionally show lack of preparation or understanding	Comments reflect little understanding of either the assignment or previous remarks in class
Impact on class	Comments frequently help move class discussion forward	Comments keep the conversation on track, but do little to move it forward	Comments do not advance the conversation or are actively harmful to it
Frequency of participation	Actively participates at appropriate times	Participates when called upon, but no more	Seldom participates and is generally disengaged or absent

Grading scale for participation component:

- A - Strong in most categories
 - A- - Participation is strong in some categories but needs development in others
 - B - Need for development in most categories
 - C - Unsatisfactory in some categories
 - E - Unsatisfactory in nearly all.
- **Discussion questions and comments (10% cumulative)** Each student will submit at least three questions or comments for discussion prior to each seminar meeting. These questions can (1) highlight an ambiguity or conflict in the readings, (2) comment on common topics addressed by multiple readings, or (3) suggest (or inquire about) an application of the readings to a particular field of political science. These are due on Canvas on 9 am on the day of seminar.

- **Followup assignments (20% cumulative).** Unless otherwise noted, followup assignments will be one to two page essays due on Canvas before the next class, and will build on the concepts introduced in the previous class. When assigned, the followup assignments will be discussed as "show and tell" in the first part of the next class meeting. In most weeks, the followup assignment will require that participants discuss how their one of their own research interests might be addressed with a different design.
- **Present and Write a Research Proposal (60% total).** Each participant will be required to submit a research proposal. Papers will be judged on readability, the appropriateness of the research question, and the suitability of the design for that question. Each proposal will consist of several parts. You must meet with me at least once prior to the due date for the statement of intent.
 - The initial statement of intent is due January 31 **(5%)**. It will be discussed in class on that date. Your statement should
 - Introduce the topic;
 - State your research question clearly and concisely;
 - Describe the payoff from knowing the answer;
 - Provide an intuition about how you could advance the literature on the topic;
 - Suggest a theoretical link between the factors you see as consequential to the outcome of interest; and
 - Provide an initial bibliography of at least 8 sources.
 - The literature review is due on March 6th **(10%)**. Students should review the literature relevant to your question, paying particular attention to concepts, measurements, case selection, and methods.
 - Brief presentation on research topic on March 27th **(5%)**. After introducing their research question, students will provide a theoretical statement about the political process they are studying, from which we can derive more expectations. In their presentation, students should identify scope conditions (to whom the theory applies, when, and why). Students should also explain what methodological approach they believe would be most conducive to testing their theory.
 - Presentations of research proposals will be in class on April 24th **(5%)**.
 - Final research papers are due noon Monday, April 29. **(35%)** This paper should be in the form of a 10-page (single-spaced) research proposal that meets the requirements of a "project description" for an APSA Doctoral Dissertation Improvement Grant.

The proposal you develop for this class may not end up being the basis for your dissertation prospectus or a grant proposal – that is okay. By identifying an interesting puzzle, formulating a viable research question, evaluating existing research on the topic, proposing an explanation, and then developing a plan to collect and analyze data, you will develop critical research skills that will be valuable in the future.

Course Readings

The following books are required. They are available via the UF bookstore and online:

- Henry Brady and David Collier. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2012. 2nd edition

- Gary King, Robert Keohane, Sidney Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry*. Princeton University Press, 1994.
- John Gerring, *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework*. Cambridge University Press, 2012. 2nd edition

In addition to readings from these books, there are readings from academic journals and volumes that I expect you to read.

Proposal Reference Readings

- Przeworski, Adam and Frank Salomon (1988, 1995). “The Art of Writing Proposals: Some Candid Suggestions for Applicants to Social Science Research Council Competitions.” Memo published by the Social Science Research Council.
- Watts, Michael, William Bowen, and Neil Rudenstien. 2001. "The Holy Grail: In Pursuit of the Dissertation Proposal." *Institute of International Studies*: 1-12.

Grading Scale

Percent	Grade	Grade Points		Percent	Grade	Grade Points
94.0 - 100.0	A	4.00		74.0 – 76.9	C	2.00
90.0 - 93.9	A-	3.67		70.0 - 73.9	C-	1.67
87.0 - 89.9	B+	3.33		67.0 - 69.9	D+	1.33
84.0 - 86.9	B	3.00		64.0 - 66.9	D	1.00
80.0 - 83.9	B-	2.67		60.0 - 63.9	D-	0.67
77.0 - 79.9	C+	2.33		0 - 59.9	E	0.00

"A" is intended to signal excellent work at the graduate level, "A-" signals good work, "B+" signals acceptable work at the graduate level, but improvement is needed, "B" or "B-" signals a warning that your work does not predict future success at the graduate level, and grades of "C+" are lower are unacceptable at the graduate level.

More information on UF grading policy may be found at:

[UF Graduate Catalog](#)
[Grades and Grading Policies](#)

Administrative Stuff

Cell phones

Please silence and do not answer cell phones during seminar discussions. If a cell phone rings audibly during seminar discussion, the owner of the phone will be required to bring cookies or alternative healthy treats for all seminar participants at the next meeting of the seminar. (The instructor is partial to Publix Heath Bar cookies.)

Recordings

Students are allowed to record video or audio of class lectures, but are not allowed to record seminar discussions. The purposes for which these recordings may be used are strictly controlled. The only allowable purposes are (1) for personal educational use, (2) in connection with a complaint to the university, or (3) as evidence in, or in preparation for, a criminal or civil proceeding. All other purposes are prohibited. Recordings that are admitted as evidence in a criminal or civil proceeding may be used either in support of or in opposition to the interests of the person who made the recording.

A “class lecture” is an educational presentation intended to inform or teach enrolled students about a particular subject, including any instructor-led discussions that form part of the presentation, and delivered by any instructor hired or appointed by the University, or by a guest instructor, as part of a University of Florida course. A class lecture does not include seminar discussions, lab sessions, student presentations, clinical presentations such as patient history, academic exercises involving solely student participation, assessments (quizzes, tests, exams), field trips, private conversations between students in the class or between a student and the faculty or lecturer during a class session.

Publication without permission of the instructor is prohibited. To “publish” means to share, transmit, circulate, distribute, or provide access to a recording, regardless of format or medium, to another person (or persons), including but not limited to another student within the same class section. Additionally, a recording, or transcript of a recording, is considered published if it is posted on or uploaded to, in whole or in part, any media platform, including but not limited to social media, book, magazine, newspaper, leaflet, or third party note/tutoring services. A student who publishes a recording without written consent may be subject to a civil cause of action instituted by a person injured by the publication and/or discipline under [UF Regulation 4.040 Student Honor Code and Student Conduct Code](#).

Students Requiring Accommodations

Students with disabilities who experience learning barriers and would like to request academic accommodations should connect with the [Disability Resource Center](#). It is important for students to share their accommodation letter with their instructor and discuss their access needs, as early as possible in the semester.

Course Evaluation

Students are expected to provide professional and respectful feedback on the quality of instruction in this course by completing course evaluations online via GatorEvals. Guidance on how to give feedback in a professional and respectful manner is available at <https://gatorevals.aa.ufl.edu/students/>. Students will be notified when the evaluation period opens, and can complete evaluations through the email they receive from GatorEvals, in their Canvas course menu under GatorEvals, or via <https://ufl.bluera.com/ufl/>. Summaries of course evaluation results are available to students at <https://gatorevals.aa.ufl.edu/public-results/>.

University Honesty Policy

UF students are bound by The Honor Pledge which states, “We, the members of the University of Florida community, pledge to hold ourselves and our peers to the highest standards of honor and integrity by abiding by the Honor Code. On all work submitted for credit by students at the University of Florida, the following pledge is either required or implied: “On my honor, I have neither given nor received unauthorized aid in doing this assignment.” [The Honor Code](#) specifies a number of behaviors that are in violation of this code and the possible sanctions. Furthermore, you are obligated to report any condition that facilitates academic misconduct to appropriate personnel. If you have any questions or concerns, please consult with the instructor in this class.

As a reminder, UF’s policy on plagiarism prohibits “reuse of the student’s own submitted work, or the simultaneous submission of the Student’s own work, without the full and clear acknowledgment and permission of the Faculty to whom it is submitted.” If you are working on a project that might partially satisfy requirements in multiple classes, please consult with me and with the other professor(s) *prior* to starting your work. We will seek to determine the degree to which the distinct components of your project meet (or do not meet) the separate seminar requirements, and advise you accordingly. I will want to see the other seminar requirement/ assignment.

Software Use

All faculty, staff, and students of the University are required and expected to obey the laws and legal agreements governing software use. Failure to do so can lead to monetary damages and/or criminal penalties for the individual violator. Because such violations are also against University policies and rules, disciplinary action will be taken as appropriate. We, the members of the University of Florida community, pledge to uphold ourselves and our peers to the highest standards of honesty and integrity.

Student Privacy

There are federal laws protecting your privacy with regards to grades earned in courses and on individual assignments. For more information, please see the [Notification to Students of FERPA Rights](#).

Health and Wellness

Crisis Resources: If you or someone you know is struggling with any crisis including but not limited to gender, sexual, racial, or domestic violence, there are many community and University of Florida resources available. Some of these include:

- U Matter, We Care (umatter@ufl.edu, 352-392-1575, <https://umatter.ufl.edu>)
- RESPECT – UF Division of Student Affairs (<https://respect.ufsa.ufl.edu>)
- Counseling and Wellness Center – available 24/7 (352-392-1575, <https://counseling.ufl.edu>)
- Student Health Care Center (352-392-1161, <https://shcc.ufl.edu>)
- Sexual Assault Recovery Services (SARS) Student Health Care Center, 392-1161.

- Multicultural & Diversity Affairs (352-392-1217, <https://multicultural.ufl.edu>) • Hitchcock Field & Fork Pantry- Assisting members of our campus community who experience food insecurity - <https://pantry.fieldandfork.ufl.edu>
- UF Health Shands Emergency Room / Trauma Center (352-733-0111)
- University Police Department at 392-1111 (or 9-1-1 for emergencies), or police.ufl.edu.
- Gainesville Police Department (non-emergency #: 352-955-1818, <https://gainesvillepd.org>)

Academic Resources

- [E-learning technical support](#), 352-392-4357 (select option 2) or e-mail to Learning-support@ufl.edu.
- [Career Connections Center](#), Reitz Union, 392-1601. Career assistance and counseling.
- [Library Support](#), Various ways to receive assistance with respect to using the libraries or finding resources.
- [Teaching Center](#), Broward Hall, 392-2010 or 392-6420. General study skills and tutoring.
- [Writing Studio](#), 302 Tigert Hall, 846-1138. Help brainstorming, formatting, and writing papers.

Course Schedule

* indicates that the item is on electronic course reserve at the UF Libraries.

** indicates that the physical item is on course reserve at the UF Library West.

1/10/2024 Introduction to the course

(No Class: I will be travelling to the Southern Political Science Association Meetings on January 10, so we will not have seminar on that date. Our first class meeting will be January 17.)

Please read and be prepared to discuss on January 17

- Lightman, Alan. "A Sense of the Mysterious." *Daedalus*, 132.4 (2003): 5-21.
- Gustafsson, Karl, and Linus Hagström. "What is the Point? Teaching Graduate Students How to Construct Political Science Research Puzzles." *European Political Science*, 17.4 (2018): 634-648.
- * Carsey, Thomas. 2020. "Tom's Comments: Advice About Graduate School, Finding a Job, Reaching Tenure in Political Science and Other Social Sciences, and All of the Steps in Between." Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Chapel Hill. Chapter 3.

1/17/2024 Social Inquiry and the Scientific Method

- Gerring, John. *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework*. 2nd Edition. Cambridge University Press, 2012. Chapters 1-2.
- * Brady, Henry and David Collier. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2010. Prefaces and Introduction.
- * Carsey, Thomas. 2020. "Tom's Comments: Advice About Graduate School, Finding a Job, Reaching Tenure in Political Science and Other Social Sciences, and All of the Steps in Between." Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Chapel Hill. Chapter 8.
- Hall, Melinda Gann. 1992. "Electoral-Politics and Strategic Voting in State Supreme Courts." *Journal of Politics* 54 (2, May): 427-446.
- White, Ismail K., Chryl N. Laird, and Troy D. Allen. "Selling Out?: The Politics of Navigating Conflicts Between Racial Group Interest and Self-Interest." *American Political Science Review* 108.4 (2014): 783-800.

1/24/2024 Scientific Research

- Gerring, John. *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework*. 2nd Edition. Cambridge University Press, 2012. Chapters 3-4
- * King, Gary, Robert Keohane, Sidney Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry*. Princeton University Press, 1994. Chapters 1 and 2
- * Brady, Henry and David Collier. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2010. Chapter 2.
- Most, Benjamin A. 1990. "Getting started on political research." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 23 (4, December), 592-596.
- Knopf, Jeffrey W. 2006. "Doing a Literature Review." *PS-Political Science & Politics* 39 (1, January): 127-132.
- Samuel Huntington, "Clash of Civilizations," *Foreign Affairs* Summer, 1993.
- Henderson, Errol A., and Richard Tucker. "Clear and Present Strangers: The Clash of Civilizations and International Conflict," *International Studies Quarterly* 45.2 (2001) 317-38.

1/31/2024 Concepts and Measures: The Building Blocks of Research

NOTE: Statement of Intent is due before class.

- Gerring, John. *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework*. 2nd Edition. Cambridge University Press, 2012. Chapters 5-7.
- * King, Gary, Robert Keohane, Sidney Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry*. Princeton University Press, 1994. Section 5.1
- Adcock, Robert and David Collier. "Measurement Validity: A Shared Standard for Qualitative and Quantitative Research." *American Political Science Review*, 95.3 (2001): 529-546.
- Munck, Gerardo and Jay Verkuilen. "Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy: Evaluating Alternative Indices." *Comparative Political Studies*, 35.1 (2002): 5-34.

Supplemental Readings:

- McDonald, Michael and Samuel Popkin. "The Myth of the Vanishing Voter," *American Political Science Review* 95.4 (2001): 963-74.

- Fariss, Christopher. 2014. "Respect for Human Rights Has Improved Over Time: Modeling the Changing Standard of Accountability." *American Political Science Review* 108.2 (2014): 297-318.
- Bailey, Stanley R., Mara Loveman, and Jeronimo O. Muniz. "Measures of "Race" and the Analysis of Racial Inequality in Brazil." *Social Science Research* 42.1 (2013): 106-119.
- Mondak, Jeffery. "Reconsidering the Measurement of Political Knowledge." *Political Analysis* 8.1 (1999): 57-82.
- Postmes, Tom, Alexander Haslam, and Lise Jans. "A Single-item Measure of Social Identification: Reliability, Validity, and Utility," *British Journal of Social Psychology* 52.4 (2013): 597-617.
- Benoit, K., K. Munger & A. Spirling (2019) "Measuring and Explaining Political Sophistication through Textual Complexity." *American Journal of Political Science*, 63, 491-508.
- Hamm, Keith E., Ronald D. Hedlund, and Nancy Martorano. 2006. "Measuring State Legislative Committee Power: Change and Chamber Differences in the 20th Century." *State Politics & Policy Quarterly* 6 (1, Spring): 88-111.

2/7/2024 Building Theories: Inferring vs. Explaining and Other Problems

- Gerring, John. *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework*. 2nd Edition. Cambridge University Press, 2012. Chapters 8-10.
- ** Lave, Charles and James March. *An Introduction to Models in the Social Sciences*. University Press of America, 1993. Chapter 2.
- * Brady, Henry and David Collier. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2010. Chapter 5.
- * King, Gary, Robert Keohane, Sidney Verba. *Designing Social Inquiry*. Princeton University Press, 1994. Chapter 3.

2/14/2024 Political Science Pitfalls: Selection Bias, Validity Issues, and Choosing Levels of Analysis

- ** Skocpol, Theda. *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia and China*. Cambridge University Press, 2015. Chapter 1.
- * Geddes, Barbara. *Paradigms and Sand Castles: Theory Building and Research Design in Comparative Politics*. University of Michigan Press, 2003. Pages 89-129.
- Bennett, Andrew and Colin Elman. "Qualitative Research: Recent Developments in Case Study Methods," *Annual Reviews of Political Science*. 9 (2006): 455-476.
- * King, Gary, Robert Keohane, Sidney Verba. *Designing Social Inquiry*. Princeton University Press, 1994. Section 1.2.3
- Majeski, Stephen and Shane Fricks. "Conflict and Cooperation in International Relations," *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 39.4 (1995): 622-645.

2/21/2024 Research Designs I: Experiments

- * Kinder, Donald R., and Thomas R. Palfrey. 1993. "On Behalf of an Experimental Political Science." In *Experimental Foundations of Political Science*. Eds. Donald R. Kinder, and Thomas R. Palfrey. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press. pp. 1-39.
- Bond, Robert M. et al. "A 61-million-person Experiment in Social Influence and Political Mobilization." *Nature* 489 (2012):295–98.
- Olken, Benjamin. "Monitoring Corruption: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Indonesia." *Journal of Political Economy* 115.2 (2007): 200–49.
- Mattes, Michaela & Jessica L. P. Weeks. 2019. "Hawks, Doves, and Peace: An Experimental Approach." *American Journal of Political Science*, 63 (1, January): 53-66.

2/28/2024 Research Designs II – Correlational Designs

- Bond, Jon. “The Scientification of the Study of Politics: Some Observations on the Behavioral Evolution in Political Science,” *Journal of Politics* 69.4 (2007), 897-907.
- Fuhrmann, Matthew, and Michael C Horowitz. 2015. "When Leaders Matter: Rebel Experience and Nuclear Proliferation." *Journal of Politics* 77: 72-87.
- Stratmann, Thomas and Martin Baur. 2002. "Plurality Rule, Proportional Representation, and the German Bundestag: How Incentives to Pork-Barrel Differ across Electoral Systems." *American Journal of Political Science* 46 (3, July): 506-514.
- Shair-Rosenfield, Sarah and Reed M. Wood. 2017. "Governing Well after War: How Improving Female Representation Prolongs Post-conflict Peace." *Journal of Politics* 79 (3, July): 995-1009.
- Schrodtt, Philip A. "Seven Deadly Sins of Contemporary Quantitative Political Analysis." *Journal of Peace Research* 51.2 (2014): 287-300.

3/6/2024 Research Designs III - Case Study and “Small-N” Analyses

NOTE: Literature reviews are due on Canvas before class.

- Crasnow, Sharon. (2012). The Role of Case Study Research in Political Science: Evidence for Causal Claims. *Philosophy of Science*, 79(5), 655–666.
- * King, Gary, Robert Keohane, Sidney Verba. *Designing Social Inquiry*. Princeton University Press, 1994. Chapter 6.
- * Brady, Henry and David Collier. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2010. Chapters 10 and 11.
- ** Mahoney, James. “Strategies of Causal Assessment in Comparative Historical Analysis,” in James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer eds. *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003. pp. 337-72.
- Doner, Richard, Bryan Ritchie and Dan Slater. “Systematic Vulnerability and the Origins of Developmental States: Northeast and Southeast Asia in Comparative Perspective,” *International Organization* 59.2 (2005): 327-61.
- Elman, Colin. 2004. "Extending Offensive Realism: The Louisiana Purchase and America's Rise to Regional Hegemony." *American Political Science Review* 98 (4, November): 563-576.

3/20/2024 What Does it Mean to be an (Un)Ethical Social Scientist?

- Milgram, Stanley (1963). Behavioral Study of Obedience. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 67 (4): 371-378.
- Johnson, Jeremy B. 2018. "Protecting the Community: Lessons from the Montana Flyer Project." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 51(3): 615–19.
- Fujii, Lee Ann (2012). Research ethics 101: Dilemmas and responsibilities. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 45(4), 717-723.
- Cronin-Furman, Kate, and Milli Lake. 2018. "Ethics Abroad: Fieldwork in Fragile and Violent Contexts." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 51(3): 607–14
- Michelson, Melissa R. 2016. "The Risk of Over-Reliance on the Institutional Review Board: An Approved Project Is Not Always an Ethical Project." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 49(2): 299–303.
- Optional
- Humphreys, Macartan. 2015. Reflections on the Ethics of Social Experimentation. *Journal of Globalization and Development* 6 (1): 87-112.
- Phillips, Trisha. (2021). Ethics of field experiments. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 24, 277–300.

3/27/2024 Theory and Method Workshop

Each student will do a brief presentation (8-10 minutes). After stating their research question, students will provide a theoretical statement about the political process they are studying, from which we can derive more expectations. In their presentations, students should identify scope conditions (to whom the theory applies, when, and why). Students should also describe what methodological approach they believe would be most conducive to testing their theory.

4/3/2024 Diverse Approaches in American

- Fenno, Richard. "US House Members in Their Constituencies: An Exploration," *American Political Science Review* 71, 3 (1977): 883-917.
- Franko, William W., Nathan J. Kelly, and Christopher Witko. 2016. "Class Bias in Voter Turnout, Representation, and Income Inequality." *Perspectives on Politics* 14(2): 351–68.
- ** Kingdon, John W. 1973. *Congressmen's Voting Decisions*. Chapter 1.
- Costa, Mia. 2021. "Ideology, Not Affect: What Americans Want from Political Representation." *American Journal of Political Science* 65: 342-358.

4/10/2024 Diverse Approaches in Comparative

- Cederman, Lars-Erik, Andreas Wimmer, and Brian Min. "Why do Ethnic Groups Rebel? New Data and Analysis," *World Politics*, 62.1 (2010): 87-119.
- Varshney, Ashutosh. "Ethnic Conflict and Civil Society: India and Beyond," *World Politics* (2001) 362-98.
- McClendon, Gwyneth. "Race and Responsiveness: An Experiment with South African Politicians," *Journal of Experimental Political Science* 3 (2016): 60-74.
- Posner, Daniel. "The Political Salience of Cultural Difference: Why Chewas and Tumbukas are Allies in Zambia and Adversaries in Malawi." *American Political Science Review* 98.4 (2004): 529-545.

4/17/2024 Diverse Approaches in International Relations

- Owen, John. 1994. "How Liberalism Produces Democratic Peace," *International Security* 19.2
- Maoz, Zeev, and Bruce Russett. "Normative and Structural Causes of Democratic Peace, 1946–1986." *American Political Science Review* 87.3 (1993): 624-638.
- Tomz, Michael R., and Jessica L. P. Weeks. 2013. "Public Opinion and the Democratic Peace." *American Political Science Review* 107(4): 849–65.
- Oren, Ido. "The Subjectivity of the Democratic Peace: Changing U.S. Perceptions of Imperial Germany," *International Security* 20.2 (1995): 147-184.

4/24/2024 Workshopping Research Designs

Each participant will orally present the draft research proposal. The order of the presentations will be randomly determined, but announced before the presentation date.

Presentations may utilize the overhead projector and software of your choice (Adobe, Powerpoint, Prezi, or something else). Presentations should include

1. an introduction to the research question which grabs attention and quickly orients audience to the overall purpose of the study;
2. an orientation to the literature, which explains its development or sorts into “camps”;
3. a clearly defined, testable research question, which is placed in the context of the literature;
4. a research design that
 - states one or more testable hypotheses;
 - proposes the basic strategy for testing those hypotheses (experiment, field experiment, historical analysis, case study, etc.);
 - articulates strategies for sampling or case selection, measurement, observation, and causal inference;
 - highlights the strengths in internal validity, external validity, or both.
5. a conclusion that highlights the value of the research in the context of the academic literature or the practical value of the research, as well as the challenges

Presentations should be confident, well-structured, clear, and geared toward an intelligent audience of political scientists who are not experts in the subfield.

Each participant (and Martinez) will evaluate the other presentations, and offer suggestions for improvement before the final submission.

4/29/2024 Final proposals are due on Canvas at 12:00 Noon