



Empirical Research Methods

INTA 6003

Instructor Info



David Muchlinski



M 11:00-12:00 & by appointment



Habersham 147



davidmuchlinski.com



david.muchlinski@inta.gatech.edu

Course Info



Prereq: None



Tuesday



6:30p-9:15p



Habersham G 17

TA Info



Jonathan Darsey (JD)



Th 12:00-3:00 OBA



Habersham 312

Overview

What are Empirical Research Methods in international affairs? You will find many answers to this apparently simple question as you progress through this seminar. And while there is no universal answer to this question, you will discover that some answers are more helpful than others. In this seminar, you will come to discover how a combination of philosophy, science, and international affairs intertwine to produce knowledge that will enhance, and even maybe challenge, the way in which you think about the world of social science.

Through reading, discussion, and “getting your hands dirty” you will come to understand how effective research methodology helps us determine what is likely to be true about the world around us. Topics to be covered include:

- Philosophy of Science
- How to ask and answer interesting questions
- Discover the likely truth or falsity of existing theories
- How to design research studies to discover the truth or falsity of existing theories

This seminar meets weekly for 2.75 hours. My expectation is that we will collaboratively engage in discussion to mutually assist in our exploration of the material. This, of course, requires that you complete all assigned reading in advance of each seminar meeting. You may note that this syllabus requires a relatively rigorous amount of reading. Please utilize effective reading strategies to get the main idea and utilize the seminar to “fill in the gaps”. Discussion should focus on critical questions to assess questions of *why*, *how*, *under what conditions*, and *so what*, and should assess how the assigned readings can be usefully combined to understand critical debates in the field.

Overall, we will work together to be critically informed consumers of social science. In a world where technology allows disinformation to be shared with the touch of a button, we will discover ways to effectively rescue truth from falsehood and a means to become more critically aware and engaged citizens of the world.

Required Texts

Chalmers, A. F. (2013). *What is this Thing Called Science?*. 4th Edition. Hackett Publishing.

de Mesquita, E. B., & Fowler, A. (2021). *Thinking Clearly with Data: A Guide to Quantitative Reasoning and Analysis*. Princeton University Press.

King, G., Keohane, R. O., & Verba, S. (1994/2021). *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research (New Edition)*. Princeton University Press.

Goertz, G. (2020). *Social Science Concepts and Measurement: New and Completely Revised Edition*. Princeton University Press.

Recommended Reference Texts

Wickham, H., & Grolemund, G. (2016). *R for Data Science: Import, Tidy, Transform, Visualize, and Model Data*. O'Reilly Media, Inc. Available online at <https://r4ds.had.co.nz/>

Xie, Y., Allaire, J. J., & Grolemund, G. (2018). *R Markdown: The Definitive Guide*. CRC Press. Available online at <https://bookdown.org/yihui/rmarkdown/>

Fox, J., & Weisberg, S. (2018). *An R Companion to Applied Regression*, 3rd Edition. Sage Publications.

FAQs

? What Does this Seminar Cover?

! This seminar is a “scope and methods” seminar. It introduces you to the diverse approaches researchers may take to asking and answering important questions with rigorous scientific methods.

? Why Should I Care about Methodology?

! Understanding how to design a rigorous research study is a key skill to master not only for those looking for academic careers, but for those looking to engage with government, private, and non-profit work as well. The ability to understand measurement, control over variables, probability, sampling, randomization, and other research fundamentals will assist you in thinking critically through what can be dense and esoteric topics.

? What if I Have No Quantitative Experience?

! No previous mathematical experience is necessary to succeed in this seminar, nor is a quantitative methodological approach a requisite for success in the field. However, with the pace of technological advancement, and the proliferation of new and interesting sources of data, a statistical background is necessary to compete for desirable jobs, understand much of the literature, and produce actionable insights. This course will introduce to you the basics of how to understand how to begin utilizing a quantitative approach to understanding international affairs.

Grading Scheme

| | |
|-----|-------------------------|
| 5% | Discussion Questions |
| 20% | Homework |
| 25% | Midterm Exam |
| 25% | Policy Memo Rough Draft |
| 25% | Policy Memo |

Grades will follow the standard scale: A = 100-90; B = 89-80; C = 79-70, D = 69-60, F = < 50.

Learning Objectives

- Students will be able to apply basic statistical skills to include quantitative and qualitative methodologies in academic and professional contexts within the field of international affairs.
 - Students will gain proficiency in reading and interpreting basic statistical evidence including regression tables, graphs, and charts
 - Students will become experienced in utilizing statistical software and code to generate simple statistical analyses and visualizations
- Students will be able to demonstrate knowledge of principal contemporary global challenges in the field of international security
 - Students will read, analyze, and synthesized knowledge of international security issues by becoming knowledgeable about recent scientific advancements in the field of international security
 - Students will express knowledge through a written policy memo detailing policy actions to solve contemporary security issues
- Students will be able to apply research skills to address problems in the field of international affairs.
 - Students will identify, analyze, critique, improve, and understand the scientific research process as applied in international affairs.

Midterm Exam

Students will complete a take home midterm to be distributed by the professor. Exams will primarily test student’s critical thinking skills. Students will have two weeks to complete their exam. More detailed instructions will be released with the exam.

Homework

There will be 3 homework assignments during the semester. These homework assignments will assess students’ critical thinking, analysis, writing, analysis, and integration skills. Students have two weeks to complete each assignment. All assignments should be completed individually. A “rough draft” of each assignment is due one week from the assigned date. Students must attend office hours to receive and ask questions regarding feedback on the rough draft. See the sign up sheet on Canvas to reserve a spot to receive feedback. Grades for the homework assignments will be weighted 0.33 for the rough draft and 0.67 for the final. So students are encouraged to do well on the first draft, but the final draft is weighted more heavily to assist students with mastery of the assignment. Students are expected to incorporate all feedback in the final draft to receive maximum credit.

Policy Memo

Students must independently find, skim, and assess 2 additional scholarly articles a week beginning in Week 5 on a topic of their own choosing that must be discussed with and approved by the professor during office hours. This topic must be germane

to the field of international affairs. Students will incorporate insights from these articles into a Policy Memo that is due on the date of the final exam. This policy memo must utilize the bibliography gathered by researching these additional articles to advance a specific policy agenda for one of three agencies: the Central Intelligence Agency, United States Agency for International Development, or the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy. See the detailed instructions for the Policy Memo on Canvas for more detailed instructions.

Discussion Questions

At the start of each seminar, one or more students will be randomly assigned to present a series of critical questions designed to facilitate discussion for that week. This discussion questions should critically evaluate various aspects from the week's readings including similar themes, adversarial debates, critical lacunae in analysis, improper research designs, measurement issues, theoretical shortcomings, and other issues. Discussion questions must evince a *critical* understanding of the material and go beyond superficial summary towards a sharpened critique of the material. In short, everything you read is incorrect. Discuss why.

Make-up Policy and Late Work

Make-up assignments and exams will not be permitted unless in case of legitimate medical or other concerns which should be discussed privately with the professor to determine legitimacy. If an extension is granted, work must be submitted by the mutually agreed upon time or receive a score of zero. If a student submits late work without notifying the professor of any change in circumstances, such work will not be accepted and receive a score of zero.

Diversity and Inclusivity Statement

The Institute does not discriminate against individuals on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity, or veteran status in the administration of admissions policies, educational policies, employment policies, or any other Institute governed programs and activities. The Institute's equal opportunity and non-discrimination policy applies to every member of the Institute community. The Institute's affirmative action program, Title IX program, and related policies are developed in compliance with applicable law. Pursuant to Title IX, the Institute does not discriminate on the basis of sex in its education programs and activities. As such, the Institute does not tolerate any kind of gender-based discrimination or harassment, which includes sexual violence, sexual harassment, and gender-based harassment. Inquiries concerning the Institute's application of or compliance with Title IX may be directed to the Title IX Coordinator, Burns Newsome, burnsnewsome@gatech.edu, 404-385-5151. Additionally, inquiries concerning the application of applicable federal laws, statutes, and regulations (such as Title VI, Title IX, and Section 504) may be directed to the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights at www2.ed.gov/ocr.

Accommodations for Students with Disabilities

Reasonable accommodations will be made for students with verifiable disabilities. In order to take advantage of available accommodations, students must register with the Office of Disability Services at Suite 123, Smithgall Student Services Building, 353 Ferst Drive, 404-894-2563 (Voice); 404-894-1664 (TDD). For more information on Georgia Tech's policy on working with students with disabilities, please see review the Office of Disability Service's web page at <https://policies.ncsu.edu/regulation/reg-02-20-01/>. The Office of Disability Services collaborates with students, faculty, and staff to create a campus environment that is usable, equitable, sustainable and inclusive of all members of the Georgia Tech community. Disability as an aspect of diversity that is integral to society and Georgia Tech. If students encounter academic, physical, technological, or other barriers on campus, the Disability Services team is available to collaboratively find creative solutions and implement reasonable accommodations.

Academic Integrity

Academic dishonesty in the form of cheating or plagiarism will not be tolerated. In brief, plagiarism is defined, for the purposes of this class, as: copying, borrowing, or appropriating another entity's work and presenting it as your own in any submitted assignment, deliberately or by accident. Acts of plagiarism will be reported in accordance with the Honor Code. In order to avoid being charged with plagiarism, if you use the words, ideas, phrasing, charts, graphs, or data of another person or from published material, then you must either: 1) use quotation marks around the words and cite the source, or 2) paraphrase or summarize acceptably using your own words and cite the source. The plagiarism policy is not restricted to books, but also applies to video and audio content, websites, blogs, wiki's, AI generated content like Chat-GPT, and podcasts. Plagiarism includes putting your name on a group project to which you have minimally contributed. For information on Georgia Tech's Academic Honor Code, please visit <http://www.catalog.gatech.edu/policies/honor-code/> or <http://www.catalog.gatech.edu/rules/18/>. Any student suspected of cheating or plagiarizing on a assignment will be reported to the Office of Student Integrity, who will investigate the incident and identify the appropriate penalty for violations. The student will also receive a grade of zero on the assignment at the professor's discretion.

MODULE 1: Philosophy of Science

Aug 20 What are we Doing?

REQUIRED READING

Almond, G. A., & Genco, S. J. (1977). Clouds, Clocks, and the Study of Politics. *World Politics*, 29(4), 489-522.

Bernstein, S., Lebow, R. N., Stein, J. G., & Weber, S. (2000). God Gave Physics the Easy Problems: Adapting Social Science to an Unpredictable World. *European Journal of International Relations*, 6(1), 43-76.

Bueno de Mesquita & Fowler Ch. 1

Chalmers. Chs. 1-2

King, Keohane, and Verba (KKV) Ch. 1

RECOMMENDED READING

Gerring, J. (2008). The Mechanismic Worldview: Thinking Inside the Box. *British Journal of Political Science*, 161-179.

Mahoney, J. (2001, September). Beyond Correlational Analysis: Recent Innovations in Theory and Method. *Sociological Forum* (pp. 575-593). Eastern Sociological Society.

Mayo, Deborah and Spanos, Aris. (2010). Error and Inference: Recent Exchanges on Experimental Reasoning, Reliability, and the Objectivity and Rationality of Science. Ch. 1-2

Ostrom, E. (1998). A Behavioral Approach to the Rational Choice Theory of Collective Action: Presidential Address, American Political Science Association, 1997. *American Political Science Review*, 1-22.

Snyder, R. (2001). Scaling down: The Subnational Comparative Method. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 36(1), 93-110.

Schwartz, M. A. (2008). The Importance of Stupidity in Scientific Research. *Journal of Cell Science*, 121(11), 1771-1771.

Aug 27 Making Sense of Concepts

REQUIRED READING

Chalmers Ch. 3

KKV Ch. 2

Lebow, R. N. (2011). Philosophy and International Relations. *International Affairs*, 87(5), 1219-1228.

Jungherr, A., & Theocharis, Y. (2017). The Empiricist's Challenge: Asking Meaningful Questions in Political Science in the Age of Big Data. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics*, 14(2), 97-109.

Shapiro, I. (2002). Problems, Methods, and Theories in the Study of Politics, or What's Wrong with Political Science and What to do About it. *Political Theory*, 30(4), 596-619.

Homework # 1 Assigned

RECOMMENDED READING

Frankfurt, H. G. (2009). *On Bullshit*. Princeton University Press.

Pennycook, G., Cheyne, J. A., Barr, N., Koehler, D. J., & Fugelsang, J. A. (2015). On the Reception and Detection of Pseudo-Profound Bullshit. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 10(6), 549-563.

Sagan, C. (2007). The Fine Art of Baloney Detection. *Paranormal Claims: A Critical Analysis*, Ch 1.

Pennycook, G., Fugelsang, J. A., & Koehler, D. J. (2015). Everyday Consequences of Analytic Thinking. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 24(6), 425-432.

Tetlock, P. E. (2017). *Expert Political Judgment: How Good is It? How can we Know?*. Princeton University Press.

Tetlock, P. E., & Gardner, D. (2016). *Superforecasting: The Art and Science of Prediction*. Random House.

Sokal, A. D. (1996). A Physicist Experiments with Cultural Studies. *Lingua Franca*, 6(4), 62-64.

Harris, S. R. (2013). *How to Critique Journal Articles in the Social Sciences*. SAGE Publications.

Sept 3 Understanding I

REQUIRED READING

Blagden, D. (2016). Induction and Deduction in International Relations: Squaring the Circle between Theory and Evidence. *International Studies Review*, 18(2), 195-213.

Chalmers Ch. 4-5

Mahoney, J. (2021). *The Logic of Social Science*. Princeton University Press. Ch. 1-2.

Walt, S. M. (2005). The Relationship between Theory and Policy in International Relations. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 8, 23-48.

RECOMMENDED READING

Whetten, D. A. (1989). What Constitutes a Theoretical Contribution?. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 490-495.

Freedman, D. A. (2008). On Types of Scientific Inquiry: The Role of Qualitative Reasoning. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*, 300-318.

Dunning, T. (2010). Design-based Inference: Beyond the Pitfalls of Regression Analysis?. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*, 273-311.

Mahoney, J., & Goertz, G. (2006). A tale of two cultures: Contrasting quantitative and qualitative research. *Political Analysis*, 14(3), 227-249.

Sutton, R. I., & Staw, B. M. (1995). What Theory is Not. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 371-384.

Sept 10 Understanding II

REQUIRED READING

Chalmers Chs. 6-7

Healy, K. (2017). Fuck Nuance. *Sociological Theory*, 35(2), 118-127.

KKV Ch. 3

Shmueli, G. (2010). To Explain or to Predict?. *Statistical Science*, 25(3), 289-310.

Waltz, K. N. (1997). Evaluating Theories. *American Political Science Review*, 91(4), 913-917.

Ward, M. D. (2016). Can we Predict Politics? Toward what End?. *Journal of Global Security Studies*, 1(1), 80-91.

Homework #2 Assigned

ADDITIONAL READING

Marsh, D., & Furlong, P. (2002). A skin not a sweater: ontology and epistemology in political science. *Theory and methods in political science*, 2, 17-41.

Arendt, H. (1981). *The Life of the Mind*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt. Chapter I: Appearance. Available at <https://antilogicalism.files.wordpress.com/2017/07/life-of-the-mind.pdf>

Jackson, P. T. (2016). *The Conduct of Inquiry in International Relations: Philosophy of Science and its Implications for the Study of World Politics*. Routledge. Ch. 1-2 **Canvas**

Levy, J. S. (1997). Prospect Theory, Rational Choice, and International Relations. *International Studies Quarterly*, 41(1), 87-112.

Sept 17 Explanation I: Paradigms

REQUIRED READING

Almond, G. A. (1988). Separate Tables: Schools and Sects in Political Science. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 21(4), 828-842.

Chalmers Chs. 8-10

Elman, C., & Elman, M. F. (2002). How not to be Lakatos Intolerant: Appraising Progress in IR Research. *International Studies Quarterly*, 46(2), 231-262.

Lake, D. A. (2011). Why “isms” are evil: Theory, Epistemology, and Academic Sects as Impediments to Understanding and Progress. *International Studies Quarterly*, 55(2), 465-480.

ADDITIONAL READING

Niou, E. M., & Ordeshook, P. C. (1999). Return of the Luddites. *International Security*, 24(2), 84-96.

Tilly, C. (2001). Mechanisms in Political Processes. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 4(1), 21-41.

Walt, S. M. (1999). Rigor or Rigor Mortis?: Rational Choice and Security Studies. *International Security*, 23(4), 5-48.

Mayntz, R. (2004). Mechanisms in the Analysis of Social Macro-Phenomena. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 34(2), 237-259.

Lake, D. A. (2013). Theory is Dead, Long Live Theory: The End of the Great Debates and the Rise of Eclecticism in International Relations. *European Journal of International Relations*, 19(3), 567-587.

Lichbach, M. I., & Zuckerman, A. S. (2009). *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture, and Structure*. Cambridge University Press. Chs. 1-6

Clarke, K. A., & Primo, D. M. (2012). *A Model Discipline: Political Science and the Logic of Representations*. Oxford University Press.

Reus-Smit, C. (2013). Beyond Metatheory?. *European Journal of International Relations*, 19(3), 589-608.

Maliniak, D., Oakes, A., Peterson, S., & Tierney, M. J. (2011). International relations in the US academy. *International Studies Quarterly*, 55(2), 437-464.

Ward, M. D., Greenhill, B. D., & Bakke, K. M. (2010). The Perils of Policy by p-Value: Predicting Civil Conflicts. *Journal of Peace Research*, 47(4), 363-375.

Sept 24 Understanding II: Methodology

REQUIRED READING

Chalmers Chs. 11-12

KKV Ch. 4

Mahoney (2021) Ch. 7

ADDITIONAL READING

Mayo, D. G., & Spanos, A. (Eds.). (2011). *Error and Inference: Recent Exchanges on Experimental Reasoning, Reliability, and the Objectivity and Rationality of Science*. Cambridge University Press.

Nau, H. R. (2011). No Alternative to “isms”. *International Studies Quarterly*, 55(2), 487-491.

Jackson, P. T. (2016). The Conduct of Inquiry in International Relations: Philosophy of Science and its Implications for the Study of World Politics. Routledge. Ch. 3

Mearsheimer, J. J., & Walt, S. M. (2013). Leaving Theory Behind: Why Simplistic Hypothesis Testing is Bad for International Relations. *European Journal of International Relations*, 19(3), 427-457.

Oct 1 Understanding III: Experimentalism

REQUIRED READING

Chalmers Ch. 13

KKV Ch. 5

Lake, D. A. (2013). Theory is Dead, Long Live Theory: The End of the Great Debates and the Rise of Eclecticism in International Relations. *European journal of International Relations*, 19(3), 567-587.

Midterm Exam Assigned

ADDITIONAL READING

Bennett, A. (2007). The Mother of all “isms”: Organizing Political Science around Causal Mechanisms. In *Revitalizing Causality* (pp. 221-235). Routledge.

Cartwright, N. (2020). Middle-Range Theory. *Theoria: An International Journal for Theory, History and Foundations of Science*, 35(3), 269-323.

Findley, M. G., Kikuta, K., & Denly, M. (2021). External Validity. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 24, 365-393.

MODULE 2: Method

Oct 8 Ontology

REQUIRED READING

Chalmers Ch. 14-15

King, Keohane, and Verba Ch. 6

Goertz Ch2. 1-2

Oct 15 Observational Studies

REQUIRED READING

Holland, P. W. (1986). Statistics and Causal Inference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 81(396), 945-960. (Read only to page 949)

Keele, L. (2015). The Statistics of Causal Inference: A View from Political Methodology. *Political Analysis*, 23(3), 313-335.

Matthews, R. (2000). Storks Deliver Babies ($p= 0.008$). *Teaching Statistics*, 22(2), 36-38.

Pearl, J. (2003). Statistics and Causal Inference: A Review. *Test*, 12(2), 281-345.

ADDITIONAL READING

Cohen, J. (1994). The Earth is Round ($p < .05$). *American Psychologist*, 49(12), 997.

Policy Memo Rough Drafts Assigned

Oct 22 Case Studies

REQUIRED READING

Bueno de Mesquita and Fowler Chs. 2-3

Dinas, E., Matakos, K., Xefteris, D., & Hangartner, D. (2019). Waking up the Golden Dawn: Does Exposure to the Refugee Crisis Increase Support for Extreme-Right Parties?. *Political Analysis*, 27(2), 244-254.

Dube, O., & Vargas, J. F. (2013). Commodity Price Shocks and Civil Conflict: Evidence from Colombia. *Review of Economic Studies*, 80(4), 1384-1421.

ADDITIONAL READING

Tu, Y. K., Gunnell, D., & Gilthorpe, M. S. (2008). Simpson's Paradox, Lord's Paradox, and Suppression Effects are the Same Phenomenon - the Reversal Paradox. *Emerging Themes in Epidemiology*, 5(1), 1-9.

Dunning, T. (2008). Improving Causal Inference: Strengths and Limitations of Natural Experiments. *Political Research Quarterly*, 61(2), 282-293.

Copas, J. B., & Li, H. G. (1997). Inference for Non-random Samples. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 59(1), 55-95.

King, G. (2014). Restructuring the Social Sciences: Reflections from Harvard's Institute for Quantitative Social Science. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 47(1), 165-172.

Titunik, R. (2015). Can Big Data Solve the Fundamental Problem of Causal Inference?. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 48(1), 75-79.

Oct 29 Survey Research

REQUIRED READING

Hangartner, D., Dinas, E., Marbach, M., Matakos, K., & Xefteris, D. (2019). Does Exposure to the Refugee Crisis make Natives more Hostile?. *American Political Science Review*, 113(2), 442-455.

Kuklinski, J. H., Cobb, M. D., & Gilens, M. (1997). Racial Attitudes and the "New South". *The Journal of Politics*, 59(2), 323-349.

Goertz Chs. 3-4

Lyall, J., Blair, G., & Imai, K. (2013). Explaining Support for Combatants during Wartime: A Survey Experiment in Afghanistan. *American Political Science Review*, 107(4), 679-705.

Homework #3 Assigned

| | | |
|--------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Nov 5 | Election Day | No Class |
| Nov 12 | Experimental Research | <p>REQUIRED READING</p> <p>Goertz Ch. 5-6</p> <p>Hyde, S. D. (2015). Experiments in International Relations: Lab, Survey, and Field. <i>Annual Review of Political Science</i>, 18, 403-424.</p> <p>Mintz, A., Redd, S. B., & Vedlitz, A. (2006). Can we Generalize from Student Experiments to the Real World in Political Science, Military Affairs, and International Relations?. <i>Journal of Conflict Resolution</i>, 50(5), 757-776.</p> <p>Tomz, M. (2007). Domestic Audience Costs in International Relations: An Experimental Approach. <i>International Organization</i>, 61(4), 821-840.</p> <p>Policy Memo Rough Drafts Due</p> |
| Nov 19 | Qualitative Methods | <p>REQUIRED READING</p> <p>Collier, D. (2011). Understanding Process Tracing. <i>PS: Political Science & Politics</i>, 44(4), 823-830.</p> <p>Mahoney, J., & Goertz, G. (2006). A Tale of Two Cultures: Contrasting Quantitative and Qualitative Research. <i>Political Analysis</i>, 14(3), 227-249.</p> <p>Goertz Ch. 7-8</p> <p>Additional Reading</p> <p>Beach, D. (2016). It's all About Mechanisms - What Process-Tracing Case Studies Should be Tracing. <i>New Political Economy</i>, 21(5), 463-472.</p> <p>Goertz, G. (2006). Assessing the Trivialness, Relevance, and Relative Importance of Necessary or Sufficient Conditions in Social Science. <i>Studies in Comparative International Development</i>, 41, 88-109.</p> <p>Policy Memo Final Draft Assigned</p> |
| Nov 26 | Thanksgiving Break | |
| Dec 3 | Forecasting | <p>REQUIRED READING</p> <p>Chadefaux, T. (2017). Conflict Forecasting and its Limits. <i>Data Science</i>, 1(1-2), 7-17.</p> <p>Colaesi, M., & Mahmood, Z. (2017). Do the Robot: Lessons from Machine Learning to Improve Conflict Forecasting. <i>Journal of Peace Research</i>, 54(2), 193-214.</p> <p>D'Orazio, V. (2020). Conflict Forecasting and Prediction. In Oxford Research Encyclopedia of International Studies.</p> |

Hegre, H., Metternich, N. W., Nygård, H. M., & Wucherpfennig, J. (2017). Introduction: Forecasting in Peace Research. *Journal of Peace Research*, 54(2), 113-124.

Goertz 9-10

| | | |
|-----|------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| TBD | FINAL EXAM | Policy Memo to be submitted to Canvas, time TBD. |
|-----|------------|--------------------------------------------------|
