

Instructor: Dr. Shawna K. Metzger  
Lecture: TF, 10:00-11:35am  
Location: Cinnamon South Learn Lobe, TR1

Office: Cinnamon West Learn Lobe, #02-03  
Office Hours: By appointment  
Web Site: <https://ivle.nus.edu.sg/>  
Contact: [smetzger@nus.edu.sg](mailto:smetzger@nus.edu.sg)

### Table of Contents

Module Description .....	1
Course Objectives .....	2
Course Expectations .....	2
Use of Technology during Class.....	3
Reading Material.....	3
Course Grade and Assessments .....	3
Academic Integrity .....	4
Course Outline: Topics, Reading List.....	5
Projects Information .....	8
Overview .....	8
Procedural .....	8
Project: War Data (45% of grade) .....	9
Project: Group Presentation (25% of grade).....	10

“Ultimately, the best strategy to ensure our security and to build a durable peace is to support the advance of democracy elsewhere. Democracies don't attack each other.”  
– US President William J. Clinton, 1994 State of the Union Address<sup>1</sup>

### Module Description

#### *Generalities: The Rhetoric of Numbers*

This Foundation-level module introduces students to the basics of quantitative reasoning—the way in which we can use numbers to provide evidence for our arguments. It does so by examining a specific substantive topic whose claims can be assessed quantitatively. The module is required for all USP students entering the programme in Sem1 of the AY 2012/13 school year or later.

In this module, we will regard “quantitative reasoning” as a philosophical approach. The module’s core idea is simple: quantitative analysis is rhetoric for numbers. Just as sound argumentation involves clear, logically consistent, fallacy-free prose, sound quantitative analysis involves appropriate research design, valid data measures, and the correct statistical technique. As students, you have spent your entire educational career learning how to conceptualize, recognize, and critique written rhetoric. You have spent less time developing the corresponding skillset for “numerical” rhetoric. Thus, the primary objective of this module is to develop these skills.

#### *Substantive Topic: The Democratic Peace*

Does democracy promote peace between states? Immanuel Kant was among the first to argue “yes” in his 1795 essay, “[Perpetual Peace](https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/kant/kant1.htm).”<sup>2</sup> “The reason,” writes Kant, “is this: if the consent of the citizens is required in order to decide that war should be declared (and in this [republican] constitution it cannot but be the case), nothing is more natural than that they would be very cautious in commencing such a poor game, decreeing for themselves all the calamities of war.”

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/WCPD-1994-01-31/html/WCPD-1994-01-31-Pg148.htm>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/kant/kant1.htm>

Over 200 years later, Kant's argument continues to attract attention because of its clear implications for our world. It has been the subject of countless academic articles and books, and has even made appearances in politicians' foreign policy speeches, as shown by the epigraph.

Numerous scholars have made arguments in favor and against Kant's claims, which have been dubbed the "democratic peace theory." We follow in their footsteps by using quantitative reasoning and analysis. We assess whether the likelihood of interstate war is affected by countries' regime types. We will survey extant research on the subject, wrestle with thought-provoking questions about appropriate ways to quantitatively measure the theoretical concepts, and develop a research design that we will then execute when we build and interpret our empirical models.

The module is organized around four thematic components, reflecting the process described above and the core idea of "rhetoric of numbers":

- I. Why Quantitative? The Rhetoric of Numbers
- II. Setting up Your 'Argument': Research Design
- III. From Prose to Numbers and Back Again: Empirical Testing and Evaluating the Results
- IV. Sound Logic vs. Numerical Fallacies: Assessing Quantitative Analyses and their Limitations

### Course Objectives

The Quantitative Reasoning Foundation (QRF) module has three broad objectives:

1. To introduce students to the basic intuition and logic that undergirds quantitative analyses.
2. To demonstrate how this logic can be applicable to questions in students' own fields of study.
3. To mold students into critical consumers of quantitative knowledge by increasing their "quantitative literacy": the ability to read, interpret, and think critically about the use of numbers in the material they encounter daily.

For this specific QRF module, you should be able to do several tasks upon completing the course:

- I. Quantitative Reasoning
  1. Discuss the purpose, strengths, and weaknesses of quantitative analysis
  2. Name the steps of the scientific method as it applies to quantitative research, describe the relevant tasks associated with each step, and be able to perform these tasks correctly
  3. Have a particular awareness of (1) the role that theoretical concepts and their empirical operationalization play in the research process; and (2) the importance of "falsifiability"
  4. Be able to: (1) build datasets by gathering and organizing numerical data, (2) compute basic descriptive statistics, (3) perform basic statistical analyses (in the form of linear and nonlinear regression), and (4) interpret the descriptive statistics and analysis results
  5. Have familiarity with the concept of "significance," in the statistical sense, and be able to explain why it is central to the very notion of quantitative reasoning
- II. Substantive Topic
  1. Know the basic tenants of the democratic peace theory.
  2. Be familiar with the way in which scholars have measured "war" and "democracy" quantitatively, and the strengths and weaknesses of these measures.
  3. Articulate the main empirical findings associated with the democratic peace, as well as the main counterarguments to the theory, and the empirical support associated with those counterarguments.

### Course Expectations

I have four broad expectations regarding your knowledge of the material and your degree of effort. First, I expect you to learn the material. Second, learning the material comes from putting effort into preparing for the relevant assignments each class. For that reason, I expect you to prepare for class that day, regardless of the nature of the assignment. Third, if a concept does not make sense in class, or if you are unsure about an assignment, I expect you to contact me. Finally, class starts at the top of the hour. Be here on time.

In return, you can expect certain things from me. First, I will be prepared for each class so the information is presented as coherently as possible to you. Second, I will not waste your time with menial readings or other coursework. Third, assignments will be graded fairly and returned promptly. Promptness also extends to email responses, where you can expect a reply to any emails you send within 36 hours on weekdays, unless told otherwise. Finally, class ends at 35 past the hour. I will always make a serious effort to end class at that time.

In short: If I am willing to put forth the effort to make the class work, I expect no less from you.

#### Use of Technology during Class

Electronic devices—computers, tablets, mobiles, MP3 players—have revolutionized our lives. The classroom is no exception. While these devices have many beneficial qualities, they can create a discordant learning environment if they are used inappropriately during class.

Examples of inappropriate behavior include, but are in no way limited to: wearing headphones during class, sending SMSes, ringing phones, playing games on your mobile, checking your email, surfing the internet (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, Tumblr), and working on coursework for other classes. Such usage is distracting to your fellow students, and it is disrespectful to the professor.

To promote a positive learning environment, anyone caught using electronic devices inappropriately during class will be penalized. **Your final course grade will be lowered by one half-letter grade for every infraction.** For example, if your final course grade is an A-, but you are caught texting once, it will be lowered to a B+. If you are caught twice, it will be a B.

You are allowed to use your laptop to take class notes. I only ask that you be considerate and sit toward the sides or back of the classroom, so that no one behind you will be distracted by your screen. However, if you are caught doing anything other than notetaking, the same penalty applies.

This policy applies to everyone, no exceptions. Even I silence my mobile before class starts. In the rare event of *truly* exigent situations (e.g., family emergency), where you cannot avoid violating this policy, you must let me know before class starts. I will not hear appeals after the penalty is assessed. I will point you to this paragraph, albeit sympathetically.

#### Reading Material

The course has one required textbook, abbreviated “K&W” in the course outline:

Kellstedt, Paul M., and Guy D. Whitten. 2013. *The Fundamentals of Political Science Research*. 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (ISBN: 9781107621664)

The book is available for purchase at the Forum branch of the NUS Co-op, as well as BookHaven in the Riady Centre. There are also two copies available in the NUS Reading Room.

I have also assigned a number of additional readings to supplement the textbook. They range from book excerpts to journal articles. These readings are available digitally on IVLE, under “Additional Readings” in the “Course Documents” Workbin.

#### Course Grade and Assessments

Students’ final course grades are comprised of four major elements:

- |                                |     |
|--------------------------------|-----|
| 1. Seminar Participation       | 5%  |
| 2. Project: War Data           | 45% |
| 3. Project: Group Presentation | 25% |
| <i>Class Presentation</i>      | 15% |
| <i>Individual Summaries</i>    | 10% |
| 4. Final Examination           | 25% |

Incomplete grades (“IC”) will not be given, except in extenuating circumstances.

#### IMPORTANT DATES OF NOTE

All assignments are due on the date listed by 10am for *all* students. You will submit your work using the “Assignment Submissions” Workbin on IVLE, under the appropriate folder. Late assignments will not be accepted. Plan accordingly.

- Project: War Data
  - Assignment #1: M&R – GBD Breakdown 22 August 2014 (F)
  - Assignment #2: Measurement – DV 02 September 2014 (T)
  - Assignment #3: M&R – RD Breakdown 16 September 2014 (T)
  - Assignment #4: Descriptive Statistics 23 September 2014 (T)
  - Assignment #5: Inference – OLS 07 October 2014 (T)
  - Assignment #6: Inference – Logit 21 October 2014 (T)
  - Assignment #7: Substantive Reflection 28 October 2014 (T)
- Project: Group Presentation
  - Class Presentation } 04 November 2014 (T) – Groups 1-3
  - Individual Summaries } 07 November 2014 (F) – Groups 4-5
- Final Examination: Monday, 24 November 2014, 1-3pm (location TBA by Registrar).

#### SEMINAR PARTICIPATION

Most class periods will contain at least one activity, ranging from group work to silent self-reflection. These activities are intended to stimulate your thinking about the topic we have been discussing, so as to help you understand and learn it. You are expected to participate fully.

I reserve the right to hold pop quizzes at any time, should I suspect that anyone is not doing the course readings or is not paying attention. The quizzes contribute to this section of your grade.

#### PROJECTS

Both projects are made up of multiple parts, due at various points throughout the semester. The parts are described in their entirety in the “Projects Information” section, starting on p. 8.

#### FINAL EXAM

The final exam is comprised of multiple choice and short answer questions. Material will come mostly from the lectures, but any assigned reading is also testable. The exam is cumulative. It is scheduled for Monday, 24 November 2014, at 1pm. The Registrar announces the location two weeks in advance on the “Examination Directory” page of myPortal. Exam grades will be moderated as needed.

The exam has two *de facto* segments. The first segment tests your knowledge and comprehension of the topics we have discussed in class, particularly the material on the Day’s Objectives slides. The second segment tests your ability to apply this knowledge. It is deliberately written to be challenging. If you know the course’s fundamentals well (the first segment), your exam grade will likely be a B+/A-. Your ability to *apply* these fundamentals (the second segment) will push you into the A/A+ range.

Absences from the scheduled examination are governed by University-level policies. They are available for you to view under “Examination Directory” on myPortal.

#### Academic Integrity

All NUS students are bound by the Code of Student Conduct.<sup>3</sup> This includes academic integrity. Any violations (e.g., cheating, plagiarism) will be prosecuted fully according to University policy.<sup>4</sup>

You are allowed to confer with your classmates about the assignments as you complete them, as is typical in most USP classes. However, the work that you turn in must ultimately be your own. All

<sup>3</sup> <http://nus.edu.sg/osa/so/guidelines/student-conduct>

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.usp.nus.edu.sg/curriculum/acad-matters/academic-code.html>

of the assignments are to be completed by an individual, not a collective, with the class presentation portion of the group project being the sole exception. Thus, any assignment must reflect your understanding of the subject matter—e.g., it must be in *your* words, with its organization reflecting *your* line of reasoning. Borrowing someone else’s words is a form of plagiarism, as is borrowing their organizational structure. Both are possible in a QR class, because QR is concerned with not only obtaining the correct “numbers”, but your ability to interpret the numbers, give them substantive meaning, acknowledge their potential flaws, and weave them back into a larger argument.

Academic integrity violations tend to happen when individuals feel like they have no other way to complete an assignment on time and/or correctly. If you ever feel lost, confused, overwhelmed, pressured, etc. by an assignment, please: do not cheat, plagiarise, etc. Your education is serious business, but it should not come at the cost of sacrificing your morals and personal integrity.

Instead, stop by to talk to me. My door is always open, and our conversations will remain between us. I am on your side at the end of the day, but I cannot help if you do not ask for it, nor can I help if you wait too long to ask. (I cannot work miracles.) I am willing to work with you to complete the assignment if you contact me *at least 24 hours before the due date*. This can include granting an extension, should I see fit. Some accommodations will entail point deductions, so as to be fair to your classmates, but your grade would still be higher than it would if you were caught cheating.

Simply put: you should never feel that academic dishonesty, cheating or otherwise, is your only option. If you engage in such behavior, I will come down on you. Hard.

#### Course Outline: Topics, Reading List

The class will be a combination of lecture and seminar. I rely on PowerPoint as a structuring tool for discussion. The presentations have a small amount of text by design, and ***are not meant to be substitutes for taking class notes!*** They are meant to serve as a topical outline for the discussion, which—to reiterate—means they are not meant to capture each class word for word.

Presentations will be posted on IVLE by 6:00am on the day of class, should you want to print the slides for taking notes. Any abbreviations in the presentation are summarized on the last slide.

The readings are to be completed for the class under which they are listed. You may find it helpful to read them in the order they appear.

#### **Section I: Why Quantitative? The Rhetoric of Numbers**

- 1.) 12 Aug Introduction  
K&W, Ch. 1, all (Sect. 1.3 = very important; know it well)
- 2.) 15 Aug Background: Historical Cases of War  
Mingst and Arreguín-Toft, pp. 234-241  
Choose one war from list in fn. 5, read war’s associated material<sup>5</sup>
- 3.) 19 Aug Research Questions and the “Scientific Approach”  
K&W, Ch. 2, all (skip Sects. 2.3, 2.6-2.7)  
Graff, Birkenstein, and Durst, Ch. 13

---

<sup>5</sup> I. Falklands/Malvinas War  
• Her Majesty’s Stationery Office. 1982. *Britain and the Falklands Crisis: A Documentary Record*. London: Central Office of Information. Pp. 2-16.

II. Korean War  
• Stoessinger, John G. 2005. *Why Nations Go to War*. 9th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth. Ch. 3.

III. War of the Triple Alliance  
• “Paraguay’s Awful History: The Never-Ending War.” 2012. *The Economist*. December 22, 45-48.  
<http://www.economist.com/news/christmas/21568594-how-terrible-little-known-conflict-continues-shape-and-blight-nation>  
• Wilson, Peter H. 2004. “Latin America’s Total War.” *History Today* 54 (5): 52-59.

- 4.) 22 Aug     The Democratic Peace  
Maoz and Russett, "Normative and Structural Causes of Democratic Peace"  
«Assignment #1 due: 10am, IVLE»
- 5.) 26 Aug     The Dependent Variable  
K&W, pp. 7-9, Sections 5.3.1  
Jones, Bremer, and Singer, "Militarized Interstate Disputes," pp. 163-177
- 6.) 29 Aug     The Independent Variable  
\*\*CLASS HELD ONLINE (SEE IVLE FOR DETAILS)\*\*  
Clark, Golder, and Golder, Ch. 5  
K&W, Section 5.4
- 7.) 02 Sep     Causality, Hypotheses, and Falsifiability  
\*\*CLASS HELD ONLINE (SEE IVLE FOR DETAILS)\*\*  
K&W, Ch. 3, all; p. 4 (reread)  
«Assignment #2 due: 10am, IVLE»
- 8.) 05 Sep     Scope, Population, and Sampling  
K&W, Section 6.1; Section 2.4 (reread)  
Sarkees and Wayman, *Resort to War*, pp. 11-26

**Section II: Setting up Your 'Argument':**

*Research Design*

- 9.) 09 Sep     Data Organization, Types of Measurement Levels  
K&W, Sections 4.3, 2.3, 5.8
- 10.) 12 Sep    Reliability and Validity  
K&W, Sections 5.1, 5.3  
Clark, Golder, and Golder, pp. 162-167 (reread)
- 11.) 16 Sep    Descriptive Statistics  
K&W, Sections 5.9-5.10, 6.2-6.3  
«Assignment #3 due: 10am, IVLE»
- 12.) 19 Sep    Bivariate Measures of Association, Intro to "Regression"  
K&W, Sections 7.4.3, 8.1-8.2
- 23 Sep     «Assignment #4 due: 10am, IVLE»
- 21/9-27/9  No classes, Recess Week

**Section III: From Prose to Numbers and Back Again:**

*Empirical Testing and Evaluating the Results*

- 13.) 30 Sep    Regression: Bivariate  
K&W, Sections 8.1-8.2 (reread), 8.3
- 14.) 03 Oct    Regression: Multivariate  
K&W, Sections 9.1-9.4
- 15.) 07 Oct    Hypothesis Testing  
K&W, Sections 7.3, 8.4 (intro only), 8.4.4, 8.4.6, 8.4.8  
«Assignment #5 due: 10am, IVLE»
- 16.) 10 Oct    Model Specification  
Ray, "Explaining Interstate Conflict and War", pp. 4-15  
K&W, Sections 8.4.1-8.4.3
- 17.) 14 Oct    Binary Dependent Variables  
K&W, Sections 11.1, 11.2 (sans 11.2.3)
- 18.) 17 Oct    Robustness Checks: Substantive and Empirical  
Danilovic and Clare, "The Kantian Liberal Peace (Revisited)"

- 19.) 21 Oct Robustness Checks: Counterarguments to the Democratic Peace  
 Read one of the articles listed below (skim abstracts for the other two)
- Farber and Gowa, “Politics and Peace”
  - Gartzke, “Kant We All Just Get Along?” (1998)
  - Gartzke, “The Capitalist Peace” (2007)
- <<Assignment #6 due: 10am, IVLE>>

**Section IV: Sound Logic vs. Numerical Fallacies:**

*Assessing Quantitative Analyses and their Limitations*

- 20.) 24 Oct Assumptions of Regression (Linear)  
 K&W, Sections 8.5, 9.7
- 21.) 28 Oct The Qualitative vs. Quantitative Debate, Revisited  
 Rosato, “The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory”  
 Slantchev, Alexandrova, and Gartzke, “Probabilistic Causality, Selection Bias...”  
 <<Assignment #7 due: 10am, IVLE>>
- 22.) 31 Oct On the Use of Qualitative: Its Occurrences, Synergies with Quantitative  
 Fearon and Laitin, “Integrating Qualitative and Quantitative Methods”  
 Goddard, “Uncommon Ground,” with a particular focus on pp. 37-41, 49-51
- 23.) 04 Nov Class Presentations – Groups 1-3  
 <<Class presentations due, Grps. 1-3: 10am, IVLE>>  
 <<Individual summaries due, Grps. 1-3: 10am, IVLE>>
- 24.) 07 Nov Class Presentations – Groups 4-5  
 <<Class presentations due, Grps. 4-5: 10am, IVLE>>  
 <<Individual summaries due, Grps. 4-5: 10am, IVLE>>
- 25.) 11 Nov Other Methods in Political Science: Experiments  
 K&W, Section 4.2 (sans 4.2.2), 8.4.5, 8.4.7  
 Tomz, “Domestic Audience Costs in International Relations”, pp. 821-827, 836-837
- 26.) 14 Nov Course Wrap, Review  
 K&W, Ch. 12, all  
 Chernoff, “The Study of Democratic Peace...,” pp. 49-55, 65-72
- 24 Nov Final Exam  
 1:00-3:00pm

## Projects Information

### Overview

Two projects comprise 70% of your final course grade. Each is comprised of smaller assignments:

1. Project: War Data 45% (pp. 9-10)
2. Project: Group Presentation 25% (pp. 10-12)

This segment provides the projects' particulars. It details the motivation behind each project, discusses how each assignment contributes to the final project grade, and—most importantly—provides the actual assignments and their accompanying instructions.

Four of the assignments follow a problem set format. These assignments are noted clearly in the handout. You will require access to Microsoft Excel to complete them. Their instructions will be made available on IVLE, approximately 7-10 days before the due date.

### Procedural

#### DUE DATES

- All assignments are due on the date listed by 10am for *all* students.
- You will submit all your work via IVLE (see below).
- **Late assignments will not be accepted. Plan accordingly.**

#### FORMATTING

- You should use word processing software to type your assignments.
- In line with standard academic practice, you should appropriately cite any sources to which you refer or paraphrase. This includes, but is not limited to, the textbook and any other supplemental reading from the course. You may use whatever citation format you prefer. Simply be consistent.
- Your document should:
  - Have 1-inch margins
  - Be double spaced<sup>6</sup>
  - Use a serif or sans-serif font face
  - Have a font size no smaller than 12 points

#### SUBMISSION

- Please submit assignments as PDF files.
- Please include your name and matric number somewhere on your assignment.
- Upload your files to the “Assignment Submissions” Workbin on IVLE.
- Each assignment has its own submission folder; the folders are organized within the Workbin by project. Make sure that you upload your assignment to the correct location. Uploading files to the wrong folder is not an acceptable excuse for late assignments.

#### FEEDBACK

I will mark all your assignments electronically. You will receive feedback through IVLE.

#### A NOTE ON CLASS USAGE

We will use some of the assignments as a basis for class discussion. You should have a copy of your submitted assignment with you, either in hard copy or digitally, for several classes after its due date (at minimum).

---

<sup>6</sup> The individual summaries for the group project are the only exception to this rule. These summaries may be single spaced.



Project: War Data (45% of grade)

BACKGROUND

The thematic focus of this module is the analysis of interstate war, specifically, how its likelihood is affected by countries' regime types. As you complete this project during the semester, you will work through the literature on interstate war and the democratic peace, analyze data on the occurrence of war by building an empirical model, interpret the model's results, and reflect upon the strengths and weaknesses of the democratic peace theory and critics' objections to it.

COMPONENT INFORMATION

The project is comprised of seven components, whose due dates are summarized in the table below. Some assignments are short, while others are more substantial. The table also provides the approximate weight of each assignment toward the project's final grade, relative to the other assignments. The assignment's length is correlated with its weight.

Assignment	Due Date	Weight
Assignment #1: M&R – GBD Breakdown	22AUG2014 (F)	2
Assignment #2: Measurement – DV	02SEP2014 (T)	1
Assignment #3: M&R – RD Breakdown	16SEP2014 (T)	2
Assignment #4: Descriptive Statistics	23SEP2014 (T)	3.5
Assignment #5: Inference – OLS	07OCT2014 (T)	4
Assignment #6: Inference – Logit	21OCT2014 (T)	4
Assignment #7: Substantive Reflection	28OCT2014 (T)	3

INDIVIDUAL ASSIGNMENT INSTRUCTIONS

1. *Maoz and Russett (M&R) – Graff, Birkenstein, and Durst (GBD) Breakdown*  
 Provide a summary of Maoz and Russett (1993) using the various parts described in Ch. 13 of Graff, Birkenstein, and Durst, sans the “Analysis” section. Be sure to clearly note the puzzle, research question, argument, and hypothesis that Maoz and Russett are advancing. Spend most of your time on these sections. The summary should be no more than 2 pages in length.  
Due: 22 August 2014 (F).
2. *Measurement – Dependent Variable (DV)*  
 Consider the three operationalizations of “fighting” we discussed in Class 5. Which aligns best with the causal mechanisms of the democratic peace? Explain the reasoning behind your answer. Your response should be around 1 page in length, but no longer than 2 pages.  
Due: 02 September 2014 (T).
3. *Maoz and Russett – Research Design (RD) Breakdown*  
 Provide a detailed breakdown of Maoz and Russett's (1993) research design. What is the temporal range of their analysis? What is their spatial domain? Their unit of analysis? What is their main dependent variable, how do they measure it, and from where do they get these data? Answer the same series of question for their main independent variable. Responses should be about 1 page in length, but should not exceed 2 pages.  
Due: 16 September 2014 (T).
4. *Descriptive Statistics*  
 \*\*Problem set format.\*\* Compute and interpret the requested descriptive statistics on the war data provided to you. [Detailed instructions to follow on IVLE.]  
Due: 23 September 2014 (T).
5. *Inference – Ordinary Least Squares (OLS)*  
 \*\*Problem set format.\*\* Analyze a set of data using ordinary least squares regression, and interpret the results as instructed. [Detailed instructions to follow on IVLE.]  
Due: 07 October 2014 (T).

6. *Inference – Logit*  
 \*\*Problem set format.\*\* Analyze the war data as instructed using regression models appropriate for binary dependent variables, along with any requested interpretation.  
*[Detailed instructions to follow on IVLE.]*  
Due: 21 October 2014 (T).
7. *Substantive Reflection*  
 \*\*Problem set format.\*\* Reflect more fully on the results from Assignment #6. *[Detailed instructions to follow on IVLE.]*  
Due: 28 October 2014 (T).

Project: Group Presentation (25% of grade)

BACKGROUND

This module focuses on one potential cause of interstate war, countries’ regime type. However, interstate war research has noted many other potential causes. The purpose of this group project is to expose you to a sampling of this research. You will break into groups of 3-5 people and select a set of articles pertaining to an additional potential cause of war (or militarized conflict more generally, in some cases). You will apply the skills you have developed throughout the semester to reflect upon these articles in order to assemble a class presentation on them.

You may choose from the following five topics:

- I. Alliances
- II. Contentious Issues
- III. International Organization Membership
- IV. International Trade
- V. Military Power

The list of articles is on the last page of the “Projects Information” section. You will choose your group and topic at the end of Week 4 of the semester. I will create project groups on IVLE to facilitate coordination among your group’s members.

COMPONENT INFORMATION

The project is comprised of two components. Both are due on the day of your presentation. Presentation order will be randomly assigned.

Assignment	Due Date	Final Grade %
Class Presentation	04NOV14 (T) – Grps. 1-3	15%
Individual Summaries	07NOV14 (F) – Grps. 4-5	10%
<i>TOTAL:</i>		25%

INDIVIDUAL ASSIGNMENT INSTRUCTIONS

1. *Class Presentation*

Each group will give an in-class presentation during Week 12 that provides an overview of your topic for the rest of the class, using your assigned articles. Each presentation **should be around 20 minutes in length**, but NO LONGER than 25 minutes. To the extent possible, presentation time should be equally divided among all group members. Audience members will be invited to ask questions after the presentation concludes.

Your primary goal is to introduce your topic to an audience who has not read anything about it. This includes, at a fundamental level, giving the audience a sense of the basic findings regarding the relationship between the onset of militarized conflict and your topic. Your presentation should focus on three core sets of questions (1) article-specific questions (i.e., what is the article about—research question, theory, findings), (2) how the articles tie together, and (3) meta questions pertaining to the role of quantitative analysis across *all* the articles, beyond its obvious role in hypothesis testing.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup> In general, for meta questions about QR, think about the arguments being advanced. How does quantitative analysis help validate (or invalidate) the arguments? For instance, what insights do we gain about the

Importantly, your presentation’s focus will be different than your summaries’ focus (detailed in the next subsection). Your summaries are, literally, summarizing *all* the major components of each article. By contrast, your presentation should rely on your substantive *topic* as its unifying organizational thread. Your presentation will not (and should not) have all of the information that your summaries do.

To see the difference between these modes of organization, consider the three articles from Class 19. All pertain to the democratic peace, in some way. A presentation about these three articles could use the components of each article as its unifying thread, as laid out in the “Individual Summaries” table below. Alternatively, a presentation could focus on the idea of democracy: “what it is”, how it is argued to affect the probability of military conflict, and what each article does to challenge or affirm the idea. You should aim for the latter. In some cases, this may mean that you do not discuss every finding from an article, but instead, selectively choose those that are consistent with the narrative you are creating about your topic. This may also mean that you are selective in other ways, too.

All group members should also contribute equally when preparing the presentation. You will each assess the efforts of fellow group members through a post-project IVLE survey. Only I will see the survey results. If an individual did not do his/her share of the work, and group members indicate this on the survey, the individual will lose points off his/her class presentation grade. The other group members’ presentation grades will be unaffected.

Due: The day your group presents, 10am (see due date table on previous page).

2. *Individual Summaries*

Each student will be expected to complete and turn in one summary of every article assigned to his or her group. Please submit all summaries as a single PDF document. As a rule of thumb, you should have one page for every article you summarize; you may single space your summaries. The summaries should include all of the following information, at minimum:

Puzzle	Methodological Technique (OLS, logit, probit...?)
Research Question	Unit of Analysis
Contribution (So what? + What has prior research shown?)	Temporal Range
	Spatial Domain
Argument/Theory	Dependent Variable <i>Measurement, Source of Data</i>
Hypotheses	Main Independent Variable <i>Measurement, Source of Data</i>
Main Findings	Control Variables <i>Only brief descriptions needed</i>

Due: The day your group presents, 10am (see due date table on previous page).

arguments’ veracity from a quantitative analysis that another type of analysis (e.g., qualitative) may not have uncovered? Do we find the argument *more* convincing than it would be without any quantitative analysis, or do we find the argument *less* convincing because of the quantitative analysis? Notice how these questions go beyond parroting back the various strengths and weaknesses of QR that we have discussed in class.

To give an example of this general type of “meta” thinking: most people believe that economic sanctions are effective because of a few well-known historical cases (e.g., ending apartheid in South Africa). However, quantitative evidence suggests exactly the opposite. Economic sanctions are usually *ineffective* (for reasons that scholars then go on to explore), implying that the well-known cases are more the exception than the norm.

GROUP PROJECT TOPICS

The articles should be read in the order they are listed. You may download them from IVLE (“Course Documents” > “Additional Readings” > “Group Presentation Readings”).

I. Alliances

- Leeds, Brett Ashley. 2003. “Do Alliances Deter Aggression? The Influence of Military Alliances on the Initiation of Militarized Interstate Disputes.” *American Journal of Political Science* 47 (3): 427-439.
- Leeds, Brett Ashley. 2003. “Alliance Reliability in Times of War: Explaining State Decisions to Violate Treaties.” *International Organization* 57 (4): 801-827.
- Benson, Brett V. 2011. “Unpacking Alliances: Deterrent and Compellent Alliances and Their Relationship with Conflict, 1816-2000.” *Journal of Politics* 73 (4): 1111-1127.

II. Contentious Issues

- Hensel, Paul R. 2001. “Contentious Issues and World Politics: The Management of Territorial Claims in the Americas, 1816-1992.” *International Studies Quarterly* 45 (1): 81-109.
- Senese, Paul D. 2005. “Territory, Contiguity, and International Conflict: Assessing a New Joint Explanation.” *American Journal of Political Science* 49 (4): 769-779.
- Hensel, Paul R., Sara McLaughlin Mitchell, Thomas E. Sowers, and Clayton L. Thyne. 2008. “Bones of Contention: Comparing Territorial, Maritime, and River Issues.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 52 (1): 117-143.

III. International Organization Membership

- Oneal, John R., and Bruce Russett. 1999. “The Kantian Peace: The Pacific Benefits of Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations, 1885-1992.” *World Politics* 52 (1): 1-37.
- Boehmer, Charles, Erik Gartzke, and Timothy Nordstrom. 2004. “Do Intergovernmental Organizations Promote Peace?” *World Politics* 57 (1): 1-38.
- Pevehouse, Jon, and Bruce Russett. 2006. “Democratic International Governmental Organizations Promote Peace.” *International Organization* 60 (4): 969-1000.

IV. International Trade

- Mansfield, Edward D., and Jon C. Pevehouse. 2000. “Trade Blocs, Trade Flows, and International Conflict.” *International Organization* 54 (4): 775-808.
- Dorussen, Han. 2006. “Heterogeneous Trade Interests and Conflict: What You Trade Matters.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 50 (1): 87-107.
- McDonald, Patrick J. 2004. “Peace through Trade or Free Trade?” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 48 (4): 547-572.

V. Military Power

- Bremer, Stuart A. 1992. “Dangerous Dyads: Conditions Affecting the Likelihood of Interstate War, 1816-1965.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 36 (2): 309-341.
- Hegre, Håvard. 2008. “Gravitating toward War: Preponderance May Pacify, but Power Kills.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 52 (4): 566-589.
- Reed, William, David H. Clark, Timothy Nordstrom, and Wonjae Hwang. 2008. “War, Power, and Bargaining.” *Journal of Politics* 70 (4): 1203-1216.