Political Science PSC 571 Quantitative Approaches to International Politics

Hein Goemans Harkness 337 O ce Hours: Wed. 1{2 henk.goemans@rochester.edu Course Info: 4 Credits Spring 2020 Thursday 2:00{4:40 Harkness 329

This seminar examines some of the latest quantitative research in international relations. As you all know, with the **causal inference** revolution, with some exceptions, what was once standard work is no longer deemed acceptable in the top tier journals. In this course we read some of this more recent quantitative work which uses various strategies

<u>I expect a well-written, grammatically correct</u> nal paper. To become a better writer all students <u>must</u> watch: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vtIzMaLkCaM. In addition, I strongly (!) urge students to avail themselves of the opportunities o ered by the writing program here at the University of Rochester. Failure to provide a well-written, grammatically correct nal paper will count heavily in the nal grade.

Academic Resources

Students may have disabilities which impede their learning. This class, this department and this university are strongly committed to help provide resources to overcome any obstacles to learning. The University of Rochester respects and welcomes students of all backgrounds and abilities. In the event you encounter any barrier(s) to full participation in this course due to the impact of disability, please contact the O ce of Disability Resources. The access coordinators in the O ce of Disability Resources can meet with you to discuss the barriers you are experiencing and explain the eligibility process for establishing academic accommodations. You can reach the O ce of Disability Resources at: http://disability@rochester.edu; (585) 276-5075; Taylor Hall.

Be familiar with the University's policies on academic integrity and disciplinary action (http://www.rochester.edu/living/urhere/handbook/discipline2.html#XII). Violators of University regulations on academic integrity will be dealt with promptly, which means that your grade will su er, and I will forward your case to the Chair of the College Board on Academic Honesty, on which I served.

Course Outline

Thursday January 16

Thursday February 13

Prof. Goemans will be out of town.

Thursday February 20

4. Insurgency and Counter-Insurgency

Daniel W. Hill, Jr. and Zachary M. Jones. 2014. An Empirical Evaluation of Explanations for State Repression. *American Political Science Review* 108(3) August: 661{687

Luke N. Condra, James D. Long, Andrew C. Shaver and Austin L. Wright. 2018. The Logic of Insurgent Electoral Violence. *American Economic Review* 1801(11): 3199{3231.

Jacob N. Shapiro and Nils B. Weidmann. 2015. Is the Phone Mightier Than the Sword? Cellphones and Insurgent Violence in Iraq. *International Organization* 69(2): 247{274.

Thursday February 27

5. **IPE**

In Song Kim. 2017. Political Cleavages within Industry: Firm-Level Lobbying for Trade Liberalization. *American Political Science Review* 111(1): 1{20.

Tara Slough and Christopher J. Fariss. 2019. *Misgovernance and Human Rights: The Case of Illegal Detention without Intent.* Manuscript, University of Michigan.

Thursday March 5

6. Structural Equation Models

Casey Crisman-Cox and Michael Gibilisco. 2018. Audience Costs and the Dynamics of War. *The American Journal of Political Science* 62(3): 566-580.

Scott Abramson and Sergio Monteiro. 2020. *Learning About Growth and Democracy*. Manuscript, University of Rochester.

Thursday, March 12

Spring Recess

Thursday, March 19

7. Con ict and Survey Experiments

Michaela Mattes and Jessica L. P. Weeks. 2018. Hawks, Doves, and Peace: An Experimental Approach. *American Journal of Political Science* 63(1) January: 53-66.

Michael Tomz, Jessica Weeks and Keren Yarhi-Milo. 2019/2020. Public Opinion and Decisions about Military Force in Democracies. Forthcoming, *International Organization*.

Joshue D. Kertzer and Ryan Brutger. 2016. Decomposing Audience Costs: Bringing the Audience Back into Audience Cost Theory. *American Journal of Political Science* 60(1) January: 234{249.

Thursday March 26

8. Con ict and Survey Experiments

Hein Goemans, Michael Weintraub and Andi Zhou, 2020. *Maps to Die for?*. Manuscript, University of Rochester.

Andi Zhou, Michael Weintraub and Hein Goemans, 2020. *Loss Aversion in Territorial Disputes?*. Manuscript, University of Rochester.

Elaine K. Denny and Jesse Driscoll. 2019. Calling Mogadishu: How Reminders of Anarchy Bias Survey Participation. *Journal of Experimental Political Science* 6(2) Summer: 81-92

Thursday April 2

9. War and Peace

Havard Hegre, Lisa Hultman and Havard Mokleiv Nygard. 2018. Evaluating the Con ict-Reducing E ect of UN Peacekeeping Operations, *Journal of Politics*, 81(1), 215-232

Daina Chiba and Jesse C. Johnson. 2019. Military Coalitions and Crisis Duration. *Journal of Politics* 81(4): 1466{1479

Zachary M. Jones and Yonatan Lupu. 2018. Is there More Violence in the Middle? *American Journal of Political Science* 62(3) July:652{667

Thursday, April 9

10. Measurement

Melissa M. Lee and Nan Zhs,

Therese Anders, Christopher J. Fariss and Jonathan N. Markowitz. 2020. *Bread before guns or butter: Introducing Surplus Domestic Product (SDP)*. Manuscript, University of Michgan.

Thursday April 16

Questions to consider in formulating and evaluating social science research

1. What is the central question?

Why is it important (theoretically, substantively)?

What is being explained (what is the dependent variable and how does it vary)?

How does this phenomenon present a puzzle?

2. What is the central answer?

What is doing the explaining (what are the independent variables and how do they vary)?

What are the hypotheses, i.e., what is the relationship between independent and dependent variables, what kind of change in the independent variable causes what kind of change in the dependent variable?

What are the causal mechanisms, i.e., why are the independent and dependent variables so related?

How do the independent variables relate to each other?

What assumptions does your theory make?

Is the theory falsi able in concept?

What does this explanation add to our understanding of the question?

3. What are the possible alternative explanations?

What assumptions are you making about the direction of causality?

What other explanations might there be for the phenomenon of study, and to what degree do they con ict with the central answer?

Could the hypothesized relationships have occurred by chance?

4. Why are the possible alternative explanations wrong?

What is the logical structure of the alternative explanations (compare 2)?

What is the empirical evidence?

5. What is the relationship between the theory and the evidence?

What does the research design allow to vary, i.e., in this design are the explanations variables or constants?

What does your research design hold constant, i.e., does it help to rule out the alternative competing explanations?

How are the theoretical constructs represented empirically, i.e., how do you know it when you see it (measurement)?

6. How do the empirical conclusions relate to the theory?

How con dent are you about the theory in light of the evidence?

How widely do the conclusions generalize, i.e., what might be the limitations of the study?

What does the provisionally accepted or revised theory say about questions of broader importance?