

**POSC 6000
POLITICAL SCIENCE CONCEPTS**



Department of Political Science, Memorial University
Fall 2017
Meeting Time/Location: Thursdays 9 am – 12 pm, SN-2033
Instructor: Dr. Amanda Bittner
Instructor's email address: abittner@mun.ca
Office Hours: Tuesdays 12–1:30 & Tues/Thurs 3:30–4:30

BACKGROUND:

This seminar provides an overview of important theoretical and methodological issues in political analysis based on readings in the philosophy of science, political behaviour, rational choice, feminism, qualitative analysis, and postmodernism, among other things. The subject matter of this seminar is applicable to all sub-fields of the discipline.

The course is meant to give you a taste of some of the various debates, controversies, and issues in political analysis, as well as providing a general sense of the plurality of approaches that exist in our field as a whole. No two political scientists are the same, and the ways in which they choose to approach research questions are often very different. At the end of this course you should have a basic understanding of some (not all) of the different kinds of things that political scientists “do,” and you should be able to situate yourself to some degree within the field. We all have preferences of our own, and all approaches have strengths and weaknesses. When we consider a research question, it is important to think about the methodological and ontological tradeoffs involved with approaching the question from different angles. The tools gained in this course should be applicable to all future research in political analysis.

REQUIRED READINGS:

There is no textbook for this course.

We will be reading selected articles and chapters over the course of the term, as listed below. The readings will be made available for download from the instructor before classes begin. Students are responsible for the material in the assigned readings. These readings will form the basis of class discussion.

ASSIGNMENTS AND GRADING:

Assignment	Dates & Deadlines	Value
Presentation of a Week's Topic	Chosen by students	20%
Critical Review Papers (3 x 1000 words)	Submit throughout course	15%
SSHRC Grant Application Proposal	November 2	10%
Research Paper (7000–8000 words: journal article length)	<i>Initial paper</i> due (by email) Thursday November 16 th by midnight <i>Final paper</i> due Friday Dec 8 th by midnight (via email)	30%
Research Paper review	Due Tuesday November 21 st by midnight (via email)	10%
Participation	Throughout	15%

CLASS POLICIES:

1. Students are expected to attend every class session, do all the reading before class, and come prepared to discuss it.
2. Late papers are not acceptable for the short critical review assignments based on the weekly readings. Because you get to choose when you submit them, deciding NOT to submit a paper is also your choice. They need to be submitted within the first 10 minutes of class, or else they are simply not counted towards your three critical review papers.
3. Laptops/tablets are allowed in class for note-taking purposes **ONLY**, not for checking emails, Facebook or surfing the web. Lots of research shows that students who take notes with laptops actually don't do as well as students who take notes by hand. If you decide to use a laptop for the course, please respect your fellow colleagues and your instructor enough to give them your full attention. There is nothing worse than presenting in front of 20 people who are all laughing at their friends' Facebook updates and are busy emailing their girlfriend/boyfriend.
4. When contacting the instructor, please state your full name and needless to say, be civil! I aim to be as responsive as possible to email from students, but am unlikely to be able to respond within less than 48 hours. For substantive questions that require long answers, come and see me during office hours, I would be more than happy to chat with you then.
5. Cheating, in addition to being unfortunate in any class, is especially unfortunate in a class where the main goal is to read, think, and discuss your ideas. It is simply not acceptable. Cheating on assignments includes (but is not limited to) allowing another student to copy from your own work and presenting someone else's work as your own. Information about procedures and penalties for academic dishonesty is outlined in the University Calendar and is available through the Department of Political Science.
6. Each of us is an adult and therefore expected to adhere to basic rules of common courtesy in sharing group space and exchanging ideas. We should all treat others as we would wish to be treated. Agreeing to disagree with someone is not a personal or moral failure. We will be decent to one another.

BRIEF COURSE OUTLINE AND READING SCHEDULE:**WEEKLY TOPICS AND ACTIVITIES**

DATE	TOPIC	Assignments Due
Sept 7	Introduction	
Sept 14	1. What is Political Science?	
Sept 21	2. What is a Political Science "Concept"?	
Sept 28	3. Scientific Study of Politics	
Oct 5	4. Rational Choice	
Oct 12	NO CLASS (Thursday is a Tuesday in MUN calendar)	
Oct 19	5. Institutionalism	
Oct 26	6. Feminism	
Nov 2	7. Post-Modernism	SSHRC proposals due
Nov 9	8. Normative Theory	
Nov 16	9. Quantitative Methods in Political Science	1 st draft research paper due (Nov 16)
Nov 23	10. Qualitative Methods in Political Science	Peer review due this week (Nov 21)
Nov 30	11. Bringing it altogether	Final research paper due (Dec 1)

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP SERIES

DATE	TOPIC	INSTRUCTOR
Sept 13, 2-3pm	Reading Skills & Strategies	Dr. Sarah Martin
Sept 18, 3:30-4:30pm	How to Cite Your Sources	Dr. Christina Doonan
Sept 25, 3:30-4:30pm	Preparing a Grant Funding Application	Dr. Russell Williams
Sept 28, 11am-12pm	How to Prepare a Literature Review	Dr. Amanda Bittner
Nov 8, 2-3pm	How to Deliver a Conference Paper	Dr. Sarah Martin
Nov 16, 11am-12pm	Applying to Graduate School	Dr. Amanda Bittner

These professional development talks will take place across graduate courses in the fall of 2017. None of the courses overlap, and students are expected to attend all of them, even if they are not taking place during the bounds of our normal class time. Participation in these seminars will count towards your participation grade.

DETAILED COURSE OUTLINE AND READING SCHEDULE:

September 7

Introduction: What is the point of this class?

Three things to read before you start reading

- <http://www.raulpacheco.org/2017/05/distinguishing-between-description-and-analysis-in-academic-writing/>
- <https://www.nottingham.ac.uk/studentservices/documents/description-vs-analysis---learnhigher.pdf>
- <http://blogs.monm.edu/writingatmc/files/2013/01/Critical-Thinking-Handout.pdf>

September 14

Unit 1: What is Political Science?

Read this first:

- Patel, Salma. research paradigm – methodology, epistemology and ontology – explained in simple language <http://salmapatel.co.uk/academia/the-research-paradigm-methodology-epistemology-and-ontology-explained-in-simple-language>
- Almond, Gabriel. 1990. "Separate Tables: Schools and Sects in Political Science," in Gabriel Almond, *A Discipline Divided: Schools and Sects in Political Science*. Newbury Park, CA.: Sage Publications, pp.13–31.
- Keohane, Robert O. (2009). "Political Science as a Vocation." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 42–2: 359–363. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/ps-political-science-and-politics/article/political-science-as-a-vocation/A72BD60FDD670B34D5F9395AFA2E15BB>
- Stoker, Gerry. 1995. "Introduction," in Marsh, David and Gerry Stoker, eds. *Theory and Methods in Political Science*. London: Macmillan.
- R. Claire Snyder. 2001. "Should Political Science Have a Civic Mission? An Overview of the Historical Evidence." *PS* 34:301–5. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/services/aop-cambridge-core/content/view/S1049096501000543>
- J. Tobin Grant. 2005. "What Divides Us? The Image and Organization of Political Science." *PS* 38:379–86. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/ps-political-science-and-politics/article/what-divides-us-the-image-and-organization-of-political-science/8DAA2892F656C48A1274E278468F1356>

September 21

Unit 2: What are Political Science "Concepts"?

- Sartori, Giovanni (1970). "Concept misformation in comparative politics." *American Political Science Review* 64–4: 1033–53. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/american-political-science-review/article/concept-misformation-in-comparative-politics/D8BF3109460C6005B9C12FBC1B217489>
- Collier, David, and James E. Mahon, Jr. (1993) "Conceptual "Stretching" Revisited: Adapting Categories in Comparative Analysis." *American Political Science Review* 87–4: 845–855. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/american-political-science-review/article/conceptual-stretching-revisited-adapting-categories-in-comparative-analysis/52A5DA1F2B8A9516A45C04F5B165E1C5>
- Gerring, John (1999) "What makes a concept good? A criterial framework for understanding concept formation in the social sciences." *Polity* 3: 357–93. <http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.2307/3235246>
- Rudolph, Susanne (2005) 'The Imperialism of Categories: situating knowledge in a globalizing world', *Perspectives on Politics* 3(1): 5–14. https://www.cambridge.org/core/services/aop-cambridge-core/content/view/01F221D8190B79A563D4E132A1DC2E1F/S1537592705050024a.pdf/imperialism_of_categories_situating_knowledge_in_a_globalizing_world.pdf

September 28

Unit 3: Scientific Study of Politics

- Easton, David. 1997. "The Future of the Postbehavioral Phase in Political Science," in Monroe, Kristen Renwick, al., *Contemporary Empirical Political Theory*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hawkesworth, Mary. 1992. "The Science of Politics and the Politics of Science," in Mary Hawkesworth and Maurice Kogan, eds., *Encyclopedia of Government and Politics*, London: Routledge.
- Nagel, Ernest. 1961. "The Value Oriented Bias of Social Inquiry," in Ernest Nagel, *The Structure of Science*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 485–502. Reprinted in Martin and McIntyre, 571–584.
- Rigney, Lester–Irabinna. "Internationalization of an Indigenous Anticolonial Cultural Critique of Research Methodologies: A Guide to Indigenist Research Methodology and Its Principles." *Wicazo Sa Review* 14.2 (1999): 109–121. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1409555>
- Taylor, Charles. 1967. "Neutrality in Political Science," in P. Laslett and W.G. Runciman, eds., *Philosophy, Politics and Society*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1967, 25–57. Reprinted in Martin, Michael and Lee C. McIntyre. 1994. *Readings in the Philosophy of Social Science*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 547–570.

October 5

Unit 4: Rational Choice

- Ostrom, Elinor. 2013. Collective action and the evolution of social norms. In *Journal of Natural Resources Policy Research*. 6(4): 235–252.
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/19390459.2014.935173?journalCode=rjnr20>
- Flanagan 1998. Chapter 1 "Rational Choice" in Flanagan, Thomas. 1998. *Game Theory and Canadian Politics*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Green and Shapiro, 1994. "The Paradox of Voter Turnouts" in Green, Donald P. and Ian Shapiro. *Pathologies of Rational Choice Theory: A Critique of Applications in Political Science*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Ferejohn, John and Debra Satz. 1996. "Unification, Universalism and Rational Choice Theory," in Friedman, Jeffrey (ed.). *The Rational Choice Controversy*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Jones, Bryan. 1999. "Bounded Rationality," *Annual Review of Political Science*, 2: 297–321.
<http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev.polisci.2.1.297>

October 12

No class. (Thursday is a Tuesday in the Memorial Calendar)

October 19

Unit 5: Institutionalism

- Hall, Peter, and Rosemary C.R. Taylor. 1996. "Political Science and the Three New Institutionalisms" in *Political Studies* 44(4): 936–57.
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-9248.1996.tb00343.x/abstract>
- Steinmo, Sven. 1989. "Political Institutions and Tax Policy in the United States, Sweden, and Britain" *World Politics* 41(4): 500–535. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/world-politics/article/political-institutions-and-tax-policy-in-the-united-states-sweden-and-britain/FCE5CE09A87A83F29FAE32BAE99E947E>
- Kathleen Thelen and Sven Steinmo, 'Historical Institutionalism in comparative politics' in Sven Steinmo et al (eds.), *Structuring Politics*, pp. 1–32
- Paul Pierson and Theda Skocpol, 'Historical Institutionalism in Contemporary Political Science', in Ira Katznelson and Helen Milner, *Political Science State of the Discipline*, JC11 POL, pp. 693–721

October 26

Unit 6: Feminism

- Carroll, Susan J. and Linda M.G. Zerilli, 1993. "Feminist Challenges to Political Science," in Ada Finifter, ed. 1993. *Political Science: The State of the Discipline, II*. Washington, DC: The American Political Science Association, pp.55–76.
- Jenny Chapman 'The Feminist Perspective' in David Marsh and Gerry Stoker (eds.), *Theory and Methods in Political Science*, 2nd edition, Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Lovenduski, Joni. 1998. "Gendering Research in Political Science," *Annual Review of Political Science* 1:333–56. <http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev.polisci.1.1.333>
- Tickner, J. Ann. 1997. "You Just Don't Understand: Troubled Engagements Between Feminists and IR Theorists," *International Studies Quarterly*, 41:611–632.
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/store/10.1111/1468-2478.00060/asset/1468-2478.00060.pdf?v=1&t=j6pasj6q&s=0dbc15603c3fa2eb79c79e00f8aa0297868a9651>
- Goeman, Mishuana. *Mark My Words: Native Women Mapping Our Nations*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013. Print. *First Peoples: New Directions in Indigenous Studies. Read Introduction "Gendered Geographies" & Chapter 1 "Remember what you are"* Available online through MUN QEII library.
- Dietz, Mary G. 2003. "Current Controversies in Feminist Theory," *Annual Review of Political Science*, 6:399–431.
<http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev.polisci.6.121901.085635>
- Driscoll, Amanda & Mona Lena Krook. 2012. Feminism and Rational Choice Theory. *European Political Science Review*. 4(2): 195–216.
<https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/european-political-science-review/article/feminism-and-rational-choice-theory/9C242B660E59334834034288BC60F189>

November 2

Unit 7: Post-Modernism

- Fraser, Nancy. 1995. "Politics, Culture and the Public Sphere: Toward a Postmodern Conception," in Linda Nicholson and Steven Seidman, eds., *Social Postmodernism: Beyond Identity Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 287–312.
- Howarth, David. 1995. "Discourse Theory," in Marsh, David and Gerry Stoker (eds.). 1995. *Theory and Methods in Political Science*. London: Macmillan, 115–133.
- Mitchell, Timothy. 1991. The Limits of the State: Beyond Statist Approaches and Their Critics *American Political Science Review*. 85(1);77–96. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1962879>
- Rosenau, Pauline. 1992. *Post-Modernism and the Social Sciences*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Chapter 5.
- MacDonald, Eleanor. 2002. "Incredulity and Poetic Justice: Accounting for Postmodern Accounts" in Bakan, Abigail and Eleanor MacDonald, eds. *Critical Political Studies: Debates and Dialogue from the Left*. Kingston: McGill–Queen's University Press.
- Butler, Judith. 1990. "Subjects of Sex/Gender/Desire" from *Gender Trouble*. London, Routledge.

November 9

Unit 8: Normative Theory

- Gerring, John and Joshua Yesnowitz. 2006. A Normative Turn in Political Science? *Polity* 38(1):101–133.
<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/d987/19349ca752d386fb6e5647b69f4d7d595f3b.pdf>
- Miller, Trudi C. 1990. Normative Political Science. *Policy Studies Review* 9(2):232–246.
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/store/10.1111/j.1541-1338.1989.tb01122.x/asset/j.1541-1338.1989.tb01122.x.pdf?v=1&t=j6paphto&s=0e8d619feb951f5450d7c4d203b6c37deb12abdb>

- Morgensen, Scott Lauria. "Destabilizing the Settler Academy: The Decolonial Effects of Indigenous Methodologies." *American Quarterly* 64.4 (2012): 805–808. <https://muse-jhu-edu.ge2a-proxy.mun.ca/article/494054/pdf>
- Erskine, Toni. 2010. Normative IR Theory. In Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith, eds. *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Habermas, Jurgen. 2006. Political Communication in Media Society: Does Democracy Still Enjoy an Epistemic Dimension? The Impact of Normative Theory on Empirical Research. In *Communication Theory*. 16(4):411–426. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2006.00280.x/full>
- Andrew Sabl. 2015. "The Two Cultures of Democratic Theory: Responsiveness, Democratic Quality, and the Empirical–Normative Divide," *Perspectives on Politics* 13:2, pp. 345–365. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/perspectives-on-politics/article/the-two-cultures-of-democratic-theory-responsiveness-democratic-quality-and-the-empirical-normative-divide/0A9BF5D8453C4488001FD55B1B8B40C0>

November 16

Unit 9: Quantitative Methods in Political Science

- King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Chapter 1 available here: <http://press.princeton.edu/chapters/s5458.pdf>
- King, Gary, Robert Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1995. The Importance of Research Design in Political Science. *American Political Science Review*. 89(2):475–481. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/american-political-science-review/article/the-importance-of-research-design-in-political-science/FD08A6C053323018C36C72E82A4D91A6>
- James Druckman, Donald P. Green, James H. Kuklinski, and Arthur Lupia. 2006. "The Growth and Development of Experimental Research in Political Science." *American Political Science Review* 100: 627–35. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/american-political-science-review/article/the-growth-and-development-of-experimental-research-in-political-science/4381F50C6A43ED85AF8B973326BC546A>
- Schrodt, Philip. 2014. Seven deadly sins of contemporary quantitative political analysis. In *Journal of Peace Research*. 51(2): 287–300. <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0022343313499597>

Initial Draft of Papers due Thursday November 16th at midnight

November 23

Unit 10: Qualitative methods in Political Science

- Munck, Gerardo (2004). "Tools for Qualitative Research," in Henry E. Brady and David Collier, eds. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Bennett, Andrew and Colin Elman (2006). 'Qualitative Research: Recent Developments in Case Study Methods'. *American Review of Political Science* 9: 455–76. <http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev.polisci.8.082103.104918>
- Geddes, Barbara. 1990. How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics. In *Political Analysis*. 2:131–150. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23317768?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents
- Marker, Michael. "Indigenous Voice, Community, and Epistemic Violence: The Ethnographer's 'Interests' and What 'Interests' the Ethnographer." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 16.3 (2003): 361–375. <http://www.tandfonline.com/ge2a-proxy.mun.ca/doi/abs/10.1080/0951839032000086736>
- Weeden, Lisa (2010) 'Reflections on Ethnographic work in Political Science', *ARPS* 13: 255–272. <http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev.polisci.11.052706.123951>
- Krasnow, Sharon. 2017. "Process tracing in political science: What's the story?" in *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science*. 62: 6–13.

<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0039368117300699>

Peer Review due Tuesday November 19th at midnight

November 30

Unit 11: Bringing it altogether...exploring how different scholars look at a single “topic”

Brown, Nadia and Sarah Allen Gershon, eds. 2017. Special Issue of *Politics, Groups, and Identities*. Vol 5, Issue 1. Pages 1–196. **READ THE ENTIRE SPECIAL ISSUE, ALL 196 PAGES.**
<http://www.tandfonline.com/toc/rpgi20/5/1>

Research Papers due Friday December 8th at midnight.

ASSIGNMENT DETAILS:

This course is a graduate level class (therefore advanced) in which the focus is on reading, thinking critically, and communication (both written and oral). You will be assessed primarily on your ability and effort to do those three things.

Participation (15%)

The class will be conducted in a seminar format, and participation is crucial—students are expected to have come to class prepared, having done all of the readings and ready to discuss them. Throughout the course, I want you to do your own thinking. I want you to think about the readings, where there are strengths and weaknesses, and where you think the dialogue is missing something. Everything is contentious, nothing is set in stone. I don't expect anybody to agree with everything, and I'd like to encourage you to discuss your thoughts, in an environment where we are all open-minded and considerate of one another. Your participation in discussions throughout the course will be assessed through a participation grade of 15%. The focus is on quality, not quantity, but you will be expected to have done the prep for each class, and act as an active participant throughout the course. You will be assessed for the **quality** of your oral contributions to the seminar and evidence that you have read and understood the reading material.

Presentations of Week's Topic (20%)

In the spirit of the importance of communication, each student is responsible for presenting and leading the discussion on a given week's topic (e.g. Rational Choice or Postmodernism). Students will choose the topic/date at our first class, and will be responsible for making a short presentation on the topic, and then for leading the discussion during the class. It is NOT the responsibility of the presenter to summarize all of the readings. This is where the presentations and the critical review papers have commonalities. Rather, the point of this assignment is to provide an overview of the **issues** raised in the readings (for about 20–30 minutes), and then to prepare a series of questions that will help to stimulate class discussion, which you will lead (for about an hour). All of the students will have read the readings, and presenters will proceed on that basis—raising interesting things for discussion, in order to promote critical thinking and assessment of the week's academic literature.

The idea here is that you are taking the class the next step forward, like you're the instructor of the course, and you're trying to raise issues for the benefit of all students...what things do you want them to glean from the readings that they may not have noticed on their own? What issues emerged for you that were particularly problematic for you and that you think are important to discuss? All of the things that you might raise in your presentation are things that you feel need

highlighting.

Presenters must provide a list of discussion questions (between 10 and 20) and circulate them to the group at the beginning of class. You do not necessarily need to discuss all 20 questions in class, but you must come prepared. Projection equipment will be made available for presenters. The presentation of the week's topic will provide an excellent opportunity to practice our presentation skills and become familiar with technologies used to present academic work. You will be assessed based on both the content and delivery of the presentation as well as your ability to lead the discussion.

Note: You cannot submit a review paper in the same week as your class presentation. They are separate assignments, and must be done on topics related to distinct weeks.

A basis for scheduling presentations among students will be discussed during the first seminar.

Critical Review Papers (3 x 5% = 15%)

There are ten (10) weeks of readings in the course. You must submit a minimum of 3 critical review papers, for whichever 3 weeks you like. Whatever works for your schedule is fine. I don't need to know in advance when you plan to submit them: just bring it to class and hand it in. If you submit more than 3, the marks from your best 3 will count towards your final grade.

*Papers must be 1000 words in length, **single-spaced** and typed in a 12-point font.*

Review papers are NOT summaries of the readings. You are required to make links between readings, as well as providing a critical assessment of those readings. Every critical review paper must include an argument (thesis) that must be supported with reference to the week's readings. More information about expectations and requirements will be provided in class.

Papers are due via email (to abittner@mun.ca) by 9 am on each Thursday for which we have class. Late submissions will not be accepted and do not count as submissions...since you choose when you submit and when you don't, there really isn't any valid excuse for handing in something late.

SSHRC Grant Application (10%)

This assignment is geared towards helping you identify a research question, and propose a project to investigate that question. Students are expected to write a one-page "outline of proposed research" and must also submit a bibliography/list of citations (also one page), mirroring the process required by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC). This exercise is valuable for ALL of you, but especially valuable for thesis students who should be applying for funding to assist their thesis-writing year. Details of the SSHRC application process can be found here:

- http://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/Students-Etudiants/PG-CS/CGSM-BESCM_eng.asp
- http://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/ResearchPortal-PortailDeRecherche/Instructions-Instructions/CGS_M-BESC_M_eng.asp

As required by SSHRC, for this class you are required to:

"Provide a detailed description of your proposed research project for the period during which you will hold the award. Be as specific as possible. Provide background information to position your proposed research within the context of the current knowledge in the field. State the objectives and hypothesis, and outline the experimental or theoretical approach to be taken (citing literature pertinent to the

proposal), and the methods and procedures to be used. State the significance of the proposed research to a field or fields in the health sciences, natural sciences and/or engineering or social sciences and/or humanities, as appropriate.”

I will provide you all with feedback and a grade, and for all thesis students, I am very happy to follow up with you to assist you in your submission of an “actual” grant application to SSHRC in the weeks that follow.

Research Paper (30%)

Each of you is responsible for writing a longer paper on a topic with particular application to the your major sub-field of interest that draws upon and synthesizes material covered in the class as well as in additional reading. The topic is up to you, but you must discuss it with me before October 31st. An initial draft of your paper will be due on Thursday November 16th, via email, by midnight. I will then send your paper to one other student to be peer-reviewed. All students will receive their peer-review comments by Tuesday November 19th, and will then have the opportunity to revise their papers in light of the comments received. Final drafts of the papers will be due December 8th by midnight via email.

Papers must be journal article-length (between 7000–8000 words), single-spaced and typed in a 12-point font. They must have margins of 1 inch on the left side of the page, and 2 inches on the right side of the page. You are also required to cite a minimum of 15 sources in this paper, following the *Mapping Politics* style guide (we will discuss this in class) as well as including an abstract and bibliography with your paper when you hand it in.

The grade for this assignment will consider the quality of the initial draft, the final product, and the author’s response to the peer review received. **The final paper will therefore need to include a one-page (single-spaced) author’s response to the peer review.** This should include what the author did based on the suggestions received – what changes were made, what changes were not made, and why. How does the final draft differ from the first draft? It should be clear to the instructor how the review process improved (or didn’t improve) the final draft of the paper. This one page response should be written in a separate word document and should appear in the same email as your final paper submission.

Research Paper Peer Review (10%)

This exercise will take place in the days following the submission of the initial draft of your research paper. You will submit your research paper by email on November 16th (by midnight), and the next morning you will be assigned the paper of another student to review. Reviewing of the work of others is a key component of academic life, and therefore we will practice the art of written review. This process will mirror the process of academic peer review of journal articles, and we will discuss how this process works in class.

You are each required to review another student’s initial draft of a research paper, and provide detailed commentary. Your commentary comes from the point of view of an “expert” in political science. When the time to peer-review comes around, we will already have had something like eight classes, which comes out to about 45–50 articles or chapters that you will have already read about approaches to political science and the state of the discipline...so you really are sort of an expert by then.

The peer-review task is based largely on the following key activities:

1. Reading the paper
2. Thinking critically about the paper in the context of the other literature we have read in class

3. Evaluating the paper based on a number of basic criteria for written research, including development of the argument, research conducted, clarity, structure, and style
4. Providing detailed feedback for the author, including observations about parts of the paper that were well done or particularly interesting, as well as suggestions about how the paper might be improved for the final draft

The peer review that you submit should be approximately 2–3 pages in length (single-spaced, so about 1000–1500 words), and should focus primarily on substantive (conceptual) issues in the paper, but as a courtesy, can also incorporate smaller issues such as spelling and grammar. No need to ignore spelling problems that you happen to notice as a reviewer, some are hard to notice on your own as a writer, but this is NOT the main focus of this exercise. Spell-checkers exist in word processing software, and it's your primary job as a reviewer to think about the concepts in the paper, and provide feedback on this (more substantive) level, not fix the paper's grammar and spelling.

You will email your review (in either Microsoft Word or .PDF format: no other format is acceptable) to both the instructor and the author of the paper by midnight on Tuesday, November 19th. This gives each author just over three weeks to revise their paper with the reviewer's comments in mind for final submission on the 8th of December.

NOTES ON GRADING, MISSED TESTS, AND LATE PENALTIES

The final draft of the research essay is due Friday December 8th, by midnight, via email at abittner@mun.ca. The penalty for submitting this assignment late is 10% per day, including each weekend day. So, for example, if you submit your paper on the Monday after it is due, 30% will be automatically deducted. Wait until the following Friday, and 70% will be automatically deducted.

(this is a very bad plan, please don't do this, it breaks my heart.)

Late papers are not acceptable for the short critical review assignments. Because you get to choose when you submit them, deciding not to submit a paper is also your choice.

Finally, on the initial draft of your paper and the peer review exercise, late assignments are also not acceptable. This exercise involves working in a group/team environment, and by either a) not submitting an initial draft of your paper on time; or b) not submitting your peer review on time, you are seriously inconveniencing your colleagues. Students who do not submit their initial drafts on time forfeit the opportunity to either receive a peer review, or do one themselves. This is a kind of quid pro quo exercise, and given that it's done over email, there's no excuse for missing out. You can do it from home, you can do it from your bed if you like. If you become seriously ill or something in advance of this assignment, it is important that you take steps to notify the instructor (me) about your situation so we can work something out.

Finally, cheating, in addition to being unfortunate in any class, is especially unfortunate in a class where the main goal is to read, think, and discuss your ideas. It is simply not acceptable. Cheating on assignments includes (but is not limited to) allowing another student to copy from your own work and presenting someone else's work as your own. Information about procedures and penalties for academic dishonesty is outlined in the University Calendar and is available through the Department of Political Science.

Department of Political Science

Policy on Plagiarism

Plagiarism means offering the words or ideas of another person as one's own. The material copied or paraphrased may consist of a few phrases or sentences, or an entire passage or paper. Whatever its form and extent, plagiarism constitutes two kinds of failure: 1) Failure to perform the basic tasks expected in any paper -- original mental effort and expression; 2) Potentially, the moral failure of academic dishonesty. Plagiarism may be deliberate (as in the submission of a paper written in whole or part by another student, purchased from an essay bank, or cut and pasted from web sites) or the result of carelessness through failure to provide proper documentation.

All directly copied or quoted material must be enclosed in quotation marks and the source must be clearly identified in a footnote. The source of any paraphrased material or ideas must also be properly documented. Failure to do so is plagiarism.

The procedure for handling cases of suspected plagiarism at Memorial University is set out in the University Calendar. All cases of suspected plagiarism must be reported to the Department Head in accordance with Section 4.11 of the University Calendar General Regulations. Depending on the circumstances and the degree of plagiarism involved, the Department of Political Science normally handles first offenders in accordance with the Procedures for Informal Resolution (Section 4.11.5). The penalty in such cases is normally a grade of 0 for the work concerned. The Department maintains a list of students who have been found guilty of plagiarism, and in the case of a second offence or in particularly serious cases of plagiarism, the Procedures for Formal Resolution (Section 4.11.6) will be followed. The penalty in these cases may be probation, suspension or expulsion in addition to the grade of 0 for the work concerned.

If in any doubt about what plagiarism consists of, consult with your instructor or refer to any standard work on writing essays and research papers. The Faculty of Arts Writing Centre (SN2053) can also provide relevant information. The notes on proper documentation below may be of assistance.

Notes on Proper Documentation

A good political science paper contains a logical argument built on solid evidence. While the evidence may be that of first-hand observation and study, evidence for most student papers will come from books, journals, newspapers, and government documents. Documentation in the form of footnotes, endnotes, or in-text references (with page numbers) must be provided for all facts, ideas, or interpretations which are not considered to be common knowledge. An acceptable rule of thumb for determining whether an item is one of common knowledge would be if the information is readily available in a number of different sources. An example may help.

It is common knowledge that Martin Luther King, Jr. was a black civil rights activist who was jailed in Alabama for leading a march against segregation in the early 1960s. No footnote would be required for such a fact.

A footnote would, however, be required for a statement such as: *Martin Luther King, Jr. expressed disappointment that southern religious leaders urged people to comply with desegregation not because it was morally right but because it was the law.*

In the latter case, the reader might want to check that Rev. King actually did express those views. A good guideline to follow is to ask yourself where your understanding of the thoughts, beliefs, or ideas of an individual or a group came from. If you don't know, are you sure that your understanding is accurate? If it isn't, then don't use it. If you do know, then state the source.

A common misperception is that footnotes only have to be given for direct quotations. This is not correct: footnotes must be provided in all cases where an idea, belief, action, or thought is attributed to an individual or group.

A footnote would be required for the following quotation from page 14 of the province's Strategic Economic Plan. "The private sector must be the engine of growth. While it is the role of government to create an economic and social environment that promotes competitiveness, it is the enterprising spirit of the private sector that will stimulate lasting economic growth."

A footnote would also be required for the following statement. *The Strategic Economic Plan argues that the private sector must be the basis of economic growth in the province.*

Similarly, a footnote must be provided whenever you "borrow" a particular idea, interpretation, or argument from a known source.