

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

Prof. Louise Carbert
 Class Monday 2:30 –5:15 -pm

Office: by appointment, 359 Hicks
 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, rural – urban divide, 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 emotions. 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	Value (%)	Due date
Introduction as Brightspace discussion post	5	24 January
Short writing assignments – 4 @ 12.5% each, maximum 700 words	50	one per month
Workshopping graduate-student presentations	10	as scheduled
Final essay exam; 12 hour period to be determined	35	mid-April
GRADUATE GRADING SCHEME [undergrad option w/ permission]		
Introduction as Brightspace discussion post	5	20 January
Short writing assignment – 3 @ 10% each, maximum 1000 words	30	one per month
Presentation	35	as scheduled
Participation	5	throughout
Final essay exam; 12 hour period to be determined	20	mid April

UNDERGRADUATE GRADING COMPONENTS

1. Self introduction: Introduce yourself by way of sharing a favorite political meme or video that you think is effective. You need not endorse your chosen example, which could even be nefarious or duplicitous. Explain the power of the message, who it appeals to, and why.
2. There are **four (4) short analytical papers**. Maximum 750 words. These papers summarize accurately and critique one or two of the readings for a particular module, with no additional research beyond the syllabus.
3. Workshopping: Undergraduates will be graded on their contributions to the discussions.
4. Essay exam to be written during a 12-hour period. The date to be determined for students' mutual convenience. The exam requires you to synthesize different aspects of the course material to address historical and theoretical dimensions of a question about a specified issue in the study of politics. A choice of questions will be offered.

GRADUATE GRADING COMPONENTS

1. Self introduction: Introduce yourself by way of sharing a favorite political meme or video that you think is effective. You need not endorse your chosen example, which could even be nefarious or duplicitous. Explain the power of the message, who it appeals to, and why.
2. There are **three (3) short analytical papers**. Maximum 1000 words. These papers summarize accurately and critique one or two of the readings for a particular module, with no additional research beyond the syllabus.
3. The oral presentation is the centrepiece of graduate student work in the course; consider it to be equivalent to a major research paper. A rubric is appended to the assignment dropbox. The presentations should take a decisive stand on the contributions of the readings to our understanding of the material under study for that week and the larger themes of the course more generally. More specifically, the presentations should:
 - present evidence in support of your position.
 - Extract the research design that underlies the results presented in each reading.
 - Evaluate if the research design adequately supports the conclusions presented.
 - Identify and assess the policy implications of the discussion presented.
 - Extract the article's theoretical approach.
 - Does the theory or the theoretical approach actually explain what it is supposed to explain?
 - Even if the reading is perfect, try to find the weak points and probe to see if it is a fatal flaw or not.
 - What contribution do the readings make to our overall understanding of politics?
 - Is it an empirical or theoretical contribution?
 - Do they complement or compete with previous readings?
 - Are we any further ahead than before?

Students 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.

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

9, 23 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"](#)

No class, 16 January

Craft of visualizing social science

30 January

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

Brady, H. 2011. "The art of political science: Spatial diagrams as iconic and revelatory" *Perspectives on Politics*, 9:2, 311-31

[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. PRACTICE OF PUBLIC OPINION

6 February

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

[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 ON CAMPUS

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

13 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.

READING WEEK, NO CLASS 24 February

B. GEOGRAPHY OF AMERICAN CULTURE WARS

27 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.
- Finkel, et al. 2020. "Political sectarianism in America" *Science* 370: 6516, 533-536.
- Gelman, Andrew. 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, Social Science* blog.
- Gelman, Andrew. 2018. "What really happened?" *Statistical Modeling, Causal Inference, and Social Science* blog.
- 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 U Press.

C. RURAL – URBAN GEOGRAPHY OF POPULISM

6 March

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.
- Gimpel, James, et al. 2020. "The urban-rural gulf in American political behavior" *Political Behavior*. 42, 1343–1368 (2020).
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-020-09601-w>
- Armstrong David, Jack Lucas, Zack Taylor. 2021. "The urban-rural divide in Canadian federal elections, 1896–2019" *Canadian Journal of Political Science*.
- 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

13 March

Question: Is Canada immune from the rise of Trump-style populism? Do you know any authoritarian populists?"

[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](#).

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

Environics. 2021. Democracy and political polarization in Canada and the U.S. Results from the Americas Barometer.

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

Medeiros, Mike. 2018. "The populism risk in English Canada" *Policy Options*.

NOVA SCOTIA HERITAGE DAY NO CLASS 24 February

B. STRUCTURAL FORCES DRIVING CANADIAN POPULISM

27 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. *Fueling 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.

Bennett, Patrick, Chiara Ravetti, Po Yin Wong. 2021. "Losing in a boom: Long-term consequences of a local economic shock for female labour market outcomes" *Labour Economics*. Vol. 73, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.labeco.2021.102080>.

Maurer, S.E. and Potlogea, A.V. 2021. "Male-biased demand shocks and women's labour force participation: Evidence from large oil field discoveries" *Economica*, 88: 167-188. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecca.12341>

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

V. BIOLOGICAL ORIGINS OF POLITICAL BEHAVIOUR

3 April

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](#).

Costello, Thomas et al. 2020. "Clarifying the structure and nature of left-wing authoritarianism" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. doi:10.1037/pspp0000341. See also easy summary posted to Brightspace.

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.

VI. MARKETING SOCIAL SCIENCE TO POLICY MAKERS

10 April

Question: Can the political brain be manipulated to improve public-health measures on covid?

Kam, Cindy and John Sides. 2020. Symptoms vary: Understanding Americans' differing views on COVID-19, Ebola, and Zika." Voter Study Group.

Geana, Mugur, Nathaniel Rabb, Steven Sloman. 2021. "Walking the party line: The growing role of political ideology in shaping health behavior in the United States" *Population Health*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmph.2021.100950>.

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..

DRAFT

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.

UNIVERSITY POLICIES, STATEMENTS, GUIDELINES and RESOURCES for SUPPORT

This course is governed by the academic rules and regulations set forth in the University Calendar and the Senate.

Academic Integrity

At Dalhousie University, we are guided in all of our work by the values of academic integrity: honesty, trust, fairness, responsibility and respect (The Center for Academic Integrity, Duke University, 1999). As a student, you are required to demonstrate these values in all of the work you do. The University provides policies and procedures that every member of the university community is required to follow to ensure academic integrity.

Accessibility

The Advising and Access Services Centre is Dalhousie's centre of expertise for student accessibility and accommodation. The advising team works with students who request accommodation as a result of a disability, religious obligation, or any barrier related to any other characteristic protected under Human Rights legislation (NS, NB, PEI, NFLD).

Student Code of Conduct

Everyone at Dalhousie is expected to treat others with dignity and respect. The Code of Student Conduct allows Dalhousie to take disciplinary action if students don't follow this community expectation. When appropriate,

violations of the code can be resolved in a reasonable and informal manner—perhaps through a restorative justice process. If an informal resolution can't be reached, or would be inappropriate, procedures exist for formal dispute resolution.

Diversity and Inclusion – Culture of Respect

Every person at Dalhousie has a right to be respected and safe. We believe inclusiveness is fundamental to education. We stand for equality. Dalhousie is strengthened in our diversity. We are a respectful and inclusive community. We are committed to be a place where everyone feels welcome and supported, which is why our Strategic Direction prioritizes fostering a culture of diversity and inclusiveness (Strategic Priority 5.2).

Recognition of Mi'kmaq Territory

Dalhousie University would like to acknowledge that the University is on Traditional Mi'kmaq Territory. The Elders in Residence program provides students with access to First Nations elders for guidance, counsel and support. Visit the office in the McCain Building (room 3037) or contact the programs at elders@dal.ca or 902-494-6803 (leave a message).

University Policies and Programs

- Important Dates in the Academic Year (including add/drop dates)
http://www.dal.ca/academics/important_dates.html
- University Grading Practices: Statement of Principles and Procedures
https://www.dal.ca/dept/university_secretariat/policies/academic/grading-practices-policy.html

Learning and Support Resources

- General Academic Support - Academic Advising: https://www.dal.ca/campus_life/academic-support/advising.html
- Copyright and Fair Dealing: <https://libraries.dal.ca/services/copyright-office/fair-dealing/fair-dealing-guidelines.html>
- Libraries: <http://libraries.dal.ca>
- Student Health Services: https://www.dal.ca/campus_life/health-and-wellness/health-services.html
- Counselling and Psychological Services: https://www.dal.ca/campus_life/health-and-wellness/counselling.html
- Black Student Advising: https://www.dal.ca/campus_life/communities/black-student-advising.html
- Aboriginal Student Centre: https://www.dal.ca/campus_life/communities/native.html
- ELearning Website: <https://www.dal.ca/dept/elearning.html>
- Student Advocacy Services: <https://www.dsu.ca/services/community-student-services/student-advocacy-service>
- Dalhousie Ombudsperson: https://www.dal.ca/campus_life/safety-respect/student-rights-and-responsibilities/where-to-get-help/ombudsperson.html
- Writing Centre: https://www.dal.ca/campus_life/academic-support/writing-and-study-skills.html
- Studying for Success program and tutoring: https://www.dal.ca/campus_life/academic-support/study-skills-and-tutoring.html

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 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 (OSAA) prior to or at the outset of each academic term (with the exception of X/Y courses). Please see www.studentaccessibility.dal.ca for more information and to obtain Form

A: Request for Accommodation. 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 them 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.