

POSC 4340

Women and Mass Politics



Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Department of Political Science, Memorial University

Winter 2020

Instructor: Dr. Amanda Bittner

Instructor's email address: abittner@mun.ca

Office Hours: Tuesdays 1pm-3pm, Wednesdays 12pm-2pm (or by appointment)

COURSE DESCRIPTION

For centuries women have been excluded from mainstream politics, and the legacy of this exclusion remains. To this day women are marginalized in our political system, missing from the highest administrative posts, and they continue to participate in lower numbers than men. This course explores women's political behaviour and participation, focusing primarily on the experiences of women in North America. We will look at women's efforts to secure political rights from the mid-19th century onward, as well as assessing women's attitudes towards politics, participation, and public policy.

Over the course of the semester we will address systemic and institutional barriers to participation, as well as looking at the effects of women's participation in politics, both in conventional institutional settings as well as non-conventional forms of activism. Women's behaviour is different from that of men, but it also varies across women. What are these differences? How does non-participation affect the translation of group and individual interests into policies? How big a problem is it if women don't vote, don't run for office, and don't legislate? We will explore these and other normative questions.

MEETING TIME/LOCATION

This class meets Mondays and Wednesdays from 10:30 to 11:45 in SN-4068.

READINGS

There is a textbook for this course, and it is required. It is available at the university bookstore, or you can order it online. It also comes in an e-book format.

C. Strachan and L. Poloni-Staudinger, Shannon Jenkins, and Candice D. Ortvals, "Why Don't Women Rule the World?: Understanding Women's Civic and Political Choices"

This textbook will be referred to in the list of readings each week as "SPJO", and I will list which chapters are required for each unit. YOU MUST read them IN ADVANCE of class.

In addition to the textbook, journal articles are assigned and will be discussed each week. They are listed in the grid below, and available freely online from the Memorial University library. There are a couple of book chapters or working papers assigned as well, and for those, PDFs will be provided online in Brightspace (D2L)

Recommendation: all students will be submitting written work, either in class, or online in Brightspace. **EVERYONE** should be paying attention to grammar, spelling, and formatting when submitting their written work. I recommend www.grammarly.com as a tool. You can use it to check your work in everything from word documents to emails, to online discussion posts (e.g. in D2L). There is a free version and there is a paid version. I leave it for you to decide what's best for you – but we should all be submitting and reading work that is as polished as possible.

Try the tool, it's pretty cool.

Final required reading: **THE SYLLABUS!** I beg of you, read the syllabus. Read the whole entire thing. It'll be worth it in the long run, I promise.

ASSIGNMENTS AND GRADING (Overview)

Assignment	Dates & Deadlines	Value
Field Log	January 17, 11:59 pm – via email	8%
Critical Analysis (x3)	Chosen by students	15% (3x5%)
Participation	Throughout	15%
Presentations (1 x Discussion Leader)	Chosen by students	10%
Presentations (2 x Journal Article)	Chosen by students	2 x 5% = 10%
Research Proposal	March 15, 11:59 pm – via email	10%
Research Proposal Peer Review	March 20, 11:59 pm – via email	8%
Final Project	April 3, 11:59 pm – via email	24%
		100%

BRIEF COURSE OUTLINE AND READING SCHEDULE

WEEK	DATE	TOPIC	Assignments Due
1	JAN 6 JAN 8	INTRODUCTION TO CLASS WHY DON'T WOMEN RULE THE WORLD?	
2	JAN 13 JAN 15	WHERE ARE THE WOMEN? (PART 1)	Field log due Jan 17 th , 11:59 pm via email
3	JAN 20 JAN 22	WHERE ARE THE WOMEN? (PART 2)	
4	JAN 27 JAN 29	WHO ARE THE WOMEN? (PART 1)	
5	FEB 3 FEB 5	WHO ARE THE WOMEN (PART 2)	
6	FEB 10 FEB 12	WOMEN HAVE ATTITUDES?	
7		READING WEEK, NO CLASS	
8	FEB 24	WHY DO/DON'T WOMEN RUN?	

	FEB 26		
9	MARCH 2 MARCH 4	WHAT HAPPENS WHEN WOMEN RUN?	
10	MARCH 9 MARCH 10	ARE WOMEN TOO EMOTIONAL FOR POLITICS?	Research Proposal due March 15, 11:59 pm via email
11	MARCH 16 MARCH 18	WOMEN'S RESISTANCE (PART 1)	Research Proposal peer review due March 20, 11:59 pm via email
12	MARCH 23 MARCH 25	WOMEN'S RESISTANCE (PART 2)	
13	MARCH 30 APRIL 1	WHERE ARE WE HEADING NOW?	Final project due April 3, 11:59 pm via email

CLASS POLICIES

1. Students are expected to attend every class session, do all the reading before class, and come prepared to discuss it.
2. 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 partner/father/employer, etc. (Also, frankly, if you are doing this stuff you are likely to do quite poorly in the course, because you really need to be paying attention).
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.

Accommodations, Resources, and Supports Available to Students

Memorial University is committed to facilitating and promoting an accessible, inclusive, and mutually respectful learning environment. Students requiring special accommodation are asked to communicate firstly with the Glenn Roy Blundon Centre (www.mun.ca/blundon) at the earliest opportunity. University policies and procedures pertaining to accommodations for students with disabilities can be found at www.mun.ca/policy/site/policy.php?id=239

(But really, if you need something, please come talk to me. I will do my best to make the course conducive to whatever your learning needs might be.)

Precarity: If you are having difficulty accessing food to eat every day, or if you lack a safe and stable place to live, and it is negatively affecting your ability to carry out coursework, I encourage you to contact the Student Life Office for resources and support. If you are comfortable sharing this information with me, I will help you access university resources and work with you to devise a strategy for the course work.

Here is a list of additional support services existing on campus designed to support students in a variety of ways.

They include:

- The Commons (QEII library) provides access to print, electronic and technology resources.
- The Counselling Centre (UC-5000) helps students develop their personal capabilities, ranging from study strategies to assisting distressed students.
- The Glenn Roy Blundon Centre (UC-4007) serves students whose disabilities involve conditions affecting mobility, vision, hearing, learning (disabilities), chronic illness, or mental health; support is also provided to students with documented temporary illnesses and injuries.
- Student Life (ASK, UC-3005) answers questions about such things as courses, housing, books, financial matters and health.
- The Writing Centre (SN-2053) is a free, drop-in facility for students and helps them become better writers and critical thinkers.

ASSIGNMENT DETAILS

This course is an upper 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 17%. 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. **You must attend class in order to do well in the course.**

Public Opinion in Everyday Politics Field Log (8%)

For one week, you will keep a “field log” providing your own observations and reflections on public opinion in the everyday political world. Details about this assignment and what is involved will be provided in class.

This assignment is due Friday January 17th at 11:59 pm via email.

Critical Analysis (3 x 5% = 15%)

There are twenty (20) classes in which we have readings assigned in the course. You must submit a minimum of 3 critical review papers, for whichever 3 classes 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 class's readings. More information about expectations and requirements will be provided in 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.

Discussion Leader (10%)

Throughout the course, students will be responsible for giving presentations. The first type of presentation is the job of "discussion leader" for the class. Discussion leaders are responsible for walking the class through the week's topic, including providing a broad overview of the topic, highlighting any issues that students might need to think about, and providing additional insights into the material in order to ensure that the material is comprehended. The discussion leader will also lead a discussion in the class (after the journal article presenters have done their presentations) to ensure that we connect the journal articles to the topic of the class, and to ensure that students have a solid understanding of all materials being read for the class. Discussion leaders should be VERY familiar with all of the readings, and while they are not responsible for presenting the journal articles, should ensure that the class has a good discussion of those articles after the journal article presenters have done their presentations.

The discussion leader will be responsible for guiding the class discussion, and they must submit a list of 8-10 discussion questions to the course instructor by 9 am on the day of class, which they can draw upon to lead the class discussion.

Presentation of a Journal Article (2 x 5% = 10%)

Following from above, throughout the course, students will be responsible for presenting on TWO of the journal articles assigned for a class. Students are required to do the following for the articles that they choose to present:

1. Paraphrase the author's research question and thesis statement. Does the author provide a clear and narrowly defined image of the project in the introduction?
2. Does the author effectively establish why the research topic is important and worthy of further study?
3. Is the literature review critical and well-executed? Provide specific examples from the article to support this point.
4. What theoretical perspective (or perspectives) does the author draw on? What are the central pieces of research that the author cites when describing how they answer their research questions?
5. What methodological technique is being employed in this study? Is the method clear? Do you see any flaws? How might you "fix" those problems if you were to do additional research in this area, building on what these authors have done?

For each journal article presentation, you are required to address these questions in an oral presentation, and you must also submit a written document to the instructor with your responses to each of these five points, in detail.

Presentations of each journal article should be about 5-7 minutes in length, and written supporting documents submitted to the instructor in class) should be about 2 pages (1000 words) in length.

Final Paper/Creative Project (24%)

Students are required to design and execute a research project for this course. Students can choose between a standard research paper (6,000-8,000 words) or a creative project (i.e. a video, podcast, play, etc.) paired with a 3000-4000 word report relating it to course themes. Students are required to cite a minimum of 15 academic sources in their final project.

This final project is due April 3, at 11:59 pm via email.

Research Proposal (10%)

To facilitate success with the final project, students will be required to submit a research proposal in advance of the final project's deadline. This proposal must include an introduction (which must include a research question), a literature review, and a clearly laid out plan for the project's execution. The proposal should be 2,500-4,000 words in length and should be as polished as possible.

This will be due on March 15th, 11:59 pm via email.

Research Proposal Peer Review (8%)

Students will be responsible for providing written feedback on ONE other student's research proposal. More details about this assignment will be forthcoming, but students will be asked to comment on the clarity of research questions, literature review, and project plans, with the purpose of helping the student to generate a high quality final project.

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 research proposal, 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 weeks of classes, which comes out to about 45-50 articles or chapters that you will have already read about gender and politics...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 proposal
2. Thinking critically about the proposal in the context of the other literature we have read in class
3. Evaluating the proposal based on a number of basic criteria for written research, including research question, research conducted, clarity, structure, and style, and plans for execution of the final project
4. Providing detailed feedback for the author, including observations about parts of the proposal 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 1000-1500 words in length, and should focus primarily on substantive (conceptual) issues in the proposal, 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 proposal by 11:59 pm on Friday March 20.

DETAILED SEMESTER PLAN

Week 1: Why Don't Women Rule the World?

January 6: Intro to course, overview of syllabus, discussion of expectations

January 8: Why Don't Women Rule the World?

- SPJO Chapter 1: "Why Don't Women Rule the World?"
- SPJO Chapter 2: "History of Women and Politics"

Week 2: Where Are The Women? (Part 1) → Leader/Institution Focused

January 13

- SPJO Chapter 6: "Women in Legislatures"
- Thaines, Frank C. and Margaret S. Williams. 2010. "Incentives for Personal Votes and Women's Representation in Legislatures" In Comparative Political Science 43: 1575-1600
- Tolley, Erin. 2011. "Do Women 'Do Better' in Municipal Politics? Electoral Representation across Three Levels of Government." In Canadian Journal of Political Science 44: 573-594.

January 15

- SPJO Chapter 7: "Women in the Executive"
- Jalalzai, Farida. 2008. "Women Rule: Shattering the Executive Glass Ceiling." In Politics & Gender 4: 205-231.
- Sykes, Patricia Lee. 2016. "Women's Executive Leadership." In Government and Opposition 51: 160-181.

Week 3: Where Are The Women? (Part 2) → Women, Gender, Law, and the Courts

January 20

- SPJO Chapter 8: "Women in the Judiciary"
- Williams, Margaret S. "Ambition, gender, and the judiciary." Political Research Quarterly 61, no. 1 (2008): 68-78.

January 22

- Caroline Dick, 2011. "A Tale of Two Cultures: Intimate Femicide, Cultural Defences, and the Law of Provocation," Canadian Journal of Women and the Law 23, no. 2: 519-47.
- Green, Joyce. 2001. Canaries in the Mines of Citizenship: Indian Women in Canada. Canadian Journal of Political Science 34(4): 715-738.
- "A Legal Analysis of Genocide: Supplementary Report of the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls." 2019. https://www.mmiwg-ffada.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Supplementary-Report_Genocide.pdf

Week 4: Who Are The Women? (Part 1) → Race, Ethnicity & Socioeconomic Status

January 27

- Philpot, Tasha S. and Hanes Walton Jr. 2007. "One of Our Own: Black Female Candidates and the Voters Who Support Them." In *American Journal of Political Science*. 51: 49-62.
- Stokes-Brown, Atiya Kai and Kathleen Dolan. 2010. "Race, Gender, and Symbolic Representation: African American Female Candidates as Mobilizing Agents." In *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties* 20: 463-494.
- Jardina, Ashley. 2017. White Identity Politics Isn't Just About White Supremacy. It's Much Bigger. Washington Post. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2017/08/16/white-identity-politics-isnt-just-about-white-supremacy-its-much-bigger/>

January 29

- Coulter, Kendra. 2009. "Women, Poverty Policy, and the Production of Neoliberal Politics in Ontario Canada." In *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy* 30: 23-45.
- Celis, Karen, Silvia Erzeel, Liza Mugge and Alyt Damstra. 2014. "Quotas and intersectionality: Ethnicity and gender in candidate selection." In *International Political Science Review* 35: 41-54.
- Lawrence, Bonita. 2003. "Gender, Race, and the Regulation of Native Identity in Canada and the United States: An Overview." In *Hypatia* 18: 3-31.

Week 5: Who Are The Women? (Part 2) → LGBTQ+ & The Gender Binary

February 3

- McAlister, Joan Faber. 2016. "Making Feminist, Queer, Latinx, and #BlackVotesMatter." In *Women's Studies in Communication* 39: 353-356.
- Strolovitch, Dara Z., Janelle S. Wong and Andrew Proctor. 2017. "A possessive investment in white heteropatriarchy? The 2016 election and the politics of race, gender, and sexuality." In *Politics, Groups and Identities* 5: 353-363.

February 5

- Haider-Markel, David, Patrick Gauding, Andrew Flores, Daniel Lewis, Patrick Miller, Jami Taylor and Barry Tadlock. 2019. "Year of the LGBTQ Candidate? The LGBTQ State Legislative Candidates in the Trump Era." Presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Conference. <https://preprints-api.apsanet.org/apsa/assets/orp/resource/5d8d2e56f895ab0012b96242/original/year-of-the-lgbtq-candidate-lgbtq-state-legislative-candidates-in-the-trump-era.pdf>
- Doan, Alesha E. and Donald P. Haider-Markel. 2010. "The Role of Intersectional Stereotypes on Evaluations of Gay and Lesbian Political Candidates." In *Politics & Gender* 6: 63-91.

Week 6: Women Have Attitudes?

FEBRUARY 10

- SPJO Chapter 3: "Public Opinion"
- Huddy, Leonie, Erin Cassese and Mary-Kate Lizotte. 2008. "Gender, Public Opinion, and Political Reasoning." In *Political Women and American Democracy*, ed. Christina Wolbrecht, Karen Beckwith and Lisa Baldez. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nir, Lilach and Scott D. McClurg. 2015. "How Institutions Affect Gender Gaps in Public Opinion Expression." In *Public Opinion Quarterly* 79: 544-567.

FEBRUARY 12

- O'Neill, Brenda. 2001. "A Simple Difference in Opinion? Religious Beliefs and Gender Gaps in Public Opinion in Canada." In *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 34: 275-298.
- Eagly, Alice H., Christa Nater, David I. Miller, Michele Kaufmann and Sabine Sczesny. 2019. "Gender stereotypes have changed: A cross-temporal meta-analysis of U.S. public opinion polls from 1946 to 2018." In *American Psychologist* (advance online publication).

Week 7: READING WEEK - NO CLASS

Week 8: Why Do/Don't Women Run?

FEB 24

- SPECIAL CLASS: WORKSHOP ON RACE, ETHNICITY, INDIGENITY & GENDER – STUDENTS MUST ATTEND THE WORKSHOP DURING CLASS TIME
- SJPO Chapter 4: "Political Ambition"

FEB 26:

- Holman, Mirya R. and Monica C. Schneider. 2018. "Gender, race, and political ambition: how intersectionality and frames influence interest in political office." In *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 6: 264-280.
- Sanbonmatsu, Kira and Susan J. Carroll. 2017. "Women's decision to run for office: A relationally embedded model." In *The Political Psychology of Women in U.S. Politics*, ed. Angie L. Bos and Monica C. Schneider. Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.

Week 9: What Happens When Women Run?

March 2

- SPJO Chapter 5: "When Women Run"
- Ryan, Michelle K., S. Alexander Haslam and Clara Kulich. 2010. "Politics and the Glass Cliff: Evidence that Women are Preferentially Selected to Contest Hard-to-Win Seats." In *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 34: 56-64.
- Major, Lesa Hatley and Renita Coleman. 2010. "The Intersection of Race and gender in Election Coverage: What Happens When the Candidates Don't Fit the Stereotypes?" In *Howard Journal of Communications* 19: 315-333.

March 4

- Schwindt-Bayer, Leslie A. 2011. "Women Who Win: Social Backgrounds, Paths to Power, and Political Ambition in Latin American Legislatures." In *Politics & Gender* 7: 1-33.
- Thomsen, Danielle M. 2019. "Which women win? Partisan changes in victory patterns in US House Elections." In *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 7: 412-428.

Week 10: Are Women Too Emotional for Politics? → Rage, Anger & Other Emotions

March 9

- DeGagne, Alexa. 2018. "On Anger and Its Uses For Activism." In *Contemporary Inequalities and Social Justice in Canada*, ed. Janine Brodie. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Chemaly, Soraya. 2018. "Mother Rage" In *Rage Becomes Her: The Power of Women's Anger*. New York: Atria Paperback.

March 11

- Rodriguez, Dalia. 2011. "Silent Rage and The Politics of Resistance: Countering Seductions of Whiteness and the Road to Politicization and Empowerment." In *Qualitative Inquiry* 17: 589-598.
- Brookes, Deborah Jordan. 2011. "Testing the Double Standard for Candidate Emotionality: Voter Reactions to the Tears and Anger of Male and Female Politicians." In *The Journal of Politics* 73: 597-615.

Week 11: How Are Women Resisting? → Social Movements & Activism (Part 1)

March 16

- SPJO Chapter 9: "Women in Social Movements"
- Kutz-Flamenbaum, Rachel V. 2007. "Code Pink, Raging Grannies, and the Missile Dick Chicks: Feminist Performances in Activism in the Contemporary Anti-War Movement." In *NWSA Journal* 19: 89-105.
- Starblanket, Gina. 2017. "Being Indigenous Feminists: Resurgences Against Colonial Patriarchy." In *Making Space for Indigenous Feminism* (2nd), ed. Joyce Green. Halifax and Winnipeg: Fernwood Press.

March 18

- Alexander-Floyd, Nikol G. 2015. "Women of Color, Space Invaders, and Political Science: Practical Strategies for Transforming Institutional Practices." In *Political Science & Politics* 48: 464-468.
- Swank, Eric and Breanna Fahs. 2012. "An Intersectional Analysis of gender and Race for Sexual Minorities Who Engage in Gay and Lesbian Rights Activism." In *Sex Roles* 68: 660-674.
- Gokariksel, Banu and Sara H. Smith. 2017. "Intersectional feminism beyond US flag, hijab and pussy hats in Trump's America." In *Gender, Place and Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography* 24: 628-644.

Week 12: How Are Women Resisting? → Social Movements & Activism (Part 2)

March 23

- Jackson, Sarah J. 2016. "(Re)Imagining Intersectional Democracy from Black Feminism to Hashtag Activism." In *Women's Studies in Communication* 39: 375-379.
- Williams, Sherri. 2016. "#SayHerName: using digital activism to document violence against black women." In *Feminist Media Studies* 16: 922-925.
- Baer, Hester. 2015. "Redoing feminism: Digital activism, body politics, and neoliberalism." In *Feminist Media Studies* 16: 17-34.
- Mendes, Kaitlynn, Jessica Ringrose and Jessalynn Keller. 2018. "#MeToo and the promise and pitfalls of challenging rape culture through digital feminist activism." In *European Journal of Women's Studies* 25: 236-246.

March 25: NO CLASS

Week 13: Where Are We Heading Now?

March 30: NO CLASS

April 1

- SPJO Chapter 10: "Conclusion"

NOTES ON GRADING, MISSED ASSESSMENTS, AND LATE PENALTIES

The penalty for submitting assignments late is 10% per day, including each weekend day. So, for example, if you submit your final poster on the Monday after it is due, 10% will be automatically deducted. Wait until Wednesday, and 30% will be automatically deducted.

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

Finally, on the draft of your research proposal and the peer review exercise, late assignments are not acceptable. This exercise involves working in a group/team environment, and by either a) not submitting an initial draft of your proposal on time; or b) not submitting your peer review on time, you are seriously inconveniencing your colleagues. Students who do not submit their proposals 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.

ONCE YOU READ THIS ENTIRE DOCUMENT, SEND ME AN EMAIL AT abittner@mun.ca

IN THE SUBJECT LINE, I WANT YOU TO WRITE "I read the POSC4340 syllabus!"

In the body of the email I want you to write "It's time to burn down the patriarchy" and I want you to send me an interesting gif related to gender and politics. If you do this correctly by January 13th, 2020, I'll add 1% of extra credit to your final grade.