

# POLI 2000: Designing Political Research

Yue Hu

Fall 2017

E-mail: [yue-hu-1@uiowa.edu](mailto:yue-hu-1@uiowa.edu)

Office Hours: 12:30 – 15:30 M & by Appointment

Office: 313 Shaeffer Hall

Web: TBD

Class Hours: 15:30 – 16:45 M/W

Class Room: 105 EPB

---

## Overview

How do candidates win elections? Why do countries get involved in international crises and wars? What makes a country more powerful than the others? What explains the choices of violent non-state actors like terrorists? There are just some of the questions that political scientists study. The goal of this course is to show you how to research these questions as a scholar in political science. This course will introduce students to political science research and various ways that social scientific research is undertaken.

This class will introduce the core elements of a political science research, such as concept, theory, hypothesis, and evidence. You will also learn how to build a new theory, develop testable causal inferences, and design different approaches to test your theories empirically. Emphasis will be on an active hands-on learning environment and fully interactions between the instructor and students. Students can expect to comprehend the research produced in Political Science and learn to conduct their own.

## Requirements

I will base your grade for the course on your performance in the four areas below. You will get a score for each component, and your total grade will be the sum of them. The grade points will be translated to letter grades in the following way: 93-100 A, 90-92.9 A-, 87-89.9 B+, 83-86.9 B, 80-82.9 B-, 77-79.9 C+, 73-76.9 C, 70-72.9 C-, 67-69.9 D+, 63-66.9 D, 60-62.3 D-, 59.9 or less F.

**Class Performance (10% attendance + 10% participation + 5% presentation).**

Regarding participation, I am looking for you to show that you have fully read and critically evaluated the assigned readings (all available in ICON) and are actively engaged in our in-class discussions. Before each week's class you will receive a one-page reading guideline. It will give you a hint how to read the week's readings and which part you should pay special attention to. The guideline will always include a recommended reading order and several questions to help you comprehend the materials.

By the second week, we will decide a presentation schedule together. You will sign in a schedule sheet by picking the topic and articles you are interested. Starting from the third Monday, every first 20 minutes will be your show time. The student who signed for that day will make a 10-min presentation about the reading. The presentation should include three parts: a brief summarising what the article is about and its relations with other materials, which point in the article impresses you the most and why, and at least one question you really want to know but the article does not spell it out. I will evaluate your performance in each—especially the latter two—aspects (see more details in the attached rubric). Please cherish this chance to practice your presentation capability, and there is no chance for make-up presentation if you miss it.

### **In-Class Quizzes (10%)**

You will get ten pop quizzes throughout the semester. Each quiz includes 2-3 questions about the required readings we are going to discuss in the class. (Hint: some questions may come from the reading guide.) At the end of the semester, the eight highest scores of the ten quizzes will be recorded to contribute to your final grade. Quizzes will be administered and completed either at the beginning or the end of class. You cannot make up any missed or failed quizzes for any reason. Feel free to discuss the readings with your classmates prior to class. *However, you cannot share your answers to the reading questions with your classmates.*

### **Critical Response Paper (12%)**

You are expected to submit two response papers for weekly readings. You are free to pick any week's readings you like as long as we haven't discussed them yet. (You are free to write one response paper for your presentation week.) In the paper, You need to review at least three reading materials of the week. Moreover, I would like to see

1. One and ONLY one paragraphs to summarize each material.
2. Some discussion about what do you learn from these materials relating to the weekly topic.
3. Your perspective on the argument in the materials—do you agree with the author? If yes, why are his/her arguments convincing for you? If not, why?
4. Cite other sources if appropriate (but not required).

The paper is due at the BEGINNING of the Monday class (i.e., 15:30) of the week the materials are going to be discussed (submit to ICON). Late paper will be penalized 10 points for each day of being late. Each paper should be 2-6 pages, double-spaced, 1-inch margins, and in 12 font size. Papers will be evaluated based on the above points (see more details in the attached rubric).

### **Examination (20%)**

There is only one exam (viz. midterm) for this course. The exam is comprised of identification and short essay questions. The exam will be held on 2017-10-09 in the same class of the lecture.

### **Research Proposal (23%)**

You are expected to submit a research proposal at the end of the semester. It could be a proposal for your degree thesis or for a funding application. The proposal should include at least six parts:

1. A cover table (see the template on ICON).
2. An introduction to your research question and why it is important.
3. A brief literature review about what scholars have done on this topic. You need to cite at least three articles published in academic journals of political science in this part and discuss how they relate to your topic. Your citation should be in the style used by the American Political Science Association (see the guideline [here](#)).
4. A section discussing your theory and hypotheses.
5. A section discussing the data and method you plan to use to test your theory and why they are the best choice for your project.
6. A section discussing the operational feasibility of your research design.

The proposal is expected 5-10 pages (excluding the title and reference pages) in double-spaced, 1-inch margins, and 12 font size. The proposal will be evaluated based on each of the above parts and the overall writing (see more details in the attached rubric).

Here are some important dates relating to the research proposal:

- You must get your research question approved by the instructor by 2017-10-09 (submitted in ICON).
- You must submit a brief about your theory by 2017-11-13 (submitted in ICON).
- The proposal is due by 2017-12-11. Late paper will be penalized 30 points for each day of being late (submitted in ICON).

### *Extra credit*

You can get two extra credits if you use bibliography management software (EndNote, Jabref, Zotero, etc. see more information about this type of software [here](#).) and submit relevant bibliography files with your proposal.

You can get another two credits if you can gain the Certifications in Human Subjects Protections (CITI) in “Group 2 - Social & Behavioral - IRB-02”. See more information about it [here](#).

You can get a third extra credit by attending an academic workshop held by the Department of Political Science and send me a selfie at the workshop scene.

## **Required textbook:**

Earl R. Babbie. *The Practice of Social Research*. 13th ed. Australia: Wadsworth Cengage Learning, 2012. ISBN: 9781133049791 1133049796.

S. Van Evera. *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*. Cornell paperbacks. Cornell University Press, 1997. ISBN: 9780801484575.

## **Schedule**

### **Week 1 (2017-08-21/2017-08-23): Being a Political Scientist**

Robert O Keohane. “Political Science as a Vocation”. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 42.02 (2009), pp. 359–363.

John S Dryzek. “Revolutions without Enemies: Key Transformations in Political Science”. *American Political Science Review* 100.04 (2006), pp. 487–92.

Gary King. “Publication, Publication”. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 39.01 (2006), pp. 119–125.

## **Week 2 (2017-08-28/2017-08-30): Being Scientific**

Babbie (2012), pp.1-27, 112-120.

Gary King. “Replication, Replication”. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 28.03 (1995), pp. 444–452.

Gabriel A Almond. “Separate Tables: Schools and Sects in Political Science”. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 21.4 (1988), pp. 828–42.

Imre Lakatos and Musgrave Alan. “Falsification and the Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes”. *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge* (1970), pp. 91–180.

## **Week 3 (2017-09-04/2017-09-06): What’s A Good Question (Labor Day)**

Barbara Geddes. “Big Questions, Little Answers: How the Questions You Choose Affect the Answer You Get”. In: *Paradigms and Sand Castles: Theory Building and Research Design in Comparative Politics*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2010. Chap. 2, pp. 27–88.

Van Evera (1997), pp.97-99.

## **Week 4 (2017-09-11/2017-09-13): How to Find Research Question**

Babbie (2012), pp.91-112.

Efren O Perez and Margit Tavits. “Language Shapes People’s Time Perspective and Support for Future-Oriented Policies”. *American Journal of Political Science* (2017), pp. 1–13.

Timothy J McKeown. “Case Studies and the Statistical Worldview Review of King, Keohane, and Verba’s Designing Social Inquiry Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research”. *International Organization* 53.01 (1999), pp. 161–190.

Charles C Ragin and Lisa M Amoroso. *Constructing Social Research: The Unity and Diversity of Method*. Pine Forge Press, 2010. (Chapter 1, 2)

## **Week 5 (2017-09-18/2017-09-20): Concepts**

Babbie (2012), pp.165-177.

Michael Barnett and Raymond Duvall. “Power in International Politics”. *International Organization* 59.01 (2005), pp. 39–75.

David Collier and Steven Levitsky. “Democracy with Adjectives: Conceptual Innovation in Comparative Research”. *World Politics* 49.03 (1997), pp. 430–451.

David Collier and James E Mahon. “Conceptual “Stretching” Revisited: Adapting Categories in Comparative Analysis”. *American Political Science Review* 87.04 (1993), pp. 845–855.

Giovanni Sartori. “Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics”. *American Political Science Review* 64.04 (1970), pp. 1033–1053.

### **Week 6 (2017-09-25/2017-09-27): Principles of Measurement**

Babbie (2012), pp.177-194, 197-223.

Jason Seawright and David Collier. “Rival Strategies of Validation Tools for Evaluating Measures of Democracy”. *Comparative Political Studies* 47.1 (2014), pp. 111–138.

Andreas Schedler. “Judgment and Measurement in Political Science”. *Perspectives on Politics* 10.1 (2012), pp. 21–36.

Shawn Treier and Simon Jackman. “Democracy as a Latent Variable”. *American Journal of Political Science* 52.1 (2008), pp. 201–217.

Robert Adcock and David Collier. “Measurement Validity: A Shared Standard for Qualitative and Quantitative Research”. *American Political Science Review* 33 (2001), pp. 529–546.

### **Week 7 (2017-10-02/2017-10-04): Measurement in Practice**

Van Evera (1997), pp.7-50.

Midterm Review

### **Week 8 (2017-10-09/2017-10-11): What’s Theory?**

*Due for the research question approval: 2017-10-09.*

Midterm.

Babbie (2012), pp.57-83.

John Gerring. “Causation: A Unified Framework for the Social Sciences”. *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 17.2 (2005), pp. 163–198.

Adam Przeworski and Henry Teune. *The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1970. Chapter 1.

### **Week 9 (2017-10-16/2017-10-18): Theory and Causal Inference**

James Johnson. “How Conceptual Problems Migrate: Rational Choice, Interpretation, and the Hazards of Pluralism”. *Annual Review of Political Science* 5.1 (Jun. 17, 2017), pp. 223–48. (Visited on 06/17/2017).

John Gerring. “Causal mechanisms: Yes, But...” *Comparative Political Studies* 43.11 (2010), pp. 1499–526.

Steven Bernstein, Richard Ned Lebow, Janice Gross Stein and Steven Weber. “God Gave Physics the Easy Problems: Adapting Social Science to an Unpredictable World”. *European Journal of International Relations* 6.1 (2000), pp. 43–76.

James D. Fearon. “Counterfactuals and Hypothesis Testing In Political Science”. *World Politics* 43.2 (1991), pp. 169–195.

### **Week 10 (2017-10-23/2017-10-25): Experimental Logic and Design**

Babbie (2012), pp.271-291.

Alan S Gerber and Donald P Green. “Field Experiments and Natural Experiments”. In: *The Oxford Handbook of Political Science*. Ed. by Robert E. Goodin. 2011. <http://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199604456.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199604456-e-050?mediaType=Article> (visited on 06/15/2017).

Alex Mintz, Steven B Redd and Arnold Vedlitz. “Can We Generalize from Student Experiments to the Real World in Political Science, Military Affairs, and International Relations?” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 50.5 (2006), pp. 757–776.

Alex Mintz. “Foreign Policy Decision Making in Familiar and Unfamiliar Settings”. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 48.1 (2004), pp. 91–104.

### **Week 11 (2017-10-30/2017-11-01): Principles of Case Study**

Jack S Levy. “Case Studies: Types, Designs, and Logics of Inference”. *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 25.1 (2008), pp. 1–18.

John Gerring. “What is a Case Study and What is it Good for?” *American Political Science Review* 98.02 (2004), pp. 341–354.

Timothy J McKeown. “Case Studies and the Limits of the Quantitative Worldview”. In: *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Ed. by David Collier and Henry E. Brady. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2004, pp. 139–167.

Adam Przeworski and Henry Teune. *The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1970. 31-39, 74-87.

### **Week 12 (2017-11-06/2017-11-08): Case Study in Practice**

Van Evera (1997), pp.49-88.

Barbara Geddes. “How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics”. In: *Paradigms and Sand Castles: Theory Building and Research Design in Comparative Politics*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2010, pp. 89–129.

Andrew Bennett and Colin Elman. “Case Study Methods in the International Relations Subfield”. *Comparative Political Studies* 40.2 (2007), pp. 170–195.

Gerardo L. Munck. “Tools for Qualitative Research”. In: *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Ed. by David Collier and Henry E. Brady. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2004, pp. 105–121.

### **Week 13 (2017-11-13/2017-11-15): A Glance of Other Small-N Methods**

*Due for the brief of the theory: 2017-11-13.*

Babbie (2012), pp.295-321.

Andrew Bennett. “Process Tracing: A Bayesian Perspective”. In: *Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. Ed. by Janet Box-Steffensmeier, Henry Brady and David Coiller. 2008, pp. 702–21.

Giovanni Capoccia and R Daniel Kelemen. “The Study of Critical Junctures: Theory, Narrative, and Counterfactuals in Historical Institutionalism”. *World Politics* 59.03 (2007), pp. 341–369.

Clifford Geertz. “Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture”. *Readings in the Philosophy of Social Science* (1994), pp. 213–31.

### **Week 14 (2017-11-20/2017-11-22): Thanks Giving Week**

### **Week 15 (2017-11-27/2017-11-29): Understanding Large-N Analyses**

Babbie (2012), pp.415-438.

Wenfang Tang, Yue Hu and Shuai Jin. “Affirmative Inaction: Language Education and Labor Mobility among China’s Muslim Minorities”. *Chinese Sociological Review* (4 2016), pp. 346–66.

Emilie M Hafner-Burton and Alexander H Montgomery. “Power Positions: International Organizations, Social Networks, and Conflict”. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 50.1 (2006), pp. 3–27.

James Mahoney and Gary Goertz. “A Tale of Two Cultures: Contrasting Quantitative and Qualitative Research”. *Political Analysis* 14.3 (2006), pp. 227–49.

### **Week 16 (2017-12-04/2017-12-06): Professionalization**

Babbie (2012), pp.498-519.

Van Evera (1997), pp.99-111.

[Presentation at APSA 2014: Policy Bargaining and International Conflict](#)

[Presentation at MPSA 2017: Trump Scenes](#)

### **Week 17 (2017-12-11/2017-12-13): Final Week**

*Due for the research proposal: 2017-12-11.*

## Rubric for In-Class Presentation

Item	Criterion	Grade
Duration	> 8 mins 1; 5-8 mins .5; < 5 min 0.	X
Summary about the material	clearly described the logic and main arguments 1; covered the main arguments 0.5; failed to capture the main arguments 0.	X
Relation with other materials	clearly explained the relation with the week topic and other materials 1; mention another material 0.5; only talked about the assigned reading 0.	X
Impressive point	clearly described the impressive point and explained why 1; mentioned the impressive point 0.5; not discuss the point at all 0.	X
Critical reading	clearly described the question and why it's important 1; posted a question 0.5; not raise any question 0.	X

## Rubric for Response Paper

Item	Criterion	Grade
Summary of the material	clearly described the logic and main arguments 2; covered the main arguments 1; failed to capture the main arguments 0	X
learned Point	clearly explained the learned points and their importance 2; clearly describe the points learned 1; no learned point mentioned 0	X
Critical thinking	clearly opinions and why 2; have a perspective of the reading 1; no perspective at all 0	X



## Rubric for the Research Proposal

Item	Criterion	Grade
Cover table (5%)	Is the table fully filled? Is every element defined?	X
Research Question Approval (5%)	Was the research proposal approved by 2017-10-09?	X
Brief of Theory (5%)	Was the brief of the theory submitted by 2017-11-12?	X
Introduction (10%)	Is the research question well stated? Does the intro clearly explain the importance of the study? Does the intro clearly explain the potential contribution of this project?	X
Literature Review (10%)	Does the LR address more than three existing studies? Does the LR clearly review the findings of the existing literature? Does the LR clearly state how the existing literature serve as the basis for this study?	X
Theory (15%)	Is the causal logic clearly stated? Are the concepts in the theory well defined? Is the causal chain complete and consistent? Are the causal inferences (hypotheses) clearly stated and consistent with the theory?	X
Research Design (20%)	Does the author clearly describe the strategy to test the hypotheses? Does the author well defend his/her method choice?	X
Data (10%)	Is there a complete plan of data collection? How do the data fit the research design? Validations?	X
Feasibility (5%)	Is the research design a feasible one for a college student? What're the potential difficulties the researcher may encounter?	X
Citation (5%)	Are the citations well presented? Is there a full bibliography attached? Are the citation and bibliography styles consistent with the APSR requirement?	X
Overall writing (10%)	Does the language well edited? Do the paragraphs well framed and organized? Does the layout match the requirement?	X

## CLAS Teaching Policies & Resources — Syllabus Insert

### Administrative Home

The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences is the administrative home of this course and governs matters such as the add/drop deadlines, the second-grade-only option, and other related issues. Different colleges may have different policies. Questions may be addressed to 120 Schaeffer Hall, or see the CLAS Academic Policies Handbook at <https://clas.uiowa.edu/students/handbook>.

### Electronic Communication

University policy specifies that students are responsible for all official correspondences sent to their University of Iowa e-mail address ((???)). Faculty and students should use this account for correspondences ([Operations Manual](#), III.15.2, k.11).

### Accommodations for Disabilities

The University of Iowa is committed to providing an educational experience that is accessible to all students. A student may request academic accommodations for a disability (which includes but is not limited to mental health, attention, learning, vision, and physical or health-related conditions). A student seeking academic accommodations should first register with Student Disability Services and then meet with the course instructor privately in the instructor's office to make particular arrangements. Reasonable accommodations are established through an interactive process between the student, instructor, and SDS. See <https://sds.studentlife.uiowa.edu/> for information.

### Nondiscrimination in the Classroom

The University of Iowa is committed to making the classroom a respectful and inclusive space for all people irrespective of their gender, sexual, racial, religious or other identities. Toward this goal, students are invited to optionally share their preferred names and pronouns with their instructors and classmates. The University of Iowa prohibits discrimination and harassment against individuals on the basis of race, class, gender, sexual orientation, national origin, and other identity categories set forth in the University's Human Rights policy. For more information, contact the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity, [diversity@uiowa.edu](mailto:diversity@uiowa.edu), or visit [diversity.uiowa.edu](https://diversity.uiowa.edu).

### Academic Honesty

All CLAS students or students taking classes offered by CLAS have, in essence, agreed to the [College's Code of Academic Honesty](#): "I pledge to do my own academic work and to excel to the best of my abilities, upholding the [IOWA Challenge](#). I promise not to lie about my academic work, to cheat, or to steal the words or ideas of others; nor will I help fellow students to violate the Code of Academic Honesty." Any student committing academic misconduct is reported to the College and placed on disciplinary probation or may be suspended or expelled ([CLAS Academic Policies Handbook](#)).

## **CLAS Final Examination Policies**

The final examination schedule for each class is announced by the Registrar generally by the fifth week of classes. Final exams are offered only during the official final examination period. No exams of any kind are allowed during the last week of classes. All students should plan on being at the UI through the final examination period. Once the Registrar has announced the date, time, and location of each final exam, the complete schedule will be published on the Registrar's web site and will be shared with instructors and students. It is the student's responsibility to know the date, time, and place of a final exam.

## **Making a Suggestion or a Complaint**

Students with a suggestion or complaint should first visit with the instructor (and the course supervisor), and then with the departmental DEO. Complaints must be made within six months of the incident ([CLAS Academic Policies Handbook](#)).

## **Understanding Sexual Harassment**

Sexual harassment subverts the mission of the University and threatens the well-being of students, faculty, and staff. All members of the UI community have a responsibility to uphold this mission and to contribute to a safe environment that enhances learning. Incidents of sexual harassment should be reported immediately. See the UI [Office of the Sexual Misconduct Response Coordinator](#) for assistance, definitions, and the full University policy.

## **Reacting Safely to Severe Weather**

In severe weather, class members should seek appropriate shelter immediately, leaving the classroom if necessary. The class will continue if possible when the event is over. For more information on Hawk Alert and the siren warning system, visit the [Department of Public Safety website](#).

## Reference

Babbie, Earl R. 2012. *The Practice of Social Research*. 13th ed. Australia: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Van Evera, S. 1997. *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*. Cornell Paperbacks. Cornell University Press.