POLITICAL SCIENCE 5242 / 4242
POLITICAL BEHAVIOUR: REASON, PASSION, BIOLOGY

Prof. Louise Carbert
Class Wednesday 11:30 a.m. – 2:15 pm

Office: Tuesday 11:30 - 12:30, by appointment
Email: louise.carbert@dal.ca

Abstract

Political behavior is the study of the private roots of public action. To understand how and why people act politically, we delve into psychology, family life, sexuality, and genetics. In addition to these individual characteristics, economics, geography, and class drive political behaviour. Topics include: public opinion, political polarization, culture wars, elections, modernization theory, populism, democratization and the resource curse. The final unit considers big data and commercial applications of social science research in political practice. Although this material is inherently comparative, we principally want to investigate how it applies in Canada.

Extended overview

Is political behavior driven by reason, passion, biology, or some combination of the three? As a first approach, we assume that it is based on rational judgments made through some sort of cost / benefit analysis, and we assume that our calculation of utility is informed by knowledge about public affairs. To test if this assumption operates in practice, we study public opinion, class, partisanship, and "culture wars" in North America.

The second approach is modernization theory, which is the intellectual descendent of structural Marxist and Weberian theory. This approach assumes that societies (and the individuals within them) change socially and psychologically in ways that correspond to change in the structure of the economy. These changes are rational, but they are large-scale, predictable, and independent of human volition.

The third approach assumes that political behavior is based principally on passion, as driven by biology. Much of what people do politically corresponds to their genetic heritage which has its own rational calculus. When research from biology and psychology is applied to political practice, the result is political marketing which appeals to voters' emotions. Election campaigns are the height of applied social science in this regard.

Together, these three approaches enable students to reflect in a more profound way on how their own decision-making processes operate and how they arrive at their own personal loyalties. As a result, they become better equipped to become professional practitioners of politics.

UNDERGRADUATE GRADING SCHEME		***DUE***
Introduction as Brightspace discussion post	5%	13 January
Short writing assignment – 5 @ 10% each, maximum 1500 words	50%	Minimum 1 per month
Final essay exam; 24 hour period to be determined	40%	Mid-April
Workshopping graduate students research papers	5%	4 April
GRADUATE GRADING SCHEME		***DUE***
Introduction as Brightspace discussion post	5%	13 January
Short writing assignment – 4 @ 5% each, maximum 1500 words	20%	Minimum 1 per month
Research proposal posted – 1 page text; 5 annotated sources	20%	24 March
Peer review workshopping – 2 posted reviews @ 5% each	10%	4 April
Peer review workshopping on Collaborate	5%	7 April
Research paper	40%	mid April

UNDERGRADUATE GRADING COMPONENTS

1. There are **five (5) short analytical papers**. Short means short: maximum 1500 words. These papers summarize (accurately) and critique one or two of the readings for a particular module. Much of the material is difficult; understanding is more important than critique. No additional research is required (or permitted) beyond the syllabus. A minimum of one paper must be submitted each month. The best four of five papers will be calculated into your grade. Late penalties will be imposed.
2. Listen to graduate students present their research papers on Collaborate. Undergraduates provide useful suggestions and make interesting comments. A schedule to be posted for April 7 by module; attendance at one module at the workshop is required.
3. Essay exam to be written during a 24-hour period. The date to be determined for students' mutual convenience. The exam requires you to synthesize broad course themes in an essay. To synthesize is to bring different aspects of the course material together in a coherent explanation. The question to be posed typically asks students to address – in all its historical and theoretical complexity- a current "crisis" in the study of politics.

GRADUATE GRADING COMPONENTS

1. There are **four (4) short analytical papers**. Short means short: maximum 1500 words. These papers summarize (accurately) and critique one or two of the readings for a particular module. Much of the material is difficult; understanding is more important than critique. No additional research is required (or permitted) beyond the syllabus. A minimum of one paper to be submitted each month. The best three of four papers will be calculated into your grade. Late penalties will be imposed.
2. A research paper proposal comprises one page outlining the topic and a bibliography with a minimum of 5 annotated sources. The proposal may be written out in text or it may be outlined in bullet / number format. Submit research-paper proposals as discussion posts open to comments from classmates. So long as we observe "netiquette," discussion posts are anonymous to students, but not to the Instructor.
3. Graduate students post 2 written reviews of each others' proposals. To crib from the instructions in POLI 5523, the student-reviewer will read over the research paper proposal and offer constructive feedback on the outline, pose questions to clarify what the author is planning to do, and share whatever advice they can on how to sharpen the plan for the term paper. The review could take a variety of formats: e.g., a recorded video, text, bullet points, margin notes, etc. Reviewers will send their peer-review comments to the author directly, by email, copying me on each of the emails. Here is a post from a former editor of the *Canadian Journal of Political Science* on "How to write a referee report."
4. Research paper workshopping on Collaborate. Students speak informally about their work on the major paper. Students provide useful suggestions to each other. A schedule to be posted for April 7 by module.
5. Research paper. Instructions are posted to the assignment folder.

COURSE AGENDA

Readings are listed below, in order of priority. Begin reading from the top, and make your way down as you engage in the material. Popular accounts are listed first, as an introduction to the topic. Academic journals are listed next, followed by books. Students writing analytical papers and research papers on the topic are expected to engage deeply in the academic sources. Most items are posted to Brightspace. Students are NOT expected to do ALL the readings each class.

The syllabus is subject to minor changes (i.e. an addition of a supplementary reading, guest speaker, or exclusion of a previously required reading) upon notice provided by the instructor.

I. INTRODUCTION *6, 13 January*

Question: What are we doing when we do social science?

Watts, Duncan. 2011. "The human paradox that is common sense," *New Scientist Magazine* no. 2821.

Brooks, David. 2011. "The unexamined society" *New York Times* 7 July.

Gelman, Andrew & Thomas Basbøll. March 2014. "When do stories work? Evidence and illustration in the social sciences" *Sociological Methods Research* 43:4 547-570.

Gelman, Andrew. 2018." Feminism made me a better scientist" 13 August.

Tetlock, Philip. 2015. "Why an open mind is key to making better predictions"

The craft of visualizing social science *20 January*

Question: How to construct and relate knowledge in a visually compelling story?

Brady, Henry. 2011. "The art of political science: Spatial diagrams as iconic and revelatory" *Perspectives on Politics*, 9:2, 311-331

Gelman, Andrew. 2016. Lightning talk on data visualization.

Adams, Michael. 2017. Fire and Ice revisited: America and Canada: Social values in the age of Trump and Trudeau. Environics.

Pole, Antoinette Pole and Sangeeta Parashar. 2020. "Am I pretty? 10 tips to designing visually appealing slideware Presentations," *PS* October, 757-762.

II. ACADEMIC LINEAGE OF PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH *27 January*

Question: Is a democratic public too irrational and too easily manipulated to get the government that it wants?

Guest lecture Senator Dasko: https://sencanada.ca/en/senators/dasko-donna/

Dasko, Donna. 2015. "Opinion polls: Taking the national pulse, or trying to" *Toronto Globe & Mail*.

Menand, Louise. 2004. "The unpolitical animal: How political science understands voters" *New Yorker*. August 30.

Edsall, Thomas. 2014. "Nothing in moderation: How ideological moderation conceals support for immoderate policies: a new perspective on the 'disconnect' in American politics." *NYT*.

Brookman, David. The real extremists are American voters" *Washington Post*.

Achen, Christopher & Larry Bartels. 2016. "Do Sanders supporters favor his policies?" *New York Times*, 23 May.

Gelman, Andrew.2016. No evidence that shark attacks cause elections.

Achen, Christopher & Larry Bartels. 2016. "Democracy for realists: Holding up a mirror to the electorate" *Juncture*, 22:4, 269-275.

Zaller, John. 1998. "Monica Lewinsky's contribution to political science" *Political Science & Politics.* 31:2, 182-189.

Zaller, John. 2012. "What nature and origins leaves out" *Critical Review* 24: 4, 2012.

Egan, Patrick J. 2020. "Identity as dependent variable: How Americans shift their identities to align with their politics" *American Journal of Political Science* 64.3, 699-716.

Lenz, Gabriel. 2018. "Time for a change" *Critical Review*, 30:1-2, 87-106.

Cochrane, Chris. 2015 *Left and Right: The small world of political ideas* Montreal & Kingston: McGill Queen's Univ Press.

Butler, Peter. 2007. *Polling and public opinion: A Canadian perspective.* University of Toronto Press.

III. STRUCTURAL FORCES: MODERNIZATION & POST-MODERNIZATION

Question: Even if people are not individually rational, is there rationally predictable behavior that we can identify in the aggregate? And might that rationally predictable behavior be an amalgam of Marx (economic) and Weber (culture)?

A. PROMISE & PERILS OF WORLD VALUES SURVEY *3 February*

Question: to what extent are American politics unique? Or are they globally generic?

Inglehart, Ronald. 2016. "Inequality and modernization" *Foreign Affairs,* 95:1, 2-10. Video

Foa, Roberto Stefan & Yascha Mounk. 2016. "The danger of deconsolidation" *Journal of Democracy* 27:3, July.

Inglehart, Ronald. 2016. "Reply to Foa and Mounk. How much should we worry?" *Journal of Democracy*, 27:3.

Inglehart, Ronald & Pippa Norris. 2016. "Trump, Brexit, and the rise of populism: Economic have-nots and cultural backlash" Harvard Kennedy School of Government. Working paper Series, August.

Adams, Julia and Ann Shola Orloff. 2005. "Defending modernity? High politics, feminist anti-modernism, and the place of gender, *Politics & Gender*, 1: 166-182.

Norris, Pippa and Ronald Inglehart. 2018. *Cultural backlash Trump, Brexit, and the rise of authoritarian populism* New York: Cambridge University Press, chapter 1.

Inglehart, Ronald and Christian Welzel. 2010. "Changing mass priorities: The link between modernization and democracy" *Perspectives on Politics*, 8: 551-567.

B. GEOGRAPHY OF AMERICAN CULTURE WARS *10 February*

Question: How do America's culture wars map onto federal and sub-state jurisdictions?

Maps to orient ourselves

https://www.wsj.com/articles/blue-coasts-red-heartland-house-maps-show-americans-growing-apart-11607691603?reflink=desktopwebshare_twitter

https://twitter.com/i/status/783085306090131456

Brooks, David. 2001. *"One nation, slightly divisible" Atlantic Monthly* Dec.; 288, 5.

Andrew Gelman. 2014. The Twentieth-Century Reversal: How Did the Republican States Switch to the Democrats and Vice Versa*?, Statistics and Public Policy*, 1:1, 1-5.

Gelman, Andrew. 2008. *Red state, blue state, rich state, poor state: Why Americans vote the way they do*. Princeton University Press. Slide presentation.

Gelman, Andrew. 2016. "19 Things we learned from the 2016 election, plus 5 more things" Statistical Modeling, Causal Inference, and Social Science blog.

Gelman, Andrew. 2018: "What really happened?" Statistical Modeling, Causal Inference, and Social Science blog. 10 November.

Johnston, R., Jones, K. & Manley, D. 2016. "The growing spatial polarization of presidential voting in the United States, 1992–2012: Myth or reality? *PS: Political Science & Politics* 49:4, 766–770.

Abrams, Samuel & Morris Fiorina. 2012. "The Big Sort" that wasn't: A skeptical re-examination" *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 45:02, 203-210.

Fiorina, Morris, Samuel Abrams, Jeremy Pope. 2010. *Culture war? The myth of a polarized America.* Longman.

Feller, Avi, Andrew Gelman & Boris Shor. 2012. "Red state / blue state divisions in the 2012 presidential election, *Forum* 10:4, 127–131.

Abramowitz, Alan. 2010. *The disappearing center: Engaged citizens, polarization, and American democracy*. Yale University Press.

Jacoby, William. 2014. "Is there a culture war? Conflicting value structures in American public opinion" *American Political Science Review* 108:4, 754-771.

READING WEEK, NO CLASS 17 February

C. GEOGRAPHY OF AMERICAN POPULISM — *24 February*

Question: Do people sort themselves out geographically by choice? Or does geography sort people out politically?

Gimpel, James & Kimberly Karnes. 2006. "The rural side of the urban-rural gap" *PS: Political Science & Politics* July.

Wilkinson, Will. 2018. *The density divide: Urbanization, polarization, and populist backlash.* Niskanen Center 2018.

Packer, George. 2018. "A new report offers insights into tribalism in the age of Trump" *New Yorker*. 12 October. Complete Hidden Tribes Report. VOX critique

Setzler, M. & A. Yanus. 2018. "Why did women vote for Donald Trump?" *PS: Political Science & Politics* 51:3, 523-7.

Young, Clifford. 2016. *It's nativism: Explaining the drivers of Trump's popular support*. Ipsos Public Affairs.

Perrin, Andrew. 2018. *"The invention of the "white working class"* Public books.

IV.CANADIAN CONSIDERATIONS

A. (IR)RATIONAL POPULISM IN CANADIAN PUBLIC OPINION — *3 March*

Question: Is Canada immune from the rise of Trump-style populism? Check it out by seeing if there are any "authoritarian populists" in your household.

Graves, Frank and Jeff Smith. 2020. *Northern populism: Causes and consequences of the ordered outlook,* University of Calgary: School of Public Policy Publications, TVO video to accompany.

Adams, Michael. 2017. *Could-it-happen-here? Canada in the age of Trump and Brexit*. Environics Research. TVO video to accompany.

Flanagan, Thomas. 2016. "Could a populist wave also sweep Canada?" *Policy Options*.

Kevins, A. & Stuart Soroka. 2018. "Growing apart? Partisan sorting in Canada, 1992–2015" *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 51:1, 103-133.

B. STRUCTURAL FORCES DRIVING CANADIAN POPULISM *10 March*

Question: is a natural resource economy a curse or a blessing for Canadians?

Debate: Oil, Islam, and Women, *Politics & Gender*, 5:4 (December 2009).

Norris, Pippa, "Petroleum patriarchy? A response to Ross."

Ross, Michael, "Does oil wealth hurt women? A reply to Norris."

Speer, Sean. 2018. *Working-class opportunity and the threat of populism in Canada*. Macdonald-Laurier Institute.

Speer, Sean and Brian Dijkemao. 2020. Fuelling Canada's middle class: Job polarization and the natural resource sector. Cardus.

Ross, Michael. 2008. "Oil, Islam, women," *American Political Science Review* 102: 107-123.

Blanton, R., Blanton, S., & Peksen, D. 2019. "The gendered consequences of financial crises: A cross-national analysis. *Politics & Gender*, 15(4), 941-970.

V. (IR)RATIONAL CULTURE WARS: MARRIAGE AND FAMILY *17 March*

Question: Is populism conceived at home behind white picket fences?

Lasch, Christopher. 1994. "The revolt of the elites" *Harper's Magazine,* 289, 39-49.

Douthat, Ross. 2010. "The changing Culture War" *New York Times*. December 6.

Leonhardt, David. 2015. "Red vs. Blue America on Marriage" *Upshot New York Times.*

Cahn, Naomi and June Carbone. 2010. *Red state families vs. blue state families: The family-values divide* OUP.

Wilcox, Bradford and Nicholas Zill. 2015. *Red state families: better than we knew*. Institute for Family Studies.

Wilcox, Bradford & Wendy Wang. 2017. *The marriage divide.* Research Brief for Opportunity America–Brookings Working Class Group.

Gelman, Andrew, 2013. "Charles Murray's *Coming Apart* and the measurement of social and political divisions" *Statistics, Politics, and Policy* 2013; 4:1, 70–81.

Cross, Philip and Peter Mitchell. 2014. *The marriage gap between rich and poor Canadians: How Canadians are split into haves and have-nots along marriage lines.* Institute of Marriage and Family Canada.

Malloy, Jonathan. 2009. "Bush / Harper? Canadian and American Evangelical politics compared," *American Review of Canadian Studies*. 39:4, 352–363.

Putnam, Robert, Carl Frederick, Kaisa Snellman. 2012. "Growing class gaps in social connectedness among American youth" Boston: Harvard Kennedy School of Govt. Saguaro Seminar: Civic Engagement in America.

VI. BIOLOGY & POLITICS

A. Biological origins of political behaviour *24 March*

Question: Do our genes determine our fundamental orientations to politics?

Edsall, Thomas. 2013. "Are our political beliefs encoded in our DNA?" *New York Times*. 1 October.

Pinker, Steven. 2008. "The moral instinct," *New York Times*. January 13.

Haidt, Jonathan. 2013. The Politics of Disgust .

Haidt, Jonathan "The moral roots of liberals and conservatives."

Hatemi, Peter & Rose McDermott. 2012. "Policing the perimeter: disgust and purity in democratic debate" *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 45, 675-687. TEDx talk to accompany.

McDermott, Rose. 2004. "The feeling of rationality: The meaning of neuroscientific advances for political science" *Perspectives on Politics* 2:4, 691-706.

McDermott, R., Tingley, D., Hatemi, P. 2014. "Assortative mating on ideology could operate through olfactory cues" *American Journal of Political Science*, 58: 997–1005.

B. Marketing social science *31 March*

Question: Is the political brain an irrational brain to be manipulated at will? Is it in the realm of science fiction to imagine how technology might facilitate this manipulation?

Fletcher, Joseph and Jennifer Hove. 2012. "Emotional determinants of support for the Canadian mission in Afghanistan: A view from the bridge" *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 45:1, 33-62.

Soroka, Stuart, Peter Loewen, Patrick Fournier, Daniel Rubenson. 2016. "The impact of news photos on support for military action" *Political Communication,* 1-20.

Randall, Kevin. 2015. "Neuropolitics: Where campaigns try to read your mind" *New York Times.* 3 November.

OK Cupid dating profiles are political https://theblog.okcupid.com/tagged/politics

Singer, Natasha. 2013. "A data broker offers a peek behind the curtain" *New York Times*. 31 August.

Singer, Natasha. 2012. "You for sale: Mapping and sharing the consumer genome" *New York Times*. 31 August.

Edsall, Thomas. 2012. "Let the nanotargeting begin?" *New York Times*. 15 April.

Federico Christopher, Howard Lavine, Christopher Johnston. 2012. "The unexpected impact of coded appeals" *New York Times*. 10 September.

Rothfeder, Jeffrey. 2004. Terror Games *Popular Science.*

Kosinski, Michael, David Stillwell, Thore Graepel. 2013. "Private traits and attributes are predictable from digital records of human behavior" *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 110:15, 5802-5805.

Canadian material

Guest. 2018. "Andrew Scheer's campaign manager says he builds creepy psychological profiles of voters too" *Press Progress*. 22 March.

Marland, Alex. 2018. "The brand image of Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau in international context" *Canadian Foreign Policy Journal* 24:2, 139-144.

Marland, Alex. 2016. *Brand Command: Canadian politics and democracy in the age of message control*. VCR: UBC

Delacourt, Susan. 2013. *Shopping for votes*. Madeira Park BC: Douglas & McIntyre. Video.

Flanagan, Thomas. 2014. *Winning power: Canadian campaigning in the 21st century*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill Queen's University Press, chapters 5 and7.

Marland, Alex and Tom Flanagan. 2013. "Political branding of the Conservative Party of Canada" *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 46:4, 951-69.

V. WORKSHOPPING PAPERS *7 April*

Tips to Article-Writers

Ezra W. Zuckerman, MIT Sloan School of Management February 6, 2008

Over the past several years, I often find that I am giving similar advice or reactions to colleagues and students (or as referee to authors) on how to improve their papers, usually with an eye to improving the paper's likelihood of contributing to the social scientific literature. Since I give this advice often, I thought it might be of some use to compile the advice and post it on my website. Please note that this is by no means a recipe for writing great papers. God knows that if I had such a recipe, I would have an easier time writing great papers myself! And please note that the converse is also true: there are many published articles that violate one or more of these tips. Of course, many published papers are awful. And very good papers sometimes do not get accepted for publication. Consequently, all I can say is that I think these tips generally make for better papers. And what keeps me in this business is the faith that our journals generally publish the better papers and reject the weaker ones, though that faith is often tested. A final note: I plan on updating these from time to time, as I continue to play the mentor / commentator / critic / discussant / referee roles and think of something else that might be useful. Comments (via email) are also welcome.

1. Motivate the paper. The first question you must answer for the reader is why they should read your paper. There is A LOT out there to read and it is very easy to find an excuse not to read a paper. Most people don't even read all the articles published in their field's flagship journals. So if you want your paper to be read, you need to sell the reader on why your paper is so great. The introduction of your paper has to be exciting. It must motivate the reader to keep on reading. They must have the sense that if they keep on reading, there is at least a fair chance that they will learn something new.

2. Know your audience. Since different people get excited about different things, you cannot get them motivated unless you know their taste. And different academic communities/journals have very different tastes for what constitutes an interesting question and what constitutes a compelling approach to a question. (My friend and colleague Roberto Fernandez has an excellent framework for thinking about audiences, known widely at Sloan as "Rows and Columns." I will not go into it here, but the basic idea is that social scientific communities are arrayed by two dimensions, where the "rows" are "phenomena" [e.g., area studies; topics such as entrepreneurship or racial inequality] and the "columns" are disciplines or theories. One key lesson is that one typically needs to choose whether one is aiming for a "row" audience / journal or a "column" audience / journal, and motivate / frame one's paper accordingly. Trying to motivate both row and column simultaneously usually does not work).

3. Use substantive motivations, not aesthetic ones. By an aesthetic motivation, I mean that the author is appealing to the reader's sense that a certain kind of theory or approach should be preferred regardless of its explanatory power (e.g., we should be avoiding "economistic" or "functionalist" or "reductionist" explanations). Sometimes aesthetic motivations work (for getting a paper accepted), but the contribution tends to be hollow because the end of research (figuring out how the world works) is sacrificed for the means (telling each other how much we like certain ideas). Another way of putting this is that we should not like a paper simply because it proudly displays the colors of our tribe.

4. Always frame around the dependent variable. The dependent variable is a question and the independent variables are answers to a question. So it makes no sense to start with an answer. Rather, start with a question/puzzle! (Note that I don't mean the literal dependent variable in the analysis in the paper, but the larger process/pattern that it is supposed to represent).

5. Frame around a puzzle in the world, not a literature. The only reason anyone cares about a literature is because it is helpful in clarifying puzzles in the world. So start with the puzzle. A related point is that just because a literature has not examined some phenomenon, that does not mean that you should. The only reason a phenomenon is interesting is if it poses a puzzle for existing ways of viewing the world. (Too often, I read papers that try to get motivation from the fact that a literature "has not looked at" x, y, or z. So what? There will always be a great deal of unstudied [by academics] phenomena. The question is why that matters.)

6. One hypothesis (or a few tightly related hypotheses) is enough. If people remember a paper at all, they will remember it for one idea. So no use trying to stuff a zillion ideas in a paper. A related problem with numerous hypotheses is that it's never clear what implications the invalidation of any one hypothesis has for the theory. (Note: the organizations community apparently does not agree with me on this one)

7. Build up the null hypothesis to be as compelling as possible. A paper will not be interesting unless there is a really compelling null hypothesis. If there is no interesting alternative to the author's argument, why would anyone care about it? Flogging straw men is both unfair and uninteresting.

8. Save the null. Since the null is compelling, it must be right under certain conditions. The author's job is to explain to the reader that s/he was right to believe x about the world, but that since x doesn't hold under certain conditions, s/he should shift to belief x`. This helps the reader feel comfortable about shifting to a new idea. Moreover, a very subtle shift in thinking can go a long way.

9. Orient the reader. The reader needs to know at all times how any sentence fits into the narrative arc of the paper. All too often, I read papers where I get lost in the trees and have no sense of the forest. The narrative arc should start with the first paragraph or two where a question/puzzle is framed and lead to the main finding of the paper. Everything else in the paper should be in service of that arc, either by clarifying the question or setting up the answer (including painstakingly dealing with objections). A related tip is:

10. Never write literature reviews. No one likes to read literature reviews. They are boring. So don't write them. But that doesn't mean you should ignore "the relevant literature." To the contrary. You have raised a puzzle about the real world (see tips 3-5). One reason why it is a puzzle is because existing answers are compelling (see point 7), but flawed. So you review the literature not as an end in itself but because you show what is compelling but flawed about existing answers. Any research that does not pertain to that objective can remain unmentioned. (Ok, ok. Some reviewers will demand to see their names or that of their favorite scholars even when their work is essentially irrelevant. And it is usually good to anticipate that. But try to do as little as possible.).

Additional Information for Graduate Students

As this is a cross-listed class, the requirements for graduate students are somewhat different from those for undergraduates. The number of and types of assignments are the same, but the expectations for these assignments are considerably higher:

1. In all assignments, graduate students are expected to evince a deeper analytical ability when evaluating readings; to show familiarity with a wider variety of sources; and to articulate a greater complexity of thought, in both verbal and written forms.

2. The writing style for graduate students should illustrate greater sophistication, both in the construction of the argument and in the clarity and lucidity of the writing.

3. Graduate students are expected to be prepared for each seminar; and to read beyond the minimal expectations set out for undergraduates (*i.e.,* more than one primary reading, secondary text, one online article, one student paper). Attendance is crucial. Graduate students should be willing to participate actively in the discussions, rather than waiting to be called upon to speak.

4. At the graduate level, students should show an understanding of the nuances of criticism, ie, how to accomplish an intellectually incisive criticism in a respectful and constructive manner.

5. Research papers for graduate students are generally longer. They should show evidence of good research skills; of the capacity for revision; and of the analytical capability noted in (1) above. Graduate students may choose to tailor their research papers to their thesis work; but please discuss this with me in advance.

6. Graduate students should enjoy their work more thoroughly.

Oral presentation

Graduate students are required to deliver a presentation based on the readings from one week. The oral presentation is the centrepiece of graduate student work in the course; consider it to be equivalent to a major research paper. The presentations should take a decisive stand on the contributions of the readings to our understanding of the particular problem under study for that week and the larger themes of the course more generally. More specifically, the presentations should:

1. Take a decisive stand on the contribution of the readings to understanding politics.
2. Based on the stand you take on the readings, present evidence in support of your position.
3. Extract the research design that underlies the results presented in each reading.
    a. Evaluate if the research design adequately supports the conclusions presented.
4. Identify and assess the policy implications of the discussion presented.
5. Extract the article's theoretical approach.
    a. Does the theory or the theoretical approach actually explain what it is supposed to explain?
6. Even if you think the reading is perfect, analysis entails trying to find the weakest points of an argument and probing to see if it is a fatal flaw or not.
7. What contribution do the readings make to our overall understanding of politics?
    a. Is it an empirical or theoretical contribution?
    b. Do they complement or compete with previous readings? Are we any further ahead than before?

You must use a computer and projector. Your presentation will be graded on its ability to communicate intellectually interesting and politically astute insights, not its technical artistry. Learning to present complex information in a visually compelling way is a valuable skill.

The speaking notes must be submitted as part of the assignment. Text need not be in formal essay format; it consists of presentation notes, provided that they are coherent, logical, cleaned up and properly formatted. Please create your speaking notes in the "notes" format of the pptx file. Then submit your notes in that format; it is also possible to submit notes in a separate text file.

One hour of class time is given over to your presentation. Be prepared to speak for approximately 30 minutes. You will address questions and comments from the class for the remainder of the time. The instructor chairs all presentations. Students are not responsible for presenting all the material assigned for that day, but you are expected to be familiar with the assigned readings, and to be able to address questions as to how they relate to what you present. Much of the material is quite difficult and explaining the concepts and results accurately to your classmates will take time and effort. The evaluation rubric for the class presentation is appended to this syllabus.

When the presentations are over, the class will be expected to ask **critical and thoughtful questions** about the presentations. At the end of the course, students will grade each other on their attentiveness to each other's work, using a short-version of the oral presentation rubric. This is an anonymous grade that is submitted to the instructor as an advisory grade; the instructor has task of compiling students' evaluations and assigning a final grade.

The **final take-home exam** requires you to synthesize broad course themes in an essay. To synthesize is to bring different aspects of the course material together in a coherent explanation. The question to be posed typically asks the student to address – in all its historical and theoretical complexity- a current "crisis" in the study of politics.

UNIVERSITY REGULATIONS

From the University Calendar: "Students are expected to complete class work by the prescribed deadlines. Only in special circumstances ... may an instructor extend such deadlines." Late papers will be assessed a late penalty at the instructor's discretion. Students who miss a deadline on account of illness are expected to hand in the assignment within one week of their return to class, with a medical certificate, per academic regulations of Dalhousie.

Papers should be submitted directly to the instructor, or the teaching assistant, or in person to the Political Science office between 8:30 am and 4:30 pm on weekdays only. The instructor cannot assume responsibility for papers otherwise submitted.

Students may request accommodation as a result of barriers related to disability, religious obligation, or any characteristic under the Nova Scotia Human Rights Act. Students who require academic accommodation for either classroom participation or the writing of tests, quizzes and exams should make their request to the Office of Student Accessibility & Accommodation prior to or at the outset of each academic term. Please see www.studentaccessibility.dal.ca for information and to obtain Form A: Request for Accommodation. A note taker may be required to assist a classmate. There is an honorarium of $75/course/term. If you are interested, please contact OSAA at 494-2836 for more information. Please note that your classroom may contain specialized accessible furniture and equipment. It is important that these items remain in the classroom so that students who require their usage will be able to participate in the class.

INFORMATION ON PLAGIARISM

Proper documentation is required on all writing assignments. Failure to document sources constitutes plagiarism and can result in severe academic penalty. You should keep your rough notes and be prepared to defend your work orally. Consult a writing/style manual for acceptable citation styles.

Any paper submitted by a student at Dalhousie University may be checked for originality to confirm that the student has not plagiarized from other sources. Plagiarism is considered a serious academic offence which may lead to loss of credit, suspension or expulsion from the University, or even to the revocation of a degree. It is essential that there be correct attribution of authorities from which facts and opinions have been derived.

At Dalhousie there are University Regulations which deal with plagiarism and, prior to submitting any paper in a course; students should read the Policy on Intellectual Honesty contained in the Calendar or on the Online Dalhousie website. As a student in this class, you are to keep an electronic copy of any paper you submit, and the course instructor may require you to submit that electronic copy on demand.