

INR 6910: Advanced Research Workshop

Will H. Moore	Office: Bellamy 561
Spring 2006	voice: 644-6924
Thu 9:30 - 12:15 am, Bellamy 113	will.moore@fsu.edu
Office Hours: TW 10-11 am	http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~whmoore/

The purpose of this course is to help you develop a research project (e.g., a dissertation prospectus, a grant proposal, etc.). The course is constructed on the proposition that (at least) one of three different motivations drive all good research:

1. Puzzles where evidence clashes with expectations
2. Debates in the literature
3. Substantive questions

Further, I submit that the impact of research projects is positively associated with the rank order of the motivations as presented above. As such, as you develop your dissertation project (and others) you may want to consider that claim. In any case, the course will focus on how one creates good research projects.

Having covered the course objectives, let me turn to grading. You will be evaluated over two criteria:

- (1) Class participation which will account for 25% of your final grade.
- (2) A series of brief (3-5 pages) papers that will account for 75% of your final grade.

Class Participation

After each class meeting I will assign each student a participation grade as follows:

A+ (outstanding): the student made me see things in a new light.

A (excellent): the student made unusually insightful comments that contributed to our collective understanding.

A- (strong): the student participated strongly, offering comments that contributed to our collective understanding.

B+ (good): the student contributed meaningfully to the class discussion by asking good questions and/or exhibiting a grasp of the material s/he discussed.

B (satisfactory): the student participated, but her/his comments exhibited a limited grasp of the material.

C (poor): the student spoke, but took the discussion in an unproductive direction (e.g., did not address the assigned material).

F (unsatisfactory): the student did not speak in class.

I will only count the top 11 scores when calculating your participation grade (i.e., I will drop the three lowest scores).

Papers

You will write eight brief (3-5 pages) papers. I am well aware how difficult it will often be to cover the material in such a brief space. All papers are restricted to such a length. Do not monkey with fonts, spacing or margins (anything less than 11 pt will not be accepted). Anything longer than 5 pages will not be accepted (i.e., will be assigned a zero).

Please submit the papers as hard copies to my mailbox in room 534.

With respect to format and style, your paper should conform with the American Political Science Association's (APSA) *Style Guide* (a summary is available online at: <http://www.wisc.edu/writing/Handbook/DocAPSA.html>).

PLEASE NOTE: Late work will be marked down 1 letter grade per day late (e.g., A- → B-). These policies will only be excepted when genuine medical excuses, or emergencies beyond your control prevent you from completing the work on time. Written documentation is required.

Plagiarism The Florida State Student Handbook explains that plagiarism is a violation of the academic honor system. More specifically,

...violations of the Academic Honor Code shall include representing another's work or any part thereof, be it published or unpublished, as one's own. It shall also include presenting or submitting any academic work in a manner that impairs the instructor's ability to assess the student's academic performance. For example, plagiarism includes failure to use quotation marks or other conventional markings [such as the double-indent used here] around any material quoted from any source (Florida State Student Handbook, 1998, p. 75).

Anyone found guilty of plagiarism will receive an F for the course. In addition, a letter describing the offense will be sent to the Director of Graduate Studies. The student may also be subjected to whatever additional sanctions deemed appropriate by the relevant authorities.

Course Grading Scale

A+ 98-100	A 93-97	A- 90-92
B+ 88-89	B 83-87	B- 80-82
C+ 78-79	C 73-77	C- 70-72
D+ 68-69	D 63-67	D- 60-62
F 0-59		

Academic Honesty

With respect to academic honesty, FSU students are governed by an honor code and you are advised to familiarize yourself with this policy (see the Student Handbook which is available in paper or via the WWW). Cheating and plagiarism will not be tolerated: it will lead to a zero on the assignment, and will likely lead to dismissal from the program.

Accommodating Challenges

Students with challenges who require individualized testing or other accommodations should identify themselves to the instructor and express their needs during the first week of class. Where the challenge is not immediately apparent, verification will be required. The Department of Political Science is happy to do whatever it can to assure each student a full and rewarding participation in our courses.

Reading

There are no books to order for this course. You are expected to hunt down the readings that are widely available online. Others will be made available on the Blackboard website for this course (assuming any exist that are not widely available).

Course Schedule

WEEK 1 (12 Jan):

No assigned reading. Class discussion will focus on the differences between research projects motivated by puzzles, those motivated by debates in the literature, and those motivated by substantive questions.

Assignment: write a brief paper that describes the criteria/standards you use to determine whether you would be willing to publicly advance a knowledge claim. Be sure to address how you will evaluate both theory and empirics (assuming you believe both are important).
Due: Mon 16 Jan by 3:00 pm.

1 Launching a Research Project

WEEK 2 (19 Jan):

Souva, Mark. 2005. "Thesis/Dissertation Prospectus Guide," available online at:
<http://mailer.fsu.edu/~msouva/stuguide.htm>

Philip Roeder. nd. "Research Prospectus," available online at: <http://weber.ucsd.edu/~proeder/Prospectus.pdf>

Mukherjee, Bumba. 2005. Book proposal to Cambridge University Press.

During the 1st half of class Bumba will [1] describe how he became interested in the project, [2] explain how he developed the theory, and [3] sketch the theory. Then the students will propose how best to test the theory (i.e., discuss an appropriate research design).

We will take a break and then Bumba will present his research design and we will discuss its merits relative to the preceding discussion.

Assignment: none.

WEEK 3 (26 Jan):

Crescenzi, Mark. NSF Proposal #1 and referee reports

Crescenzi, Mark. NSF Proposal #2

Crescenzi, Mark. "Reputation, Learning, and Conflict," submitted to *AJPS*

Editor's letter and referee reports.

Assignment: Select a topic/literature that interests you. Create a box-and-arrow diagram that represents the various hypothetical relations among concepts¹ (one diagram for the entire literature, not separate ones for each theory). Survey the findings reported in the empirical literature and summarize them. Bring your diagram and survey to class next week.

2 EBA as Meta Analysis

WEEK 4 (2 Feb):

Leamer, Edward E. 1983. "Let's Take the Con Out of Econometrics," *American Economic Review*, 73(1): 31-43.

Hafner-Burton, Emilie M. 2005. "Right or Robust? The Sensitive Nature of Repression to Globalization," *Journal of Peace Research*, 42(6): 679-98.

Leamer introduces us to Extreme Bounds Analysis. Discussion will focus on EBA, both as preached by Leamer and practiced by Hafner-Burton and as a possible type of 'meta-

¹Note that concepts and variables (aka operational indicators) are not the same thing. Be prepared to distinguish between the two.

analysis,² with particular attention to your efforts.

Assignment: Write a paper that is an EBA ‘meta-analysis.’ That is, search the empirical literature that you have mapped with your box-and-arrow diagram and determine what are the mean and extreme values reported in the literature.³ Did you uncover any puzzles? If not, does your meta-analysis inform a current debate in the field or shed light on a substantive question? *Due:* Mon 13 Feb by 3:00 pm.

3 Conceptualization

WEEK 5 (9 Feb):

Braumoeller, Bear. “Explaining Variance: Rethinking Social Causation.” available online at: <http://www.people.fas.harvard.edu/~bfbraum/variance.pdf>

Moore, Will H. 2006. “A Problem with Peace Science: The Dark Side of COW,” revised version of paper presented at the 2005 annual meeting of the Peace Science Society, Iowa City.

Discussion will center on Braumoeller in the 1st half and Moore in the 2nd. We will focus on debates and substantive questions that can be illuminated by considering the arguments raised in these papers. Be prepared to break into small groups to develop project ideas.

Assignment: none.

4 Rational Expectations

WEEK 6 (16 Feb):

Adaptive Expectations http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Adaptive_expectations

Rational Expectations http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rational_expectations

Tesfatsion, Leigh. 2005. “Introduction to Rational Expectations,” available online at:

²Technically, this is not a meta-analysis. A proper meta-analysis looks for patterns among different findings in a literature (e.g., do studies with small-Ns find an absence of a relationship between x and y but studies with a large-N find that x has a positive impact on y ?). See <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Meta-analysis>.

³In other words, identify the distribution of findings. You will want to work with both concepts and indicators (keep in mind that scholars sometimes use the same indicator to represent different concepts).

<http://www.econ.iastate.edu/tesfatsi/reintro.pdf>

Efficient Market Hypothesis http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Efficient_market_hypothesis

Beechey, Meredith, David Gruen & James Vickery. 2000. "The Efficient Market Hypothesis: A Survey," Research Discussion Paper 2000-01, Reserve Bank of Australia, online at: <http://www.rba.gov.au/rdp/rdp2000-01.pdf>

De Boef, Suzanna & Luke Keele. 2005. "Revisiting Dynamic Specification," (see esp. section 3) available at the Polmeth website.

For the 1st half of class we will focus on the RE hypothesis and its implications for studying conflict and cooperation in IR.⁴ During the 2nd half we will turn our attention to the EMH and its implications for the study of IPE/CPE. We may break up into small groups to generate project ideas. Discussion of how one can specify statistical models that will be pertinent throughout.

Assignment: In 3-5 pages identify a puzzle, debate, or question that you believe could be illuminated by taking a rational expectations approach. Defend your claim.

5 Data Structure

WEEK 7 (23 Feb):

Croco, Sarah E. & Tze Kwang Teo. 2005. "Assessing the Dyadic Approach to Interstate Conflict Processes," *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, 22:5-18.

Steenbergen, Marco R. & Bradford Jones. 2002. "Modeling Multilevel Data Structures," *American Journal of Political Science*, 46:218-37.⁵

Gelman, Shor, Bafumi & Park. 2005. "Rich State, Poor State, Red State, Blue State," available on the PolMeth Working Papers site.

In the 1st portion of class (roughly 1 hour) we will debate the merits and limitations of dyadic and directed-dyadic data structures for studying IR. During the 2nd part of class discussion will center on this question: given the field's interest in levels of analysis, is multi-level analysis a tool that is about to explode in IR?

⁴We will explicitly contrast it with retrospective approaches such as action-reaction (e.g., Richardson's arms race model), tit-for-tat, or adaptive expectations.

⁵If you are interested in more introductions, see the Bowers & Drake and Franzese articles in the 2005 special issue on Multilevel Modeling in *Political Analysis*. That issue also contains a number of example studies as well as some commentaries you may find helpful.

Assignment: Some of the most successful students this department has produced built their research agendas largely by learning an econometric technique and being among the first to put it to excellent use in IR (e.g., Bill Reed, Dave Clark). Identify a debate or substantive question that you believe can be effectively studied using multi-level modeling and write a paper to support your claim.

6 Events Data

WEEK 8 (2 Mar):

King, Gary & Will Lowe. 2003. "An Automated Information Extraction Tool For International Conflict Data with Performance as Good as Human Coders: A Rare Events Evaluation Design," *International Organization*, 57(Summer): 617-42.

Burgess, Philip M. & Raymond W. Lawton. 1975. "Evaluating Events Data: Problems of Conception, Reliability and Validity," in C.W. Kegley, Jr., G.A. Raymond, R.M. Rood & R.A. Skinner (eds.) *International Events and the Contemporary Analysis of Foreign Policy*, University of South Carolina Press, pp. 106-19.

Goldstein, Joshua S. & Jon Pevehouse. 1997. "Reciprocity, Bullying and International Cooperation: A Time-Series Analysis of the Bosnia Conflict," *American Political Science Review*, 91 (September): 515-529.

Discussion will focus on the merits and limitations of events data.

Assignment: Select an events data set to examine⁶ and produce some descriptive statistics. Report in a paper whether you were able to find any puzzles using the data you examined. You may work in groups on this paper.

Spring Break (8 Mar):

No Class.

7 Assessing the Fertility of Some Current Literatures

WEEK 9 (16 Mar): Initiating Peace

Kydd, Andrew. 2000. "Trust, Reassurance, and Cooperation," *International Organization*, Spring, 54(2): 325-57.

⁶You will find a list of events data sets under the Assignments link on the Blackboard site for this course.

Colaresi, Michael. 2004. "When Doves Cry: International Rivalry, Unreciprocated Cooperation, and Leadership Turnover," *American Journal of Political Science*, 28(3): 555-70.

Schultz, Kenneth A. 2005. "The Politics of Risking Peace: Do Hawks or Doves Deliver the Olive Branch?" *International Organization*, 59: 1-38.

We will discuss Kydd, Schultz and Colaresi. With respect to Colaresi I wonder whether we might generalize the claims he presents in Figure 2 by arguing that the intensity with which over-cooperation gets punished is a positive function of the intensity of hostility sent by the opponent (opponent hostility might be conceptualized as recent behavior). Taking Goldstein & Pevehouse into account, one might ask whether we would ever expect domestic audiences to punish bullying behavior (much as they punish over-cooperation). Might these ideas be extended beyond rivalries?

Assignment: none.

WEEK 10 (23 Mar): ISA annual meeting—no class.

Those interested may wish to read the following works on Reliability of Contracts:

Koremenos, Barbara. 2001. "Loosening the Ties that Bind: A Learning Model of Agreement Flexibility," *International Organization*, Spring, 55(2): 289-325.

Fortna, Virginia Page. 2003. "Scraps of Paper? Agreements and the Durability of Peace," *International Organization*, Spring, 57(2): 337-72.

Leeds, Brett Ashley. 2003. "Alliance Reliability in Times of War: Explaining State Decisions to Violate Treaties," *International Organization*, Fall, 57(4): 801-27.

Discussion will focus on [1] the domain of IR that can be profitably studied by thinking about the credibility of contracts and [2] the extent to which this is a robust research area.

Assignment: Write one of the following two papers. [1] A paper that identifies a hypothesis produced by a model that focuses on the reliability of contracts, but has not yet been tested. Sketch an appropriate research design. [2] A paper that identifies the key debate in this literature and evaluates the extent to which this debate will help us answer an interesting and important substantive question. You may work in groups if you tackle paper 1.

WEEK 11 (30 Mar): Audience Costs

Slantchev, Branislav L. 2006. "Politicians, the Media, and Domestic Audience Costs," *International Studies Quarterly*, forthcoming.

Tomz, Michael. 2005. "Domestic Audience Costs in International Relations: An Experimental Approach," Stanford, working paper.

Kurizaki, Shuhei. 2005. "Efficient Secrecy: Public versus Private Threats in Crisis Diplomacy," winner of the Carl Beck Award for best graduate student paper at the Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association.

Baum, Matthew. 2005. "Shouting into the Wind: Press Freedom, Media Access, and the Role of Domestic Audience Costs in International Disputes," Powerpoint presentation of paper presented at Peace Science.

We will begin class with a discussion of the IR domain to which models that focus on audience costs might fruitfully be applied (i.e., what puzzles, debates, and questions might such models inform?). Then we will discuss the merits of the Kurizaki, Tomz, and Baum projects: their contribution to IR generally and the audience costs literature more specifically; how the research design might be revised; and additional questions they illuminate.

Assignment: Write one of the following two papers. [1] A paper that identifies a hypothesis produced by a model that illuminates audience costs, but has not yet been tested. Sketch an appropriate research design. [2] A paper that identifies the key debate in this literature and evaluates the extent to which this debate will help us answer an interesting and important substantive question. You may work in groups if you tackle paper 1.

8 Dissertation Prospectus/Mock NSF Panel

WEEK 12 (6 Apr):

For class: write a brief review of the reading for next week that has your name following it [do not read the other proposal]. Treat them as if they were submitted to the National Science Foundation for funding and you were a member of the panel.⁷ *Due:* Mon 10 April 3:00 pm *via email*. I will distribute the reviews to the other class members.

Locke, Lawrence F., Waneen Wyrick Spirduso & Stephen J. Silverman. 2000. *Proposals that Work*, 4th ed., Sage, chaps 1 and 4, available as an E-book through the FSU Library.

Thyne, Clayton. 2005. "Interstate Relations and Civil Conflict," Dissertation Prospectus, University of Iowa. *Students:* Davis, Kosek and Rowan.

Edwards, Scott. 2006. "," Dissertation Prospectus, University of Illinois. *Students:* Park,

⁷The NSF panel does not evaluate budgets, so the fact that we do not have a budget is irrelevant. We will focus on the merits of the research and assume that the program director at NSF will evaluate the budget's merits if the panel deems the project worthy of funding.

Rubin and Young.

We will hold a panel discussion where we will debate the strengths and weaknesses of the proposals. I will select a student who read the paper to begin discussion (i.e., briefly summarize the proposal and make a case for or against funding it). The role of those who did not read the prospectus is to challenge those who did (i.e., if they argue in favor of the proposal, challenge that; if they argue against the proposal, challenge that).

Assignment: none.

WEEK 13 (13 Apr):

You will be assigned two proposals to read (find your name below). Read only those proposals. Submit a review to me by Mon 10 Apr by 3:00 pm. I will distribute the reviews to your classmates.

Heezen, Ronald R. 1991. "Take money for granted: grant proposals that work." *Library Journal*, 115(18):62-63

Proposals TBA.

We will hold a panel discussion where we will debate the strengths and weaknesses of the proposals. I will select a student who read the paper to begin discussion (i.e., briefly summarize the proposal and make a case for or against funding it). The role of those who did not read the prospectus is to challenge those who did (i.e., if they argue in favor of the proposal, challenge that; if they argue against the proposal, challenge that).

Assignment: none.

9 Human Rights & Security Studies

WEEK 14 (20 Apr):

Davenport & Armstrong. 2004. "Democracy and the Violation of Human Rights: A Statistical Analysis from 1976 to 1996," *American Journal of Political Science*, July, 48(3): 538-54.

Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce, Feryal Marie Cherif, George W. Downs & Alastair Smith. 2005. "Thinking Inside the Box: A Closer Look at Democracy and Human Rights," *International Studies Quarterly*, September, 49(3):439-58.

Walt, Stephen. 1991 "The Renaissance of Security Studies," *International Studies Quarterly*.

During the 1st two thirds of class we will discuss the human rights papers with a focus on [1] their motivation (puzzle, debate, and/or question) and [2] the prospects for further systematic work in this area. For the final one third of the class we will discuss Walt's article.

Assignment: read three 'security studies' articles/books⁸ that do not appear on a syllabus taught at FSU and identify the best puzzle, debate, and/or question that emerges from that work which could be profitably studied using the approach to IR taught at FSU. *Due:* by Mon 19 Apr by 3:00 pm.

⁸If you select a book, read only the presentation of the theory and the conclusion to find out the results—you are not expected to read the entire book.