

POL 214A: The Scientific Study of Politics

University of California, Davis

Winter, 2014

W 3:10-6:00pm

Kerr 594

Instructor: Dr. Amber Boydston
Email: aboydstun@ucdavis.edu
Office: 684 Kerr Hall
Office Hours: M 1:30-2:30pm & W 8:30-9:30am (or by appointment)

“As we know,
There are known knowns.
There are things we know we know.
We also know there are known unknowns.
That is to say, we know there are some things we do not know.
But there are also unknown unknowns,
The ones we don't know we don't know.”

– Donald Rumsfeld, Feb. 12, 2002 Dept. of Defense News Briefing

Seminar Description

How do we know what we know about politics? How do we assess critically the quality of political analysis and the knowledge obtained from such analysis? POL214A is the first half of a two-quarter seminar designed to address these and other questions. The ultimate aim: to hone your skills as a political scientist. Toward that aim, the course is structured around three key components:

- 1. The Scientific Method**
- 2. Research Design Approaches**
- 3. Your Project**

The **Scientific Method** component is designed to introduce you to the principles of social scientific research and to strengthen your logic and critical thinking skills—necessary conditions for doing high-quality work in political science. We will focus on large epistemological questions as well as the nitty gritty of good research design, giving you the tools you need to develop robust research designs of your own and to evaluate more systematically the research of others. That said, no single course can provide more than a brief introduction to such principles; this course should be the foundation for a career-long education in the scientific method. In addition to reading assignments and five Summary/Pushing assignments (more on these below), for this portion of the course I will ask you to develop a theoretical model from a list of variable parameters.

The **Research Design Approaches** component is designed to give you a buffet-style sampling of common research design approaches in political science. As with the scientific method

component, our investigation into research design approaches will merely scratch the surface. By virtue of this course, you will not become an expert in any single research approach (you'll have to do that on your own and/or in specialized methods classes), but we'll get a sense of the lay of the land. No matter how narrow your research design interests may be at the moment, having a basic understanding of a wide variety of approaches will make you a better colleague. Just as importantly, by highlighting factors that *condition* the choice of alternative research design strategies, this component of the course will give you greater traction in solving research problems you encounter throughout your career. In addition to reading assignments for this portion of the course, you will be responsible for one or more class presentations about the research design for that week. Also, each week we will discuss ways that the research design in question could be applied to testing diverse questions in political science, so come prepared with ideas.

The **Your Project** component is designed to guide you through the process of developing an article-length manuscript, ultimately of publishable quality. This manuscript will be due in complete form at the end of the spring quarter, but you will be expected to make substantial progress this winter quarter. After the manuscript is complete, you might choose to submit this paper to a journal, use it as the essay for your qualifying exam at the end of your third year, incorporate it as a chapter of your dissertation, or some/all of the above. Beyond this single manuscript, our work this year should help you to start thinking about your dissertation and your broader research agenda. Throughout the winter quarter, you will be responsible for four assignments designed to help you stay on track with your project. At the end of the quarter, you will showcase the work you have done on your project in two forms: 1) the written front half of your paper (i.e., your introduction through what should be a nearly-airtight research design), and 2) a research poster presenting this first half of your project. Our poster session will be held the last week of class, and all department faculty and graduate students will be invited to attend. As a heads up, at the end of the spring quarter you will showcase your finished project in the form of an individual research presentation (20 minutes) and Q&A session (15 minutes), to which faculty and graduate students will again be invited.

A syllabus is like a contract, so in the document that follows I've tried to specify lots of details, sometimes in relatively harsh language. Don't be turned off. We'll read a wide variety of very interesting things and you'll learn a lot in this class. I am excited to teach it and am looking forward to each week of what follows. I certainly hope it will be one of the best courses you ever take.

Required Texts

In addition to journal articles, we will be relying predominantly on two books. Both are available at the campus bookstore, in used form on the Internet, on loan from me, or borrowed from a classmate. Required articles will be available on SmartSite.

(King, Keohane & Verba) King, Gary, Robert Keohane and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

(Lave and March) Lave, Charles A. and James G. March. 1993. *An Introduction to Models in the Social Sciences*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Additional Suggested Texts

The Trochim & Donnelly book would be good to have, but you could probably get by swapping the book back and forth with a classmate.

(Trochim & Donnelly) William M. K. Trochim and James P. Donnelly. 2007. *The Research Methods Knowledge Base*. 3rd Edition. Cincinnati: Atomic Dog Publishing.

The rest are absolutely not necessary to buy. But good resources to know about (and we will be reading/skimming the Fiorina et al. book in full).

(Brady & Collier) Brady, Henry and David Collier, Eds. 2004. *Rethinking Social Inquiry*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, Publishers.

(Campbell & Stanley) Campbell, Donald T. and Julian C. Stanley. 1963. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

(Fiorina, Abrams & Pope) Fiorina, Morris P., Samuel A. Abrams, and Jeremy C. Pope. 2010. *Culture War? The Myth of a Polarized America* (3rd Edition). New York: Longman.

(Kreps) Kreps, David M. 1990. *Game Theory and Economic Modeling*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

(Miller & Page) Miller, John H. and Scott E. Page. 2007. *Complex Adaptive Systems*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

(Popper) Popper, Karl R. 1959. *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. New York, NY: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Also Required: Project Folder

You will need a folder with pockets (you know, the kind with Batman or a Care Bear or some other cool cat on the front cover) that you will use to store your assignments. Each time you submit an assignment, you will need to include the hard copy of the assignment in this folder along with the graded hard copies of all previous assignments—and also post the electronic version of the assignment on SmartSite.

Grading

Attendance and Participation:	20%
Summary & Pushing Assignments, 5 x 4%:	20%
Scientific Method Assignment, 1 x 10%:	10%
Research Design Approach Presentation(s):	10%
Your Project:	
Assignments, 4 x 5%:	20%
Research Proposal Paper:	10%
Research Proposal Poster:	10%
Total:	100%

Instructions for the **Scientific Method**, **Research Design Approach**, and **Your Project** assignments listed above will be detailed in separate documents (one for each category) on SmartSite, listed under Resources/Assignments.

Attendance and Participation (20%)

A seminar is a collaborative endeavor. In order for this seminar to be a success, you must come to class prepared to discuss the readings. Specifically, you should already be familiar with the main points of each reading and be ready to raise (and answer) interesting questions.

Even though you may have picked up a strong understanding of research design in your time thus far at Davis, we will start from a blank slate. Thus, it's perfectly fine to be confused by the material, and it's great to ask lots of questions. What I do expect is that you read, think, and talk—preferably in that order. Each week you should read all the required readings, carefully and critically, and come to class prepared to discuss them.

Class participation is a must. Short of extenuating circumstances—which you should discuss with me on the first day of class if not before—silence is not acceptable in a graduate seminar. I reserve the right to call on students individually, and I will do so. No student can be a passive participant in this class and receive higher than a B+ for the course, assuming all other work is perfect. Come prepared. Talk. Participate. Ask questions. *Carpe diem!*

Participation (showing up, having done the readings, and engaging in class discussion) is worth 20% of your grade for this class. Since there are only 10 class sessions, that's 2%—or 1/5 of a letter grade—per class based just on participation. You can see this fact as a good thing or a bad thing, depending on your habits of preparation, procrastination, and participation. If you're used to coming to your graduate classes fully prepared and excited to participate, great. If not, let this be a wonderful opportunity for you to turn over a new proverbial leaf.

Additionally, each week I strongly encourage you to send me—via email—questions you had about the readings in advance of class (ideally 24 hours in advance). These questions might involve points of confusion or clarification, or ponderings about the connections between readings, or questions about how/why the author structured the article that way—or even, why are we reading this? Why is it important? These questions will help focus our weekly discussions on what you want to talk about.

Summary & Pushing Assignments (20%)

Five times throughout the quarter, you will be assigned to write a summary of one of the readings for the following week, accompanied by a discussion giving critical push back against the piece and pushing the ideas forward through discussion of how they could be strengthened, extended, etc. If you want, you can write one of your Summary & Pushing assignments on an article of your choice from your specialized field. Summary & Pushing assignments are due in electronic (uploaded to SmartSite) and hard copy (under my office door) form by 24 hours before the start of class (i.e., by each Tuesday at 3pm). If you would like to replace one of your grades from these assignments, you can talk with me about writing a sixth one—just be sure to talk with me well before the end of the quarter. Guidelines:

Formatting

- Include your name and the author and article you're working with
- 12-point font
- All margins set at 1"
- Single spaced
- No more than one page (can be shorter!) for each part (summary & pushing), so that your final document should fit on one double-sided sheet of paper
- Begin each new item (e.g., puzzle, research question) on a new line

Summary

- Begin with a brief overview (max 100 words) of the reading's main point and core conclusions, making sure to highlight the "hummable tune."
- Then identify the elements of a social science paper (skipping the lit review, unless it's directly relevant to how the authors build their argument):
 1. Puzzle
 2. Research Question
 3. Significance
 4. *[Lit Review—optional]*
 5. Theory
 6. Hypotheses
 7. Data/Evidence
 8. Research Design
 - This section should get the most attention; be very explicit in your discussion
 - If applicable, identify the independent and dependent variables and exactly how they operationalize the moving parts of the theory above
 9. Findings & Conclusion
 10. Implications

Pushing

- Offer a constructive critique (push back) of the piece: identifying the good, the bad, and what could have been done to make the bad good.
- Then offer a constructive discussion (push forward) of how the ideas in the piece could be better developed, better tested, theoretically extended, applied in other areas, etc.
- Think of a pushing as the next step in your "conversation" with the reading after you have read the work closely, grappled with it, and allowed everything to percolate in your brain.

Late Assignments

All assignments are due prior to the start of class (24 hours prior for the **Summary & Pushings** and 48 hours prior for all other assignments). Assignments must be submitted by the respective deadline in both electronic (uploaded to SmartSite) AND hard copy (under my door) form. Late assignments will be accepted but marked down one half letter grade (i.e., 5%) for each 24 hours or portion thereof after the deadline, including weekends and holidays. For example, an assignment due Tuesday at 3pm but not submitted until after 3pm on Thursday of the same week would be marked down a full letter grade (i.e., 10%) below the earned grade. Bottom line: Don't go there. However, at the end of the quarter, your research proposal paper and your poster will not be accepted after the deadline, period. You are responsible for staying in touch with me throughout the quarter about your progress on your research project, especially if you experience any difficulties.

Laptops and Other Electronics

I love my laptop. And my iPad. However, I have found them to be strangely distracting in a seminar environment. Thus, I ask that you resort to old-school paper copies of journal articles and old-school pen-and-paper note taking. In other words, please do NOT use your laptop (or tablet or smartphone or any other electronic reading device) in class. If you have a particular learning style that is particularly benefitted by looking at articles on a screen or typing your notes, please feel free to talk with me and I will be happy to consider an exception. Finally, just like at the movies, please silence your phones.

Disabilities

UC Davis encourages qualified people with disabilities to participate in its programs and activities and is committed to the policy that all people shall have equal access to programs, facilities, and admissions without regard to personal characteristics not related to ability, performance, or qualifications as determined by University policy or by state or federal authorities. I am strongly committed to the same policy. If you feel you may need an accommodation based on the impact of a disability, you need to contact the Student Disability Center at (530) 752-3184 as soon as possible to identify and document your specific needs. Additionally, it is your responsibility to contact me privately immediately at the beginning of the quarter so we can discuss how to accommodate your needs. Do not wait until just before an assignment deadline or an exam to inform me of a learning disability; any accommodations for disabilities must be arranged well in advance.

Academic Dishonesty¹

UC Davis and the Political Science Dept. take violations of academic dishonesty seriously, as do I. Observing basic honesty in one's work, words, ideas, and actions is a principle to which all members of the community are required to subscribe. Academic integrity cases will be sent to Student Judicial Affairs, and penalties consistent with University guidelines will be imposed.

¹ Much of the text in this section has been directly obtained from the sections of the Princeton University website on Rights, Rules, and Responsibilities: <<http://www.princeton.edu/pr/pub/rrr>>.

All course work is to be done on an individual basis unless I clearly state otherwise. Any reference materials used in the preparation of any assignment must be explicitly cited. See the following link for tips on how to avoid plagiarism: <<http://sja.ucdavis.edu/files/plagiarism.pdf>>. In general, every time you use another person's idea, you must cite the person at the end of the sentence in which you use the idea. Every time you use a specific phrase, even if the phrase is only two words long (e.g., "the fourth branch of government" or "streams of policymaking"), you must put the phrase in quotation marks and cite the original author at the end of the sentence in which you use the phrase. Citations should be based on the Chicago Manual of Style, specifically the APSA Style Guide. Importantly, lying to or purposely misleading me or any other university official shall also constitute a serious violation of academic integrity.

Weekly Assignments and Topics

The list below indicates reading and assignment deadlines. Journal articles and book selections not contained in the books required for this course will be available on SmartSite under Resources/Readings. **You should do each day's readings before that day's class. All assignments are due prior to class: 24 hours prior for Summary & Pushing assignments and 48 hours prior for all other assignments.**

Note: You are responsible for reading all required readings in detail—i.e., being ready to present each reading to the rest of the class. One exception: Items marked with an asterisk (*) are ones that fall on especially heavy reading weeks. For these items, some students will be responsible for reading in detail and all others will be responsible for (thoroughly skimming).

Week 1: January 8

SCIENTIFIC METHOD: Overview

Required Reading:

- Syllabus (yep, all 13 pages)
- Barry Weingast, "Structuring Your Papers (Caltech Rules)" Document
- Boydston's "The Ten Elements of a Good Social Science Project" Document
- Betty H. Zisk, 1970. The Compleat Jargoner: How to Obfuscate the Obvious Without Half Trying. *The Western Political Quarterly*, 23: 55-56.

RESEARCH APPROACHES: Overview

Suggested Reading:

- Lee Sigelman. 2006. The Coevolution of American Political Science and the *American Political Science Review*. *American Political Science Review*, 100(4): 463-478.

YOUR PROJECT: Overview; Discuss Project Ideas and Advisors

Required Reading:

- Baumgartner's "Backwards Calendar" Document
- Patricelli's "Scientific Method" Document

Suggested Reading:

- Benesh, Sara C. 2001. The Key to a Successful Prospectus: Consult an Advisor, Early and Often. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 34(4): 853-854.
- Peters, Robert L. 1997. *Getting What You Came For* (Farr, Straus and Giroux): pp. 28-32. (Peters is writing for a hard sciences audience of prospective grad students who need to select their advisors before entering grad school, but much of the advice is applicable to political science as well)

PhD Comics for the Day: <http://www.phdcomics.com/comics/archive.php?comid=360>
<http://www.phdcomics.com/comics/archive.php?comid=1012>

Week 2: January 15

SCIENTIFIC METHOD: The Scientific Study of Politics

Required Reading:

Trochim & Donnelly, Ch. 1 Parts 1 & 2 (pp. 4-23)

King, Keohane, and Verba, Ch. 1

Boydston, Amber E. and Alison Ledgerwood. ND. On the Limits of Reframing Effects.

RESEARCH APPROACHES: Content Analysis & Developing a Codebook

Suggested Reading:

Policy Agendas Project (<http://www.policyagendas.org/>). Browse the website, paying attention to the codebook, datasets, and various applications that have been published.

Baumgartner, Frank R., Suzanna Linn, and Amber E. Boydston. 2009. The Decline of the Death Penalty: How Media Framing Changed Capital Punishment in America. In Schaffner, Brian F. and Patrick Sellers (eds), *Winning with Words: The Origins and Impact of Framing*. New York, NY: Routledge.

YOUR PROJECT: Plan of Attack

***DUE TUESDAY: Backwards Calendar & Signed Advising Sheet

PhD Comic for the Day: <http://www.phdcomics.com/comics/archive.php?comid=177>

Week 3: January 22

SCIENTIFIC METHOD: Theory Building

Required Reading:

Euclid Reading

Lave & March, Chs. 1-3

Carpenter, Dan. 2002. Groups, the Media, Agency Waiting Costs, and FDA Drug Approval. *American Journal of Political Science*, 46(3): 490-505.

RESEARCH APPROACHES: Experiments

Suggested Reading:

Trochim & Donnelly Ch. 9

Campbell & Stanley (all)

McDermott, Rose. 2002. Experimental Methods in Political Science. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 5: 31-61.

Druckman, James N., Donald P. Green, James H. Kuklinski, and Arthur Lupia. 2006. The Growth and Development of Experimental Research in Political Science. *American Political Science Review*, 100: 627-635.

Gerber, Alan and Donald Green. 2000. The Effects of Canvassing, Telephone Calls, and Direct Mail on Voter Turnout. *American Political Science Review*, 93(3): 653-663.

YOUR PROJECT: Discuss Assignments

***DUE JAN. 20: Assignment #1

PhD Comics for the Day: <http://www.phdcomics.com/comics/archive.php?comid=62>
<http://www.phdcomics.com/comics/archive.php?comid=63>

Week 4: January 29

SCIENTIFIC METHOD: Logic and Causal Inference

Required Reading:

- King, Keohane and Verba, Ch. 2 (and reread Ch. 1 if you forgot it)
- Campbell, Donald T. and H. Laurence Ross. 1970. The Connecticut Crackdown on Speeding. In Edward R. Tufte (Ed.), *The Quantitative Analysis of Social Problems*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wessley. Pgs. 110-125.
- Jennings, M. Kent and Gregory B. Markus. 1977. The Effect of Military Service on Political Attitudes: A Panel Study. *American Political Science Review*, 71(1): 131-147.

Suggested Reading:

- Fearon, James D. 1991. Counterfactuals and Hypothesis Testing in Political Science. *World Politics*, 43: 169-195.
- Chs. 1 & 2 from Lebow, Richard Ned. 2010. *Forbidden Fruit: Counterfactuals and International Relations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

RESEARCH APPROACHES: Surveys, Interviews, and Question Wording

Suggested Reading:

- Trochim & Donnelly, Chs. 4 & 5
- Fenno, Richard F. 1977. U.S. House Members in Their Constituencies: An Exploration. *American Political Science Review*, 71(3): 883-917.
- Hojnacki, Marie and David C. Kimball. 1998. Organized Interests and the Decision of Whom to Lobby in Congress. *American Political Science Review*, 92(4): 775-790.
- Codebook for the American National Election Studies, 1948–2008. Start by reading the “Introduction” pdf at this link: <http://electionstudies.org/studypages/cdf/cdf.htm>
- Pay attention to sampling procedures, personal vs. phone interviews, response rates, survey administration methods, question wording experiments, etc.

YOUR PROJECT: Discuss Assignments

***DUE JAN. 27: Assignment #2

PhD Comics for the Day: <http://www.phdcomics.com/comics/archive.php?comid=1108>
<http://www.phdcomics.com/comics/archive.php?comid=1111>

Week 5: February 5

SCIENTIFIC METHOD: In-Class Discussion of Models

***DUE FEB. 3: Modeling Assignment

Required Reading:

- King, Keohane and Verba, Ch. 3
- Fulton, Sarah. In Press. When Gender Matters: Macro-Dynamics and Micro-Mechanisms. *Political Behavior*.
- Boudreau, Cheryl. 2009. Closing the Gap: When Do Cues Eliminate Differences between Sophisticated and Unsophisticated Citizens? *Journal of Politics*, 71(3): 964-976.

RESEARCH APPROACHES: Methods of Political Theory

Required Reading:

Wolin, Sheldon S. 1969. Political Theory as a Vocation. *The American Political Science Review*, 63(4): 1062-1082.

Suggested Reading:

Easton, David. 1961. The Decline of Modern Political Theory. *The Journal of Politics*, 13(1): 36-58.

Strauss, Leo. 1957. What Is Political Philosophy? *The Journal of Politics*, 19(3): 343-368.

Rehfeld, Andrew. 2010. Offensive Political Theory. *Perspectives on Politics*, 8(2): 465-486.

YOUR PROJECT: Check In

PhD Comic for the Day: <http://www.phdcomics.com/comics/archive.php?comicaid=462>

Week 6: February 12

SCIENTIFIC METHOD: Case Selection & Sampling

Required Reading:

Trochim & Donnelly, Ch. 2

King, Keohane and Verba, Ch. 4

Squire, Peverill. 1988. Why the 1936 Literary Digest Poll Failed. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 52: 125-133.

McDonald, Michael P. and Samuel L. Popkin. 2001. The Myth of the Vanishing Voter. *American Political Science Review*, 95(4): 963-974.

Suggested Reading:

Doyle, Arthur Conan. 1930. Silver Blaze. In: *The Complete Sherlock Holmes*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, pp. 335-349.

Fearon, James. 2002. Selection Effects and Deterrence. *International Interactions*, 28(1): 5-29.

RESEARCH APPROACHES: Case Studies

Suggested Reading:

Trochim & Donnelly Ch. 6

Geddes, Barbara. 1990. How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get. *Political Analysis*, 2(1): 131-150.

Gerring, John. 2004. What Is a Case Study and What Is It Good for? *American Political Science Review*, 98(2): 341-354.

YOUR PROJECT: Discuss Assignments

***DUE FEB. 10: Assignment #3

PhD Comics for the Day: <http://www.phdcomics.com/comics/archive.php?comicaid=333>

<http://www.phdcomics.com/comics/archive.php?comicaid=334>

Professionalization Session: How to make a poster

SCIENTIFIC METHOD: Measurement Issues

Required Reading:

- Trochim & Donnelly, Ch. 3
King, Keohane and Verba, Ch. 5 & 6
Milgram, Stanley, Leon Mann, and Susan Harter. 1965. The Lost-Letter Technique. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 29(3): 437-438.
Sigelman, Lee. 1990. Toward a Stupidity-Ugliness Theory of Democratic Electoral Debacles. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 23(1): 18-20.

Suggested Reading:

- Baumgartner, Frank and Jack L. Walker. 1988. Survey Research and Membership in Voluntary Associations. *American Journal of Political Science*, 32(4): 908-928.

RESEARCH APPROACHES: Big Data and Crowdsourcing

Suggested Reading:

- Political Analysis Special Issue: Big Data in Political Science
http://www.oxfordjournals.org/our_journals/polana/virtualissue4.html
Boydston, Amber E., Rebecca A. Glazier, Matthew T. Pietryka, and Philip Resnick. In Press. Time Reactions to a 2012 Presidential Debate: A Method for Understanding Which Messages Matter. *Public Opinion Quarterly*.

YOUR PROJECT: Check In

PhD Comic for the Day: <http://www.phdcomics.com/comics/archive.php?comid=1121>

Professionalization Session: Bob Taylor on time management

SCIENTIFIC METHOD: Cross-Level Inferences

Group A Reading:

- * Naroll, Raoul. 1973. Galton's Problem. In: *A Handbook of Methods in Cultural Anthropology*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, pp. 974-89.
- * Robinson, W. S. 1950. Ecological Correlations and the Behavior of Individuals. *American Sociological Review*, 15: 351-357.
- * Achen, Christopher H. and W. Phillips Shively. 1995. *Cross-Level Inference*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. Chapter 1: Cross-Level Inference.
- * Huckfeldt, Robert, Eric Plutzer, and John Sprague. 1993. Alternative Contexts of Political Behavior: Churches, Neighborhoods, and Individuals. *The Journal of Politics*, 55: 365-381.

DEBATE IN THE LITERATURE: The democratic peace

Group B Reading:

- * Maoz, Zeev and Bruce Russett. 1993. Normative and Structural Causes of Democratic Peace, 1946-1986. *The American Political Science Review*, 87(3): 624-638.
- * Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce, James D. Morrow, Randolph M. Siverson and Alastair Smith. 1999. An Institutional Explanation of the Democratic Peace. *The American Political Science Review*, 93(4): 791-807.
- * Rosato, Sebastian. 2003. The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory. *American Political Science Review*, 97(4): 585– 602.
- * Slantchev, Branislav L., Anna Alexandrova, Erik Gartzke. 2005. Probabilistic Causality, Selection Bias, and the Logic of the Democratic Peace. *American Political Science Review*, 99(3): 459-462.
- * Henderson, Errol A. 2009. Disturbing the Peace: African Warfare, Political Inversion and the Universality of the Democratic Peace Thesis. *British Journal of Political Science*, 39(1): 25-58.

RESEARCH APPROACHES: Factor Analysis

Suggested Reading:

- Kim, Jae-On and Charles W. Mueller. 1978. *Factor Analysis: Statistical Methods and Practical Issues*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Rummel, R.J. 1967. Understanding Factor Analysis. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 11(4): 444-480.
- Fabrigar, L. R., Wegener, D. T., MacCallum, R. C., & Strahan, E. J. 1999. Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological Methods*, 4: 272-299.

YOUR PROJECT: Discuss Assignments AND How To Make a Stellar Poster

***DUE FEB. 24: Assignment #4

PhD Comic for the Day: <http://www.phdcomics.com/comics/archive.php?comid=115>

Week 9: March 5

SCIENTIFIC METHOD: Review of KKV

Group A Reading:

- * Review Symposium—The Qualitative-Quantitative Disputation: Gary King, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba's *Designing Social Inquiry*. *American Political Science Review*, 89 (June, 1995): 454-481.
- * Brady and Collier Chs. 1-4, 10-13

DEBATE IN THE LITERATURE: The polarization of the American voter

Group B Reading:

- * Fiorina, Abrams & Pope (all).
- * Abramowitz, Alan I. and Kyle L. Saunders. 2008. Is Polarization a Myth? *Journal of Politics*, 70(2): 542-555.
- * Fiorina, Morris P., Samuel A. Abrams, and Jeremy C. Pope. 2008. Polarization in the American Public: Misconceptions and Misreadings. *Journal of Politics*, 70(2):556-560.
- * Forthcoming JOP article—TBD

RESEARCH APPROACHES: Time Series Analysis

Suggested Reading:

- Ostrom, Charles W. 1990. *Time Series Analysis: Regression Techniques*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Vliegenthart, Rens. ND. Moving Up: Applying Aggregate Level Time Series Analysis in Communication Science.
- De Boef, Suzanna and Luke Keele. 2008. Taking Time Seriously. *American Journal of Political Science*, 52(1): 184–200.

YOUR PROJECT: Poster Drafts

PhD Comic for the Day: <http://www.phdcomics.com/comics/archive.php?comid=301>

Week 10: March 12

***DUE MON. March 10 BY NOON: Research Proposal Paper

*****Poster Session Date/Time TBD** (note that you're responsible for bringing your poster!)

PhD Comic for the Day: <http://www.phdcomics.com/comics/archive.php?comid=1553>