

PSCI 7053 WAR AND PEACE / SPRING 2022

Instructor: Jaroslav Tir, PhD
Office: Ketchum 226
Office hours: after the class + by appt.
e-mail: jtir@colorado.edu

Meeting time: Wednesdays 10:15 am-12:45 pm
Classroom: Ketchum 1B31
Web: sites.google.com/site/jaroslavtir/

This course focuses on the conditions that affect the prospects for militarized interstate conflict. Various factors at different levels of analysis (decision-making, monadic, dyadic, and systemic) will be considered in an attempt to understand why states fight. The course is primarily informed by the scholarly literature within the behavioral research community – without ignoring, however, certain “classical” approaches.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

Reading Materials

1. Levy, Jack S. and William R. Thompson. 2010. *Causes of War*. Wiley-Blackwell.
2. Most, Benjamin and Harvey Starr. 1989. *Inquiry, Logic, and International Politics*. University of South Carolina Press.
3. Vasquez, John (ed). 2012. *What Do We Know About War?* 2nd ed. Rowman and Littlefield. E-book available via UCB library at <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/ucb/detail.action?docID=878269>
4. Electronic journal (EJ), available through the UCB Library <https://www.colorado.edu/libraries>
5. Electronic reserve (ER), available through Canvas: <https://cuboulder.instructure.com>
6. Additional readings not listed on the syllabus may be assigned as the semester progresses.

Student Initiative

As a graduate student, you are an integral part of the scholarly community. Our class represents a microcosm of this community. In terms of our weekly meetings, this means that you are expected to take the initiative in presenting, discussing, and critiquing the assigned materials both with the instructor and your colleagues. Therefore, our sessions will not be lecture-based but rather will follow the seminar format. It is important that students **read assigned materials thoughtfully and thoroughly** and that they **attend classes regularly**, since class time will be primarily devoted to the exploration and integration of assigned readings. In terms of the term paper assignment, you are expected to help each other out with ideas and constructive criticisms.

Research Project

See the end of the syllabus.

Discussion

Participation in the class is essential to the success of this course. In order to prepare for the upcoming class, read the assigned materials with the following goals in mind. First, understand each individual reading’s conflict-generating logic, methodology, and findings. What are the gaps in these areas? Second, and most importantly, **integrate** the readings with one another, by comparing and contrasting their logic, methods, and findings. How do you account for the differences and especially for any inconsistencies across the findings? What makes one of the readings more compelling than another? What are the general problems with the research on the topic? What would be fruitful avenues for future research?

Weekly Presentations

On a rotating basis, students will develop 20-30 min Power Point presentations, focusing in particular on integrating, comparing, and contrasting the readings, and offering discussion questions. These presentations need to cover both the “classic” and recent articles in a particular topic area. The classic readings can be found in the syllabus while the recent articles are to be drawn from the related list posted on Canvas and/or Google Drive. In preparation, the presenter will need to identify which subset of the

recent articles is the most relevant and which ones they want to focus on. The presenter will then, first, email the rest of the class the list of **two** recent articles that everyone should read. This list is **due by Thursday at noon (i.e. a week) before your presentation**. Second, the presenter will upload their Power Point presentation (or a pdf version of it) to the Google Drive class folder **before the Wednesday class meeting**. Late (up to 12 hours) lists or presentation uploads will be penalized by 30%. No points will be awarded after these deadlines even though missing the deadlines does not exempt you from fulfilling these requirements if you wish to pass the class.

Attendance

Regular attendance is expected. Absences will negatively impact the overall course grade.

Grading Policy

Weekly Presentations: 30% Term Paper: 35% (15% + 20%) Discussion/Participation: 35%

Class Policies

1. Students are expected to turn in assignments at the beginning of class or at times otherwise noted.
2. Failure to meet a deadline does not exempt a student from fulfilling these requirements. Every assignment must be turned in by the last day of classes to pass the course.
3. Exceptions to the rules are granted at the instructor's discretion, only under circumstances of extreme personal emergency or serious illness. In all instances, appropriate evidentiary documentation will be requested.
4. My policy for academic dishonesty is very simple: you will receive a failing grade for the class if you are found cheating on examinations, plagiarizing the work of others or attempting to turn in assignments used in previous classes, along with all other possible infractions noted in the University's policy on academic dishonesty. Moreover, disciplinary proceedings to dismiss you from the University may be initiated against you. I **will not** tolerate academic dishonesty and will assure you that you **will** face the harshest punishment possible if you attempt it.
5. Students may request the instructor to re-read exam answers or papers that they feel have been unfairly evaluated. Requests for re-evaluation must be submitted to the instructor in **typewritten form**, along with the assignment, within a week after it has been returned to the class. The written statement must explain specifically why the student believes that the grade should be reconsidered and what grade the assignment deserves.
6. Accommodations based on disability and/or religious beliefs will be made whenever possible. But, it is the student's responsibility to let the instructor know about needing such accommodations within the first two weeks of class. Accommodation requests after this time period may not be granted.
7. All students are expected to **complete assigned readings before they are discussed in class** and they are expected to discuss and respond to random questioning by the instructor.
8. Please see Canvas for the university-mandated statements on accommodations, discrimination, and related issues.

TOPICS AND ASSIGNED READINGS

Session 1, January 12

0. COURSE OVERVIEW

Session 2, January 19

I. STUDYING WAR

- Levy and Thompson: Chapter 1.
- ER: Viotti and Kauppi, Chapter 1.
- Most and Starr. *Inquiry, Logic, and International Politics*, Chapters 1-3, and 5.
- EJ: Palmer, Glenn, Vito D’Orazio, Michael Kenwick, and Matthew Lane. 2015. “The MID4 Dataset, 2002–2010: Procedures, Coding Rules and Description.” *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 32(2): 222-242.
- International Crisis Behavior Project: <https://sites.duke.edu/icbdata/>
- EJ: Bennett, D. Scott. 2006. “Exploring Operationalizations of Political Relevance.” *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 23(3): 245-261.
- Bennett, D. Scott, Paul Poast, Allan C. Stam. 2019. “NewGene: An Introduction for Users.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 63(6): 1579-1592. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022002718824635>

Session 3, January 26

II. (NEO)REALISM AND (NEO)REALIST APPROACHES

- Read if unfamiliar with the basic tenants of (Neo)Realism ER: Viotti and Kauppi, Chapter 2.
- Levy and Thompson: Chapter 2.
- ER: Geller, Daniel, “Material Capabilities: Power and International Conflict,” 259-277.
- EJ: Chiba, Daina, Carla Martinez Machain, and William Reed. 2014. “Major Powers and Militarized Conflict.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 58(6): 976-1002.
- EJ: Sobek, David and Joe Clare. 2013. “Me, myself, and allies: Understanding the external sources of power.” *Journal of Peace Research* 50(4): 469-478.
- EJ: Wright, Thorin M. and Toby J. Rider. 2014. “Disputed Territory, Defensive Alliances and Conflict Initiation.” *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 31(2): 119-144.
- EJ: Rider, Toby J. 2013. “Uncertainty, Salient Stakes, and the Causes of Conventional Arms Races.” *International Studies Quarterly* 57(3): 580-591.
- Optional
 - Waltz, Kenneth N. 1988. “The Origins of War in Neorealist Theory.” *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 18(4): 615-628.
 - Vasquez (ed): Benson, Brett: “Alliances: ATOP Data and Deterrence,” 45-62.
 - Levy, Jack. 1984. “The Offensive/Defensive Balance of Military Technology: A Theoretical and Historical Analysis.” *International Studies Quarterly* 28(2): 219-238.
 - Vasquez (ed): Sample, Susan, “Arms Races: A Cause or a Symptom?” 111-138.
 - Vasquez (ed): Kang, Choong-Nam, “Alliances: Path to Peace or Path to War?” 27-44.
 - Wohlforth, William. 1999. “The Stability of a Unipolar World.” *International Security* 24(1): 5-41.

Session 4, February 2

III. (NEO)LIBERALISM AND (NEO)LIBERAL APPROACHES

A. Democratic Peace

- Read if unfamiliar with the basic tenants of (Neo)Liberalism ER: Viotti and Kauppi, Chapter 3.
- Levy and Thompson: 104-117.
- ER: Ray, James Lee, “Democracy: on the Level(s) Does Democracy Correlate with Peace?” 299-316.
- EJ: Mitchell, Sara M., Scott Gates, and Havard Hegre. 1999. “Evolution in Democracy-War Dynamics.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 43(6): 771-792.
- Vasquez (ed): Mitchell, Sara, “Norms and the Democratic Peace,” 167-188.
- Optional
 - Doyle, Michael. 1986. “Liberalism and World Politics.” *American Political Science Review* 80(4): 1151-1170.
 - Gleditsch, Nils Petter and Havard Hegre. 1997. “Peace and Democracy: Three Levels of Analysis.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 41(2): 283-310.
 - Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce, James D. Morrow, Randolph M. Siverson, and Alastair Smith. 2004. “Testing Novel Implications from the Selectorate Theory of War.” *World Politics* 56(3): 363-388.

Session 5, February 9

B. Economic and Institutional Integration

- Levy and Thompson: 70-77.
- EJ: Oneal, John R. and Bruce M. Russett. 1999. “The Kantian Peace: The Pacific Benefits of Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations, 1885-1992.” *World Politics* 52(1): 1-37.
- EJ: Peterson, Timothy M. 2015. “Insiders Versus Outsiders: Preferential Trade Agreements, Trade Distortions, and Militarized Conflict.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(4): 698-727.
- EJ: Lupu, Yonatan and Vincent A. Traag. 2013. “Trading Communities, the Networked Structure of International Relations, and the Kantian Peace.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 57(6): 1011-1042.
- EJ: Kinne, Brandon J. 2013. “IGO Membership, Network Convergence, and Credible Signaling in Militarized Disputes.” *Journal of Peace Research* 50(6): 659-676.
- Optional
 - Barbieri, Katherine. 1996. “Economic Interdependence: A Path to Peace or a Source of Interstate Conflict?” *Journal of Peace Research* 33(1): 29-49.
 - Boehmer, Charles, Erik Gartzke, and Timothy Nordstrom. 2004. “Do Intergovernmental Organizations Promote Peace?” *World Politics* 57(1): 1-38.
 - Kim, Nam Kyu. 2013. “Testing Two Explanations of the Liberal Peace: The Opportunity Cost and Signaling Arguments.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution*.
 - Wallace, Geoffrey P.R. 2013. “Regime type, issues of contention, and economic sanctions: Re-evaluating the economic peace between democracies.” *Journal of Peace Research* 50(4): 479-493.
 - Hegre, Havard. 2009. “Trade Dependence or Size Dependence? The Gravity Model of Trade and the Liberal Peace.” *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 26(1): 26-45.
 - Shannon, Megan, Daniel Morey, and Frederick J. Boehmke. 2010. “The Influence of International Organizations on Militarized Dispute Initiation and Duration.” *International Studies Quarterly* 54(4): 1123-1141.

Session 6, February 16

IV. ISSUE-BASED APPROACHES: EXAMPLE OF TERRITORY AND GEOGRAPHY

- ER: Huth, Paul, "Territory: Why Are Territorial Disputes Between States a Central Cause of Conflict?" 85-110.
- Vasquez (ed): Hensel, Paul, "Territory: Geography, Contentious Issues, and World Politics," 3-26.
- EJ: Wright, Thorin M. and Paul F. Diehl. 2014. "Unpacking Territorial Disputes: Domestic Political Influences and War." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*: forthcoming.
- EJ: Schultz, Kenneth A. 2014. "What's in a Claim? De Jure Versus De Facto Borders in Interstate Territorial Disputes." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 58(6): 1059-1084.
- EJ: Gibler, Douglas M. and Jaroslav Tir. 2014. "Territorial Peace and Democratic Clustering." *Journal of Politics* 76(1): 27-40.
- Optional
 - Levy and Thompson: 60-63.
 - John Vasquez. 1995. "Why Do Neighbors Fight?: Proximity, Interaction, and Territoriality." *Journal of Peace Research* 32(3): 277-293.
 - Owsiak, Andrew P. and Toby J. Rider. 2013. "Clearing the Hurdle: Border Settlement and Rivalry Termination." *Journal of Politics* 75(3): 757-772.
 - Senese, Paul D. 2005. "Territory, Contiguity, and International Conflict: Assessing a New Joint Explanation." *American Journal of Political Science* 49(4): 769-779.
 - Tir, Jaroslav. 2005. "Keeping the Peace After Secessions: Territorial Conflicts Between Rump and Secessionist States." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 49(5): 713-741.

Session 7, February 23

V. DECISION-MAKING APPROACHES

A. Rational Choice and Related Approaches

- ER: Morrow, James. 1997. "A Rational Choice Approach to International Conflict." In Nehemia Geva and Alex Mintz (eds), *Decisionmaking on War and Peace: The Cognitive-Rational Debate*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, pp. 11-31.
- EJ: Fearon, James. 1995 "Rationalist Explanation for War. *International Organization* 49(3): 379-414.
- Levy and Thompson: 63-70, 128-133.
- EJ: Scott Wolford. 2012. "Incumbents, Successors, and Crisis Bargaining: Leadership Turnover as a Commitment Problem." *Journal of Peace Research* 49(4): 517-530.
- EJ: Wolford, Scott. 2014. "Power, Preferences, and Balancing: The Durability of Coalitions and the Expansion of Conflict." *International Studies Quarterly* 58(1): 146-157.
- Optional
 - Gartzke, Erik. 1999. "War is in the Error Term." *International Organization* 53(3): 567-587.
 - Bennett, D. Scott and Alan Stam. 2000. "A Universal Test of an Expected Utility Theory of War." *International Studies Quarterly* 44(3): 451-480.

Session 8, March 2

B. Psychological and Other Alternatives to Rational Choice-Based Approaches

- Levy and Thompson: 133-161 and Chapter 6.
- ER: Lebow, Richard Ned. 1981. *Between Peace and War*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. 101-119; optional pages: 119-147.
- ER: Stein, Janice Gross and David Welch. 1997. "Rational and Psychological Approaches to the Study of International Conflict: Comparative Strengths and Weaknesses." In Nehemia Geva and Alex Mintz (eds), *Decisionmaking on War and Peace: The Cognitive-Rational Debate*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, pp. 51-77.
- EJ: Christopher K. Butler. 2007. "Prospect Theory and Coercive Bargaining." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 51(2): 227-250.
- EJ: Bar-Joseph, Uri and Rose McDermott. 2008. "Personal Functioning Under Stress: Accountability and Social Support of Israeli Leaders in the Yom Kippur War." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 52(1): 144-170.
- Optional
 - McDermott, Rose and Jacek Kugler. 2001. "Comparing Rational Choice and Prospect Theory Analyses: The US Decision to Launch Operation 'Desert Storm', January 1991." *The Journal of Strategic Studies* 24(3): 49-85.

Session 9, March 9

VI. DIVERSIONARY THEORY OF WAR

- Levy and Thompson: 99-104.
- EJ: Oneal, John and Jaroslav Tir. 2006. "Does the Diversionary Use of Force Threaten the Democratic Peace? Assessing the Effect of Economic Growth on Interstate Conflict, 1921-2001." *International Studies Quarterly* 50(4): 755-779.
- EJ: Chiozza, Giacomo and H. E. Goemans. 2003. "Peace Through Insecurity: Tenure and International Conflict." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 47(4): 443-67.
- EJ: Mitchell, Sara M. and Brandon C. Prins. 2004. "Rivalry and Diversionary Uses of Force." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 48(6): 937-961.
- EJ: Tir, Jaroslav. 2010. "Territorial Diversion: Diversionary Theory of War and Territorial Conflict." *Journal of Politics* 72(2): 413-425.
- Optional
 - Smith, Alastair. 1996. "Diversionary Foreign Policy in Democratic Systems." *International Studies Quarterly* 40(1): 133-154.

Session 10, March 16

VII. OUTCOMES AND CONSEQUENCES OF CONFLICT

- EJ: Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce and Randolph Siverson. 1995. "War and the Survival of Political Leaders: A Comparative Study of Regime Types and Political Accountability." *American Political Science Review* 89(4): 841-855.
- EJ: Sullivan, Patricia L. 2007. "War Aims and War Outcomes: Why Powerful States Lose Limited Wars." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 51(3): 496-524.
- EJ: Hutchison, Marc L. and Douglas M. Gibler. 2007. "Political Tolerance and Territorial Threat: A Cross-National Study." *Journal of Politics* 69(1): 128-142.
- EJ: Singh, Shane P. and Jaroslav Tir. 2018. "Partisanship, Militarized International Conflict, and Electoral Support for the Incumbent." *Political Research Quarterly* 71(1): 172-183.
- Optional
 - Bennett, D. Scott and Allan Stam. 1996. "The Duration of Interstate Wars, 1816-1985." *American Political Science Review* 90(2): 239-257.

- Werner, Suzanne. 1999. "The Precarious Nature of Peace: Resolving the Issues, Enforcing the Settlement, and Renegotiating the Terms." *American Journal of Political Science* 43(3): 912-934.
- Wolford, Scott, Dan Reiter, and Clifford J. Carrubba. 2011. "Information, Commitment, and War." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 55(4):556-579.
- Bas, Muhammet A. and Robert J. Schub. 2014. "How Uncertainty about War Outcomes Affects War Onset." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*.
- Singh, Shane P. and Jaroslav Tir. 2018. "The Effects of Militarized Interstate Disputes on Incumbent Voting Across Genders." Forthcoming in *Political Behavior*.
- Tir, Jaroslav and Shane Singh. 2013. "Is It the Economy or Foreign Policy, Stupid? Impact of Foreign Crises on Leader Support." *Comparative Politics* 46(1): 83-101.

Session 11, March 30

- ISA Conference
- Determine if the class meeting needs to be rescheduled due to the Peace Science conference (to e.g. a wrap-up meeting?); details TBD

Session 12, April 6

VIII. CRITICISMS OF DEMOCRATIC PEACE

- EJ: Layne, Christopher. 1994. "Kant or Cant: The Myth of the Democratic Peace." *International Security* 19(2): 5-49.
- EJ: Rosato, Sebastian. 2003. "The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory." *American Political Science Review* 97(4): 585-602.
- Vasquez (ed): Mousseau, Michael, "A Market-Capitalist or a Democratic Peace?" 189-210.
- EJ: Rasler, Karen A. and William R. Thompson. 2004. "The Democratic Peace and a Sequential, Reciprocal, Causal Arrow Hypothesis." *Comparative Political Studies* 37(8): 879-908.
- EJ: Gibler, Douglas M. and Jaroslav Tir. 2010. "Settled Borders and Regime Type: Democratic Transitions as Consequences of Peaceful Territorial Transfers." *American Journal of Political Science* 54(4): 951-968.
- Optional
 - Ray, James Lee. 2013. "War on Democratic Peace." *International Studies Quarterly* 57(1): 198-200.
 - Ferejohn, John and Frances McCall Rosenbluth. 2008. "Warlike Democracies." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 52(1): 3-38.
 - Mousseau, Michael. 2013. "The Democratic Peace Unraveled: It's the Economy." *International Studies Quarterly* 57(1): 186-197.
 - Vasquez (ed): Gibler, Douglas, "The Implications of a Territorial Peace," 211-236.
 - Gartzke, Erik. 2007. "The Capitalist Peace." *American Journal of Political Science* 51(1): 166-191.

Session 13, April 13

- Mini conference: student presentations

Session 14, April 20

- Mini conference: student presentations

Session 15, April 27

- TBD: some options include covering a topic of student interest, another mini conference day, or something else

RESEARCH PROJECT

The aim of the project is to work toward producing a professional-level research paper that could be, with additional work, presented at a conference and eventually submitted for publication.

In selecting your topic and conducting your work, please keep the following rules in mind. First, the topic of the paper must deal with militarized international conflict in a prominent manner. The easiest way to meet this requirement is to have international conflict serve as either the dependent or key independent variable. Second, the paper must represent original research. General literature reviews or summaries of other works are not acceptable. Third, the papers must have a non-case specific theoretical focus. Papers should not address purely policy questions (e.g., should NATO intervene in Syria?). That is, the paper should address the general logic of the phenomenon you are investigating and not a specific case(s). Note that the assignment lengths are quite short. Research and **think a lot before writing!**

Assignment 1: Project Prospectus (15% of the class grade)

Step 1: Familiarize yourself with the literature as soon as possible. If you do not have a topic in mind already, survey the syllabus and perform additional readings. Once you have a topic in mind, consult as many sources as possible to see what kind of investigations have been conducted on your topic of interest.

Good places to start may be journals such as *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, *Journal of Peace Research*, *International Studies Quarterly*, *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, *International Interactions*, and *International Security*. *International Organization* and *APSR*, *JOP*, *AJPS*, may also prove helpful.

Step 2: Identify gaps in the literature that you believe are particularly deserving of scholarly attention. This means that you will devise an angle of approach to your topic of interest that does not seem to be covered by the literature either at all or particularly well. Turn the narrowed-down topic into a research question. The research question should address an empirical puzzle – meaning that the phenomenon you are trying to explain is sometimes present while at other times it is not. The point of the research project is to figure out what determines the phenomenon’s presence versus absence. For example, we observe that some countries start wars while others do not; what explains the difference (e.g. presence and type of unresolved issues, regime type, history of conflict, alliance patterns, power distribution, etc.)?

Step 3: What is your argument vis-à-vis the question? To set up your project properly, you need to have a good idea of what your theoretical argument will be. This will provide the needed direction for the project.

Step 4: Answer the all-important “so what” question. That is, you need to be able to clearly demonstrate the “value added” dimension of your project. What will we (and the literature and field as a whole) know because of your project that was not known before? Why is this important not just to you but others? Why should they care?

Prospectus Format. Please follow this outline:

1. State your research question.
2. Explain briefly where the question is coming from (i.e. what is the gap in the literature it is addressing?) and why it matters.
3. Provide a preliminary answer to your question. This is a preview of your theoretical argument only, as you will develop your theory fully in the following assignment. Be sure to clearly and convincingly show why you are pursuing this line of argument; you definitely want to avoid the appearance of a fishing expedition here or of relying on someone else’s idea.

4. Conclude by defending the project idea against the “so what” question. What novel insights/twists are you offering? Once the project is complete, what will we know that we did not know before and why is this important?
5. Length: 2-3 single-spaced pages plus the bibliography.
6. Due: between March 2 and March 16.

Assignment 2: Theory, Hypotheses, and Empirics (20% of the class grade)

In the readings for the class, you will see plenty of examples of other people’s theorizing and empirical work. This is your chance to practice contributing to important scholarly debates and to start making your mark! There are two options for fulfilling this part of the research project.

The Theoretical Option

(1) Start by conducting a literature review of your topic, which identifies what has been done, what the key debates and findings, and, importantly, what the gaps are (that you intend to address). The literature review should absolutely be no longer than 40% of this assignment’s length (and can be as short as about 30% of the assignment length if your theory is particularly complex and/or involved).

(2) Next, build a theory based on both your own insights and utilizing extant theorizing and findings (i.e. the literature) as building blocks in pursuing the answer to your question. In doing so, reference the literature often to show how you are building and advancing upon it, but do not derive your expectations directly from the literature (e.g. I expect X because Horowitz says so). Instead, build a theoretical story of how the phenomenon you are investigating works; this allows you to offer novel insights. (If theory building seems too mysterious, ask me for my pieces with former grad students Karreth or Stojek for examples of theoretical development.) As a part of this process of theoretical development, you will need to make a series of assumptions (e.g. regarding the agent-structure debate, motivations of behavior, identity of agents [individuals, groups, states, state coalitions], etc.). Make sure you understand both the stated and implied assumptions you are making and that they are logically consistent with one another.

(3) Based on your theorizing, produce 1-2 carefully crafted, phrased, and testable hypotheses. In the process of theorizing and hypothesizing, imagine that you must persuade a very skeptical audience that your theory and hypotheses are important, insightful, and likely empirically true.

The Empirical Option

(1) Provide a brief logic/theory explaining 1-2 hypotheses you wish to examine. (2) Research Design: explain the data and methods you will use to test your hypotheses. (3) Provide empirical analyses (tables and figures) of your findings. Discuss your findings and their implications vis-à-vis key debates in the literature. (4) Finally, discuss the next steps in empirically evaluating the hypotheses you have identified.

Everyone

Prepare a presentation of your project for the class mini conference, tentatively scheduled for the class sessions on **April 13 and 20**. This will be a chance to obtain peer and instructor feedback before turning in the final paper.

Turn in the paper (a) re-stating your research question right at the top (2-3 sentences to a paragraph at the absolute most) and (b) presenting the theory and/or empirics depending on the chosen option. Length: about 4 single-spaced pages plus the bibliography. **Due date for the paper is April 27** (i.e. the last class session).