Logic of Political Inquiry

PSC 691 Spring 2018
Department of Political Science,
Syracuse University
Monday 12:45-3:30, Maxwell Hall 309A

Professor Shana Kushner Gadarian
Contact Information
Office: 315 Eggers
Phone: 315-443-3718
Email: sgadaria@maxwell.syr.edu
Course website: blackboard.syr.edu

Office Hours
Monday 10-12 pm or by appointment

Course Overview: The goal of this class is to introduce you to how empirical political scientists study, think, and research. We will discuss the process of theory building, hypothesis testing, and how political scientists across subfields ask and answer substantive questions. We will study both qualitative and quantitative methods but focus on how these methods help test causality. The course will also focus on professionalization topics (i.e. how to become a political scientist, not just study political science). The assignments will help you develop the following course goals:

Learning Outcomes:

- To help you develop analysis skills to evaluate and produce political science research publishable in peer-reviewed journals.
- To help you develop writing skills analyzing empirical political science research.
- To develop presentational skills to use at conferences and as an instructor.

For each week's readings, you should be prepared to discuss the following questions:

- In your view, what do you see as some of the major strengths and weaknesses of the *methods* used to investigate the subject? What methodologies, broadly conceived (e.g., basic issues of design, measurement, etc.) do you feel are most appropriate, given the subject of inquiry, and to what degree do you think the substantive conclusions drawn are dependent on the particular methods employed?
- In your view, what are some of the major *theoretical* perspectives that structure research in a given area, what are their major strengths and weaknesses, and how do they compare with other perspectives you're familiar with (encountered in the course or elsewhere)?
- How can this research be *improved*, in your view? What theories, methods and substantive foci deserve more attention in future research?
- What are the major *implications* of the findings for democratic theory and public policy? What relevance do the studies have for *your interests*? What does the study say about the way in which the American political system operates in practice – does the system live up to its billing as a democracy? According to what expectations and what definition of democracy?

COURSE EXPECTATIONS AND REQUIREMENTS:

Assignments: You are expected to read and analyze the readings prior to each week and come to class prepared to offer your insights. You are also expected to attend class each week and will need to inform me ahead of time if you will be absent. Multiple unexcused absences will lead to a lower grade.

Homework (50%)

1. Identifying research – Monday, January 22 by 9:30 am
2. *IRB training through CITI*: The Institutional Research Board oversees all projects using human subjects at Syracuse. In order to collect data through an intervention such as survey or an experiment, you will need to go through the online training provided by the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) by 9:30 am, Monday, January 29. Email your CITI certificate to me to complete the assignment.
3. Hypotheses – by Monday, Feb 5 class time – Deriving hypotheses from stylizing facts
4. Operationalization – by Monday, Feb 12 class time – Identifying concepts and measures in the American National Election Studies.
5. Observational data – by Monday, Feb 26 class time, Identifying variables

Grant proposal (50%):
Final proposals due by **Monday, May 7** by 5 pm. Late papers will be penalized 1/3 of a grade for each 24 hours they are late. There are several interim deadlines.

There are multiple phases of this project. Please note the dates below:

1. Monday, Feb 19 , Research Question (5%) (due in class): Submit a one page typed description of your research question, and explain how it fits into the general topical themes for the course. Provide an initial bibliography of at least 10 sources.

2. Monday, March 5, Research Design (10%) (Bring to class and be prepared to discuss): - PREREGISTRATION PLAN Submit five to seven typed pages (with a bibliography) that identify your research question, review the literature relevant to your question, discuss the method of analysis you intend to employ, and describe any data or historical sources you will use to evaluate your hypotheses.

3. Monday, March 19, First Draft (15%): Submit the initial draft of your application, with all key parts included (introduction, theory, research design, analysis, references). Each draft will be read by the instructor and two other students in the class. The instructor will assign the student discussants for each paper. The two papers each student will discuss will be distributed via email by Friday, March 23.

4. Monday, April 2, Reviews (20%) (due via email by 12:00pm): Each student will write a typed review commenting on two other students' papers in the class. The reviewers will be assigned "blindly", so that the authors do not know who reviewed their papers. The reviews should take the form of a journal review, where you make specific recommendations about how to improve the paper. See the readings on peer review on how to structure your review.

5. Monday May 7 by 5 PM, Final Draft (50%): Submit your final grant proposal along with a memo responding to the reviewers' comments in the previous round. I will take into consideration how well you responded to others' criticisms when assigning a final grade. The final paper grade is based on the weighted component grades for each portion of the paper (research question, research design, first draft, reviews, and final draft).

COURSE POLICIES

SCHOLASTIC DISHONESTY AND ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

There are many ways to succeed in this class. Cheating and plagiarism are not among them and will not be tolerated. The Syracuse University Academic Integrity Policy holds students accountable for the integrity of the work they submit. Students should be familiar with the policy and know that it is their responsibility to learn about instructor and general academic expectations with regard to proper citation of sources in written work.. Serious sanctions can result from academic dishonesty of any sort. For more information and the complete policy, see http://academicintegrity.syr.edu. Please see me if you have any questions about what constitutes original work. Plagiarism on research papers or the analytical papers will lead to an F for the course.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM

I encourage and value student participation. Keep in mind that since this is a class on politics, you will no doubt encounter point of views that differ from your own. Students in this class come from a variety of personal and academic backgrounds and these backgrounds may lead to a variety of perspectives on the political world. I believe that having a variety of viewpoints will make our discussions more interesting and will allow us to learn from each other. We will maintain a respectful dialogue even when we disagree and no student's grade will be affected by his or her personal views.

ACCOMMODATIONS

If you believe that you need accommodations for a disability, please contact the Office of Disability Services (ODS), http://disabilityservices.syr.edu, located in Room 309 of 804 University Avenue, or call (315) 443-4498 for an appointment to discuss your needs and the process for requesting accommodations. ODS is responsible for coordinating disability-related accommodations and will issue students with documented disabilities Accommodation Authorization Letters, as appropriate. Since accommodations may require early planning and generally are not provided retroactively, please contact ODS as soon as possible. You are also welcome to contact me privately to discuss your academic needs, although I cannot arrange for disability-related accommodations.

RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCES

It is the policy of Syracuse University that no student should be refused admission or be expelled because he or she is unable to participate in any examination, study, or work requirement because of his or her religious holy day requirements. An opportunity will be provided to make up any examination, study, or work requirements that may have been missed because of an absence due to a religious observance providing that I have been notified in writing one week before the absence. No fees will be charged to the student for the costs incurred by the University for such makeup work. In effecting this policy, the University agrees that no adverse or prejudicial effect should result to any student who avails herself or himself of its provisions.

At the end of the semester, your grade will be assigned based on the following scale:

A (93-100), A- (90-92), B+ (87-89), B (83-86), B- (80-82), C+ (77-79), C (73-76), C- (70-72). F (69 and below). There are no D grades in graduate courses.

Books to purchase:

1. Achen, Christopher. 1982. *Interpreting and Using Regression*.
2. Gerring, John. 2012. Social Science Methodology: A United Framework. *2nd Edition*
3. King, G., Keohane, R.O. and Verba, S., 1994. *Designing social inquiry: Scientific inference in qualitative research*. Princeton university press. (KKV)
4. McConnaughy, Corrine M. *The woman suffrage movement in America: A reassessment*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.
5. Shively, W. Phillips. 2010. The Craft of Political Research, *8th Ed* (9th should be ok)

Jan 22 – Social Inquiry and Becoming a Political Scientist

a. KKV – p3-33
b. Katznelson, Ira & Helen V. Milner. 2002. "American Political Science: The Discipline's State and the State of the Discipline." *Political Science: The State of the Discipline*. New York: W.W. Norton, pp. 1-26.
c. Bahn, Kate. 2014. Faking It: Women, Academia, and Impostor Syndrome." *Chronicle Vitae*.
d. Aguilar, Stephen J. 2015. "We Are Not Impostors." *Inside Higher Ed.*
e. Weeks, Gregory. 2006. "Facing Failure: The Use (and Abuse) of Rejection in Political Science," *PS: Political Science and Politics*, October: 879-82.
f. Munger, Michael C. 2010. "10 Tips on How to Write Less Badly." Chronicle of Higher Education. Sept. 6 http://chronicle.com/article/10-Tips-on-How-to-Write-Les/124268/
g. Blau, Francine D, Janet M Currie, Rachel T. A Croson, and Donna K Ginther. 2010. "Can Mentoring Help Female Assistant Professors? Interim Results from a Randomized Trial." *American Economic Review* 100 (2): 348–52. Doi:10.1257/aer.100.2.348.

Homework: Identify 5 research questions that a political scientist might want to answer. Email to me by 9:30 am Jan 22.

Jan 29 – Transparency, reproducibility, the scientific method, ethics – Colin Elman visits

a. Shively, The Craft of Political Research, Chs. 1
b. Gerring, Jon, Social Science Methodology, Ch. 2
c. Yanow, D. (2003). Practicing Discipline. *PS: Political Science and Politics, 36*(3), 397-399.
d. Elman, Colin, and Arthur Lupia. 2014. "Data Access and Research Transparency (DA-RT): A Joint Statement by Political Science Journal Editors." http://goo.gl/SuhQuA.
e. Simmons, Joseph P., Leif D. Nelson, and Uri Simonsohn. 2011. "False-Positive Psychology: Undisclosed Flexibility in Data Collection and Analysis Allows Presenting Anything as Significant." Psychological Science 22(11): 1359-66. URL: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22006061.
f. Responsible conduct of research: The LaCour case https://www.unh.edu/research/sites/www.unh.edu.research/files/docs/RIS/lacour_case.pdf

g. Gerber, Alan, and Neil Malhotra. 2008. "Do Statistical Reporting Standards Affect What is Published? Publication Bias in Two Leading Political Science Journals." Quarterly Journal of Political Science 3(3): 313-326.

Assignment: Complete CITI training and email the certificate to me by 9:30 am Jan 29. http://orip.syr.edu/human-research/training-list/Education%20and%20Training.html

Feb 5 – Building theories

a. Gerring, Jon. Social Science Methodology. Ch 2
b. Shively. The Craft of Political Research, Ninth Edition. Chapters 2, 3
c. Gailmard, Sean and John W. Patty. 2013. "Formal Models of Bureaucracy" *Annual Review of Political Science*. 15: 353-377.
d. Walsh, Katherine Cramer., 2012. Putting inequality in its place: Rural consciousness and the power of perspective. *American Political Science Review*, *106*(3), pp.517-532
e. Brady, Henry E., Sidney Verba, and Kay Lehman Schlozman. "Beyond SES: A resource model of political participation." *American Political Science Review* 89, no. 2 (1995): 271-294.

Assignment: Deriving hypotheses from facts. See assignment on Blackboard. Due in class Feb 5.

Feb 12 – Building blocks of theory – operationalization and assumptions

a. Healy, Kieran. 2016. "Fuck Nuance." 2016. Sociological *Theory*,
b. Collier, David and Steven Levitsky. 1997. "Democracy with Adjectives: Conceptual Innovation in Comparative Research." *World Politics* 49(3): 430-51.
c. Sartori, Giovanni. 1970. "Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics." *American Political Science Review* 64(4): 1033-46 [you can skim the rest]
d. Adcock, Robert and David Collier. 2001. "Measurement Validity: A Shared Standard for Qualitative and Quantitative Research." *American Political Science Review* 95(3): 529-47.
e. Sen, Maya and Omar Wasow. 2016. "Race as a Bundle of Sticks: Designs that Estimate Effects of Seemingly Immutable Characteristics." *Annual Review of Political Science* 19: 499-522.
f. Morton, Rebecca. 1999. Methods and Models: A Guide to the Empirical Analysis of Formal Models in Political Science, pp. 33-4, 36-43.

Assignment: Using the 2016 American National Election Studies Time Series, identify the variable or variables that measure the following concepts: 1. Political participation, 2. Religiosity, 3. Partisanship, 4. Foreign policy attitudes. Write a few sentences justifying the inclusion of these measures and why you excluded other potential measures. Due in class Feb 12. (http://electionstudies.org/studypages/anes_timeseries_2016/anes_timeseries_2016.htm)

Feb 19 – Assessing theory - Simon Weschle visits

a. Moore, WH. 2001. "Evaluating Theory in Political Science," unpublished.
b. King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane & Sidney Verba. 1994. "Descriptive Inference," in Designing Social Inquiry. Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 55-7, 76-82
c. Rogowoski, Ron. 1995. "The role of theory and anomaly in social–scientific inference." *American Political Science Review*, 89(2), 467–470.
d. Shively, Phillips. "Causal Thinking and Research Design," in The Craft of Political Research, pp. 74-8.

e. Seawright, Jason. "Integrative Multi-Method Research" in Multi-Method Social Science. P. 1-18.
f. Achen, Christopher. *Interpreting and Using Regression.* P. 17-30

Assignment: Submit a 1-page typed description of your research question that you will use for your grant application. Provide an initial bibliography of at least 10 sources. Due in class Feb 19.

Research designs

Feb 26 – Observational data- Danielle Thomsen visits

a. Shively. The Craft of Political Research, Ninth Edition. Chapters 4, 5 and 6 ("Problems of Measurement: Accuracy," "Problems of Measurement: Precision" and "Causal Thinking and the Design of Research"). Pp. 42-95
b. Gerring, John. Social Science Methodology. Ch 8, 9 ("Causal Arguments, Causal analyses)
c. Acharya, Avidit, Matthew Blackwell, and Maya Sen. 2016. "The Political Legacy of American Slavery." Journal of Politics 78(3): 621–641. (http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/686631)
d. Thomsen, Danielle M. "Ideological moderates won't run: How party fit matters for partisan polarization in Congress." *The Journal of Politics* 76, no. 3 (2014): 786-797.

Assignment: Practicing with observational data. Assignment on Blackboard. Due in class on Feb 26.

March 5 –Barriers to inference in observational research: - Lamis Abdelaaty visits

a. King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research. Princeton University Press: Princeton, NJ.
   Chapter 4, pp. 115-149: "Determining What to Observe."
   Chapter 5, pp. 150-207: "Understanding What to Avoid.
b. Geddes, Barbara. 1990. "How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics." *Political Analysis* 2: 131-150.
c. Clarke, Kevin. 2005. "The Phantom Menace: Omitted Variable Bias in Econometric Research." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 22: 341-352.
d. von Stein, Jana. 2005. "Do Treaties Constrain or Screen? Selection Bias and Treaty Compliance." *American Political Science Review* 99(4): 611-622.

Assignment: Research designs due in class March 5.

March 12 –No class, Spring Break – Work on your grant applications!

March 19 – Observational data: small/medium n research & peer review

a. King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Chapter 4 ("Determining What to Observe").
b. Harding, David J., Cybelle Fox, and Jal D. Mehta. "Studying rare events through qualitative case studies: Lessons from a study of rampage school shootings." *Sociological Methods & Research* 31, no. 2 (2002): 174-217.

c. Lapuente, Victor, and Bo Rothstein. "Civil war Spain versus Swedish harmony: The quality of government factor." *Comparative Political Studies* 47, no. 10 (2014): 1416-1441.
d. Goffman, Alice. "On the run: Wanted men in a Philadelphia ghetto." *American sociological review* 74, no. 3 (2009): 339-357.

Writing and communicating in the social sciences –

a. The Political Methodologist Special Issue on Peer Review (Fall 2015), pp. 2-24. URL: https://goo.gl/3kfa3e. (ALL)
b. Miller, Beth, Jon Pevehouse, Ron Rogowski, Dustin Tingley, and Rick Wilson. 2013. "How To Be a Peer Reviewer: A Guide for Recent and Soon-to-Be PhDs." PS: Political Science & Politics 46(1): 120–23.

Assignment: First draft of grant application due by class time via email March 19. Peer review to be assigned by Monday, March 26.

March 26 – Historical analysis – Steven White visits

McConnaughy, Corrine M. *The woman suffrage movement in America: A reassessment*. Cambridge University Press, 2013. (Entire)

Assignment: Catch up on your reading in other classes. (I'm feeling generous).

April 2 – Natural/Field Experiments

a. McDermott, Rose. 2002. Experimental methods in political science. *Annual Review of Political Science*, *5*(1), pp.31-61.
b. Caughey, Devin, and Jasjeet S. Sekhon. "Elections and the regression discontinuity design: Lessons from close US house races, 1942–2008." *Political Analysis* 19, no. 4 (2011): 385-408.
c. Holbein, John B. "Childhood Skill Development and Adult Political Participation." *American Political Science Review* 111, no. 3 (2017): 572-583.
d. Hyde, Susan D. "The observer effect in international politics: Evidence from a natural experiment." *World Politics* 60, no. 1 (2007): 37-63.

Assignment: Peer review (anonymous) of 2 classmates' grant applications due by 12:00 pm via email March 26.

April 9- Survey/Lab Experiments

a. Gaines, Brian J., James H. Kuklinski, and Paul J. Quirk. 2007. "The Logic of the Survey Experiment Revisited." *Political Analysis* 15 (Winter): 1-20.
b. Barabas, Jason, and Jennifer Jerit. 2010. Are survey experiments externally valid? *American Political Science Review* 104.02: 226-242.
c. Druckman, James N. Political preference formation: Competition, deliberation, and the (Ir) relevance of framing effects. *American Political Science Review* 98.04 (2004): 671-686.
d. Gadarian, Shana Kushner, and Bethany Albertson. "Anxiety, immigration, and the search for information." *Political Psychology* 35, no. 2 (2014): 133-164.

Assignment: Make an appointment to come visit me in office hours & discuss your proposal & the reviews.

April 16– Triangulating around research or Integrating multiple methods – Tom Keck visits

Seawright, Jason. Multi-Method Social Science, Chapter 8
In addition, Choose one of these sets of readings and be ready to present to the class. Your job is not to simply summarize the articles but to analyze the research and discuss how the answers we get may depend on what methods we use.

A. Judicial decision-making
    a. Keck, Thomas M. "Party, Policy, or Duty: Why Does the Supreme Court Invalidate Federal Statutes?." *American Political Science Review* 101, no. 2 (2007): 321-338.
    b. Gillman, Howard. 2001. "What's Law Got to Do with It? Judicial Behavioralists Test the 'Legal Model' of Judicial Decision Making." *Law and Social Inquiry* 26: 465–504.
    c. Graber, Mark A. 2006. "Does it Really Matter? Conservative Courts in a Conservative Era." *Fordham Law Review* 75 (November): 675–708

B. Public goods provisions and democracy
    a. Habyarimana, James, Macartan Humphreys, Daniel N. Posner, and Jeremy M. Weinstein. "Why does ethnic diversity undermine public goods provision?." *American Political Science Review* 101, no. 4 (2007): 709-725.
    b. Ostrom, Elinor. "Collective action and the evolution of social norms." *Journal of economic perspectives* 14, no. 3 (2000): 137-158.
    c. Stephen Haber and Victor Menaldo, "Do Natural Resources Fuel Authoritarianism?" American Political Science Review 105 (February 2011), pp. 1-26.

C. Democracy and War-Fighting
    a. Dani Reiter and Allan Stam, *Democracies at War* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002), chs. 1-2, pp. 1-57.
    b. Alexander Downes, "How Smart and Tough Are Democracies? Reassessing Theories of Democratic Victory in War," *International Security* 33 (Spring 2009), pp. 9-51.
    c. Randall Schweller, "Domestic Structure and Preventive War: Are Democracies More Pacific?" *World Politics*, 44 (2), January 1992, pp. 235-269.

D. Negative advertising
    a. Ansolabehere, Stephen, Shanto Iyengar, Adam Simon, and Nicholas Valentino. 1994. "Does Attack Advertising Demobilize the Electorate?" *American Political Science Review* 88(4): 829-838.
    b. Kahn, Kim Fridkin, and Patrick J. Kenney. 1999. "Do Negative Campaigns Mobilize or Suppress Turnout? Clarifying the Relationship between Negativity and Participation." *American Political Science Review* 93(4): 877-889.
    c. Brooks, Deborah. 2006. "The Resilient Voter: Moving toward Closure in the Debate over Negative Campaigning and Turnout." *Journal of Politics* 68(3): 684-696.

E. Audience Costs in International Crises

a. Kenneth A. Schultz, "Do Democratic Institutions Constrain or Inform? Contrasting Two Institutional Perspectives on Democracy and War," International Organization 53 (Spring 1999), pp. 233-66.
b. Marc Trachtenberg, "Audience Costs: An Historical Analysis," Security Studies 21 (Feb. 2012), pp. 3-42.
c. Michael Tomz, "Domestic Audience Costs in International Relations: An Experimental Approach," International Organization (Fall 2007), pp. 821-840.

F. Colonial Legacies on political institutions
    a. Daron Acemoglu, Simon Johnson, and James Robinson, "The Colonial Origins of Comparative Development: An Empirical Investigation." *American Economic Review* 91 (2001), pp. 1369-1401.
    b. David Y. Albouy, "The Colonial Origins of Comparative Development: An Empirical Investigation: Comment," *American Economic Review* 102(2012), pp. 3059-76.
    c. Alexander Lee and Kenneth A. Schultz, "Comparing British and French Colonial Legacies: A Discontinuity Analysis of Cameroon," *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 7 (2012), pp 365-410.

G. Intergroup relations
    a. Enos, Ryan. 2014. Causal Effect of Intergroup Contact on Exclusionary Attitudes. *Proceedings of the National Academy* 111(10): 3699-3704.
    b. Kuklinski , James, Michael Cobb, Martin Gilens. 1997. "Racial Attitudes and the New South" *Journal of Politics*. Vol. 59, No. 2, p. 323-349
    c. Adida, Claire L., David D. Laitin, and Marie-Anne Valfort. ""One Muslim is enough!" Evidence from a field experiment in France." *Annals of Economics and Statistics/Annales d'Économie et de Statistique* 121/122 (2016): 121-160.

H. Social policy & the effects of prison
    a. Haney, Craig, and Philip Zimbardo. "The past and future of US prison policy: Twenty-five years after the Stanford Prison Experiment." *American Psychologist* 53, no. 7 (1998): 709.
    b. Weaver, Vesla M., and Amy E. Lerman. "Political consequences of the carceral Pstate." *American Political Science Review* 104, no. 4 (2010): 817-833.
    c. Pager, Devah. "The mark of a criminal record." *American journal of sociology* 108, no. 5 (2003): 937-975.

I. Violence and civil wars
    a. Davenport, C., Moore, W. and Poe, S., 2003. Sometimes you just have to leave: Domestic threats and forced migration, 1964-1989. *International Interactions*, *29*(1), pp.27-55.
    b. Steele, Abbey. "Electing Displacement: Political Cleansing in Apartadó, Colombia." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 55, no. 3 (2011): 423-445.
    c. Lawrence, Adria S. "Triggering Nationalist Violence : Competition and Conflict in Uprisings against Colonial Rule." *International Security* 35, no. 2 (2010): 88-122.

J. Media effects
    a. Green, D. P., Calfano, B. R., & Aronow, P. M. (2014). Field experimental designs for the study of media effects. *Political Communication*, *31*(1), 168-180.

b. Gary King, Jennifer Pan, and Margaret E Roberts. 2013. "How Censorship in China Allows Government Criticism but Silences Collective Expression." American Political Science Review, 107, 2 (May), Pp. 1-18.
c. Iyengar, Shanto, Mark D. Peters, and Donald R. Kinder. "Experimental demonstrations of the" not so-minimal" consequences of television news programs." *The American Political Science Review* (1982): 848-858Gadarian – political comm piece
d. Jerit, Jennifer, Jason Barabas, and Scott Clifford. 2013. Comparing Contemporaneous Laboratory and Field Experiments on Media Effects. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 77.1 (2013): 256-282.

K. Political Responsiveness in the US
a. Gilens, Martin and Benjamin Page. 2014. "Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens". *Perspectives on Politics*. 12(3)
b. Broockman, David. "Black Politicians Are More Intrinsically Motivated To Advance Blacks' Interests: A Field Experiment Manipulating Political Incentives." *American Journal of Political Science* 57 no. 3. (2013)
c. Miller, Warren E., and Donald E. Stokes. "Constituency influence in Congress." *American Political Science Review* 57.01 (1963): 45-56.
d. Harbridge, Laurel, and Neil Malhotra. "Electoral incentives and partisan conflict in congress: Evidence from survey experiments." *American Journal of Political Science* 55.3 (2011): 494-510.

Assignment: Be prepared to present your set of readings, focused on how the different articles test similar substantive theories, using different methods

April 23 – – Presentations and wrap-up – Rachel Leventhal-Weiner Skypes in
Assignment: Prepare a 10 minute conference style presentation of your grant proposal. The presentation should give limited background and focus on the research design and the hypotheses you will be testing with the design.

Some guides for giving excellent conference presentations:

a. Columbia Graduate School: http://www.columbia.edu/cu/tat/pdfs/presentations1.pdf
b. Get a Life, PhD: http://getalifephd.blogspot.com/2011/04/how-to-give-fabulous-academic.html
c. The American Psychological Association: http://www.apa.org/science/about/psa/2010/04/presentation.aspx
d. Nick Hopwood: https://nickhop.wordpress.com/2013/09/12/a-guide-to-making-academic-conference-presentations-more-effective/

April 30 – TBD (Professionalization discussion or another as determined by needs of class)