

**Conduct of Inquiry:**  
POS 6736 Section 06GG

Spring 2019  
Thursday Periods 5-7 (11:45 am – 2:45 pm)  
Dr. Benjamin Smith  
002 Anderson  
352-273-2345  
*bbsmith@ufl.edu*  
benjaminbsmith.net

Office Hours: M 130-3pm, Th 10-1130am

Your job as a Ph.D. student in political science is to write a good dissertation. What is a good Ph.D. dissertation, and how do we know one when we see it? First, it must accomplish what Theda Skocpol describes to her own graduate students as “product differentiation.” That is, your dissertation project must establish you as an innovative scholar who has given the world a new explanation for a real-world political phenomenon. Second, it must convince us that your flashy new product in fact provides what it promises; it does so by making clear the means by which your data were collected, analyzed, and interpreted and to some degree by sticking to accepted strategies of social scientific inquiry. More on what I mean by that later.

In short, you need an interesting and researchable question to answer, and you need the tools to answer the question feasibly and convincingly. In this course you will learn something about developing doable research questions and figuring out how best to answer them. I want to put my own methodological biases on the table by stating that to my mind research problems or questions come first. The appropriate methods to answer those questions come second. And all research methods contain their own specific logics, strengths, and weaknesses; whether scholars employ one method or multiple ones, they need to understand all three aspects and choose thoughtfully rather than to follow fads or trends. Following this course, you will begin to fill your toolbox with research skills in specialized methods classes.

You will also learn something about numerous research methods, from aggregate statistical data analysis to case studies and structured comparisons to experiments to reflexive critical inquiry and textual interpretation. My primary goal (and job) here is not to stuff your heads with knowledge, but to teach you a) how to recognize various strategies that scholars use to “create” or organize knowledge, b) to critique different research approaches thoughtfully and on their own terms, and c) to lay the groundwork for becoming a knowledge producer in your own right. This last one is our collective job as faculty; to help you acquire the tools to craft your own scholarly work, find meaningful employment, and go away with your Ph.D in hand.

We will spend a good portion of the semester addressing “big” questions from the three major empirical subfields of political science: American politics, comparative politics, and international relations. We will look, for a start, at how Americanists study political

representation, how comparativists investigate the dynamics of ethnic politics, and how IR scholars explore the democratic peace thesis (i.e. that democracies don't fight one another).

Finally, you'll learn something about some of the nuts and bolts involved in doing social science research, such as evaluating the external vs. internal validity of research, appropriate levels of analysis for inquiry, inference in social inquiry, causal identification, and so on.

The bulk of your grade in this course (50%) will be based on your completion of a research design, which you will develop in consultation with me according to your own research interests. Statistically speaking, most of you will not write what becomes your dissertation prospectus; that is fine. What I expect from the exercise is that you will find a viable research question that hopefully hasn't been definitively answered already (although there will probably be multiple competing answers), think long and hard about what kind of logic of inquiry your question is likely to demand, and construct a plan of action for building theory, collecting data and analyzing it. This assignment will take shape in parts. On **January 24**, you'll submit a statement of intent, outlining the topic and question based on prior consultation with me. On **March 14**, you will submit a draft of your literature review. On **April 11**, you will submit a draft of the research design itself for feedback from me and your fellow students. The "final" version is due on **April 29** at noon.

The remaining 50% of the grade will come from participation in seminar discussions (20%) and from three response papers of approximately 1250-1500 words (30%). **I want to be very clear that participation grades are not a giveaway. Completion of all readings before we meet to discuss them, evidence of having read and thought about them, a willingness to engage the materials and the ideas of your colleagues, are all mandatory.** Please, take this seriously. You could write a brilliant prospectus, turn in splendid short assignments, and earn a B- by not actively participating in discussion.

I will circulate a guide to writing response papers early in the semester. You may choose which weeks in which you write and submit them, with only two rules: **they must be submitted to Canvas prior to the start of class in the week you write them** (i.e. you write about the readings for that week and submit the paper prior to our discussion of them), and **you must submit at least one response paper on or before February 7.**

Requirements for class attendance and make-up exams, assignments, and other work in this course are consistent with university policies that can be found in the online catalog at: <https://catalog.ufl.edu/ugrad/current/regulations/info/attendance.aspx>

Students requesting classroom accommodation must first register with the Dean of Student Office. The Dean of Students Office will provide documentation to the student who must then provide this documentation to the instructor when requesting accommodation.

Information on UF policies for grading may be found here: <https://catalog.ufl.edu/ugrad/current/regulations/info/grades.aspx>

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 (<http://www.dso.ufl.edu/sccr/process/student-conduct-honor-code/>) specifies a number of behaviors that are in violation of this code and the possible sanctions. Furthermore, you are obliged to report any condition that facilitates academic misconduct to appropriate personnel. If you have any questions or concerns, please consult with me.

Important contact information for university counseling services and mental health services: 392-1575, <http://www.counseling.ufl.edu/cwc/Default.aspx>. For the University Police Department: 392-1111 or 9-1-1 for emergencies.

While I have endeavored to keep the readings within the bounds of an acceptably heavy graduate workload, this course is going to demand much of you, so be prepared. You should come to each class meeting with all readings and assignments completed beforehand, with your own written or typed summary of the readings, three questions to bring to the discussion (to be emailed to me by 8am each Wednesday morning), and a general willingness to engage the materials. Students who come unprepared are likely to be asked to leave; this is a seminar, therefore a team effort, and there is no free riding.

The following books are required and are available at local bookstores and online:

Henry Brady and David Collier, eds. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (RSI)

Gary King, Robert Keohane, Sidney Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry* (DSI)

Steven Van Evera, *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*

John Gerring, *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (SSM)

As you will discover in reading these books, DSI, RSI and SSM present quite different ways of thinking about social science research. This kind of spirited disagreement is what characterizes political science today, even within the broad approach to explanation that we call positivism.

Note: Van Evera’s book, in my opinion, is at its most valuable as a guide to writing a proposal. That in mind, I’ve only asked you to read 2 chapters from it for discussion, but I hope that in developing your research designs you’ll find it a useful reference.

There are also many additional readings, drawn from academic journals and edited volumes. Since this is your first graduate seminar (at UF, at least) in research design, one important skill to learn is tracking down the materials that define the parameters of different research programs. To that end, you will need to access many of the readings through the UF libraries online system. In addition to saving you money, you’ll acquire a good sense of what is available through our libraries and how to get it.

## Schedule of Readings.

Readings noted as “online” can be found on the UF libraries’ online access system. You can access them remotely from off campus by installing UF’s virtual private network software (VPN) here - <http://www.uflib.ufl.edu/login/vpn.html> - and then searching for the articles on Google Scholar, my search engine of choice for academic work.

### January 10. What Does it Mean to Study Politics Scientifically?

Why do we become scientists, or social scientists, and what does being a social scientist entail? How much does it seem like what we thought we were getting ourselves into when applying to grad school? An introduction to the course, the PhD program, and all of the rest of us.

- Alan, Lightman, “A Sense of the Mysterious,” *Daedalus* Fall 2003, 5-21. Online.

### January 17. A Primer on How to Do It, with Examples.

Today we look at some arguments about what social science actually is and take a brief look at a big question in international and comparative political economy: do oil-rich countries suffer political instability that other countries do not? What led us to think they do/do not?

- Van Evera, Chapter 1.
- John Gerring, *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework*. Preface and Chapters 1 and 2.
- Terry Karl, “Reflections on the Paradox of Plenty,” *Journal of International Affairs*, 53, 1, 31-48 Fall 1999. Online.
- Terry Karl, pre-publication communication with me (to be sent by email)
- Benjamin Smith, “Oil Wealth and Regime Survival in the Developing World, 1960-1999,” *American Journal of Political Science* (2004): 232-46. Available on the research page of my website.

### January 24

**NOTE: Your statements of research design topic and question are due today.**

Today we’ll discuss conceptions of what it means to do social scientific research, beginning with what has become, rightly or wrongly, the dominant statement on the subject: King, Keohane, and Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry*. We’ll also take a look at a provocative statement from the field of international relations, and some efforts to subject it to serious testing.

- KKV Chapter 1
- Gerring, chapters 3-4.
- Samuel Huntington, “Clash of Civilizations,” *Foreign Affairs* Summer 1993. Online.

- Errol Henderson and Richard Tucker, “Clear and Present Strangers: The Clash of Civilizations and International Conflict,” *International Studies Quarterly* 47 (2001) 317-38.

**January 31. Concepts and Measures: the Building Blocks of Research.**

- Gerring, Chapters 5-7.
- KKV, Section 5.1
- Brady and Collier, Chapter 3.
- Michael McDonald and Samuel Popkin, “The Myth of the Vanishing Voter,” *American Political Science Review* 95, 4, December 2001: 963-74. Online at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3117725>

**February 7: Building Theories: Inferring vs. Explaining and Other Problems.**

- Gerring, Chapters 8-10.
- Charles Lave and James March, *An Introduction to Models in the Social Sciences*, chapter 2 “An Introduction to Speculation.”
- Brady and Collier, Chapter 5.
- KKV, Chapter 3.

**February 14. Some of the “Greatest Hits” of Research Pitfalls: Selection Bias, Validity Issues, and Choosing Levels of Analysis.**

- Theda Skocpol, *States and Social Revolutions*, Chapter 1.
- Barbara Geddes, “How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get,” in Geddes, *Paradigms and Sand Castles* (Michigan 2003), 89-129.
- Andrew Bennett and Colin Elman, “Qualitative Research: Recent Developments in Case Study Methods,” *Annual Reviews of Political Science*”
- KKV, Section 1.2.3
- Stephen Majeski and Shane Fricks, “Conflict and Cooperation in International Relations,” *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 39, No. 4. (Dec., 1995), pp. 622-645. Online.

**February 21. Research Designs, Part I. Statistical Studies. The Why and How.**

Readings:

- Peter Kennedy, *A Guide to Econometrics*, Introduction pp. 1-9.
- Daniel Little, *Varieties of Social Explanation: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Social Science*, Chapter 8 (pp 159-79).
- Jon R. Bond, “The Scientification of the Study of Politics: Some Observations on the Behavioral Evolution in Political Science,” *Journal of Politics* 69, 4 (Nov. 2007), 897-907. Online.

**February 28. Presentation of Initial topics and thoughts on research designs.**

**March 7: No class. Spring Break.**

**March 14. Research Designs, Part II. Case Study and “Small-N” Studies. The Why and How.**

- Van Evera, Chapter 2.
- KKV, Chapter 6.
- Brady and Collier, Chapters 10 and 11.
- James Mahoney, “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.
- Richard Doner, Bryan Ritchie and Dan Slater, “Systematic Vulnerability and the Origins of Developmental States: Northeast and Southeast Asia in Comparative Perspective,” *International Organization* 59, 2 (Spring 2005), 327-61.

**March 21. Research Designs, Part III. Experimental Methods.**  
**Please submit the draft literature review at the start of class.**

- David Samuels and Cesar Zucco, “The Power of Partisanship in Brazil,” *American Journal of Political Science* 58, 1: 212-225.
- Thad Dunning, “Improving Causal Inference: Strengths and Limitations of Natural Experiments,” *Political Research Quarterly* 61, 2 (June 2008): 282-293.
- Susan Hyde, “The Observer Effect in International Politics: Evidence from a Natural Experiment,” *World Politics* 60, 1 (2007), 37-63.
- Claire Adida, Lauren Davenport, and Gwyneth McClendon 2016, “Ethnic Cueing Across Minorities: A Survey Experiment on Candidate Evaluation in the United States,” *Political Opinion Quarterly* 80, 4: 815-36.
- Scott Desposato, “Ethical Challenges and Some Solutions for Field Experiments,” available here: <http://www.desposato.org/ethicsfieldexperiments.pdf>

**March 28. Big Questions in American Politics: What is Representation, and How Does it Happen?**

- Richard Fenno, “US House Members in Their Constituencies: An Exploration,” *American Political Science Review* 71, 3 (Sep. 1977): 883-917. Online.
- Bartels, Larry 1991. Constituency Opinion and Congressional Policy Making: The Reagan Defense Buildup. *American Political Science Review* 85, 2 (June 1991):457-474. Online
- John Kingdon, *Congressmen’s Voting Decisions*, Chapter 1. I’ll make this available.
- David Broockman, “Black Politicians are More Intrinsically Motivated to Advance Blacks’ Interests: A Field Experiment Manipulating Political Incentives,” *American Journal of Political Science* 57, 3 (July 2013): 521-36.

**April 4:** No class meeting: I am out of town for ISA and MPSA. Use this bye week to finish the full draft of your research design.

**April 11. Big Questions in Comparative Politics: Why do ethnic differences produce conflict in some locales but not others?**

Full draft due of your research design.

- Lars-Erik Cederman, Andreas Wimmer and Brian Min, “Why do Ethnic Groups Rebel? New Data and Analysis,” *World Politics*, 62, 1 (January 2010): 87-119..
- Ashutosh Varshney, “Ethnic Conflict and Civil Society: India and Beyond,” *World Politics* April 2001, 362-98
- Gwyneth McClendon, “Race and Responsiveness: An Experiment with South African Politicians,” working paper, Harvard University.

**April 18. Big Questions in International Relations: Is There a Democratic Peace?**

- John Owen, “How Liberalism Produces Democratic Peace,” *International Security* 19, 2 (Autumn 1994), 87-125. Online.
- Zeev Maoz and Bruce Russett, “Normative and Structural Causes of Democratic Peace, 1946-1986,” *American Political Science Review* 87, 3 (September 1993), 624-38. Online.
- Michael Tomz and Jessica Weeks, “The Democratic Peace: An Experimental Approach,” working paper, Stanford University..
- Ido Oren, “The Subjectivity of the Democratic Peace: Changing U.S. Perceptions of Imperial Germany,” *International Security* 20, 2 (Autumn 1995), 147-84. Online.

**April 29: Final draft of Research Design due by noon, to Canvas.**