

PSCI 2101A
Comparative Politics of Industrialized States
Mondays, 6:05 pm - 7:55 pm
Please confirm location on Carleton Central

Instructor: Dr. Clara Morgan
Office: B646 Loeb Building
Office Hours: Mondays, 5:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. or by appointment
Phone: (613) 520-2600 ext. 1598
Email: cmorgan@connect.carleton.ca

Course description:

Comparative politics is one of the four core sub-disciplines of political science, alongside with domestic politics, international relations and political theory. Research in comparative politics seeks to assess the similarities and differences between government institutions, political processes and public policies at various places or points in time. Its goals are both to learn more about specific countries and to gain a better understanding of general logics and challenges of government that are relevant to the study of politics everywhere in the world.

This course is designed to provide a systematic introduction to comparative politics, focusing on established industrialized democracies of the so-called ‘OECD world’ (see Appendix 1 – OECD member countries). It introduces basic concepts for the comparison of government institutions, political processes and public policies, and discusses how these concepts can be applied to specific cases. At the end of the course, students will be familiar with core political and social institutions of selected countries and will possess an analytical ‘toolkit’ of concepts and approaches to be used in comparative research.

Texts:

There is one required textbook for this course from which many readings are taken and which will also be very helpful in preparing for the final exam:

- R. Hague and M. Harrop (2007), *Political Science: A Comparative Introduction*, 5th edition (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan).

I strongly recommend that students purchase this book, which is available at the university bookstore. Please make sure to buy the most recent edition from 2007! The book has a useful companion website at <http://www.palgrave.com/politics/hague/>, which includes a glossary, links to additional material, and multiple choice questions on each chapter.

Required readings not taken from the textbook (marked by ** in the course outline) have been put on reserve in the library or are available on-line (library website).

Evaluation:

Tutorial Groups:	20%	
(Attendance)	10%	
(Group presentation)	10%	
Take-home test	10%	(due 6 October 2008)
Research paper, outline	10%	(due 27 October 2008)
Research paper, final	30%	(due 24 November 2008)
Final exam	30%	(exam period, 4-20 December 2008)

As per early feedback guidelines, the take-home test will be returned to you by October 31st.

Tutorial groups: All students must attend tutorial groups on a regular basis. Students will be marked on their participation and their group presentation. Attendance alone does not ensure a passing mark. Grades will be assigned according to the quality and quantity of contributions to the discussions and to the group presentation. TAs will give further instructions on these points in the first tutorial class.

Take-home test: There will be a take-home test (short-answer format, 3-4 pages) which will be posted on this course's Web CT site on **September 23** and is due to be handed back in class on **October 6**. The test will be based on the material covered in the classes of September 15 and 22 (including the required reading); it will contain questions on the classification of states as well as on the objectives and design of comparative studies. All answers must be written by individual students acting alone (no group work); textbooks and other course material may be used. The test will be returned to you on October 20.

Research paper and outline: The main assignment to be completed in this class is a comparative research paper focusing on at least two countries. Papers should attempt to answer a clearly stated question relating to one of the basic research objectives of comparative politics:

- (1) *contextual description* (Example: What role does the constitutional court play in the German and Italian political system?);
- (2) *comparative evaluation* (Example: What are the strengths and weaknesses of proportional representation compared to majority voting systems?);
- (3) *classification* (Example: Which types of anti-terror laws have been passed in selected states after 9/11?);
- (4) *explanation* (Example: Why was the EU Constitution ratified in Spain but rejected in France?).

Further examples for suitable research questions will be given in the tutorials.

The research question will not be assigned by the instructor, but has to be picked by the students themselves. It should first be formulated – and its relevancy justified – in a brief *paper outline* (3 pages, double spaced), to be submitted in class on **October 27**. This outline should also propose and justify a selection of countries to be studied, and sketch the steps in which research is to proceed. Outlines will be marked for the originality and analytical quality of the research design. In reaction to the feedback obtained from the instructor and the TAs, all aspects of the outline may be amended when devising the *final paper*. Final papers should be about 12-15 pages (double spaced, i.e., 3500-4500 words); they are due in class on **November 24**. It is essential that the papers are focused on answering the research question, and that they engage at least some of the concepts discussed in this course. Marks may be deducted for sloppy style and/or faulty

referencing; advice on these issues will be given in the tutorials. (See **Appendix 2, Elements of a good research paper** and **Appendix 3, Research Paper Grading Rubric.**)

Final exam: There will be a three-hour final exam during the December exam period (4-20 December 2008). The exam will be in a short-answer format; it covers all course material, including reading, lectures and discussions in class and tutorials. It is designed to test both students' knowledge of key concepts and their ability to apply them to concrete examples. The instructor will hold extended office hours in the review period to help students prepare for the exam (more details to be provided in class).

Grading:

Assignments and exams will be graded with a percentage grade. To convert this to a letter grade or to the university 12-point system, please refer to the following table.

Percentage	Letter grade	12-point scale	Percentage	Letter grade	12-point scale
90-100	A+	12	67-69	C+	6
85-89	A	11	63-66	C	5
80-84	A-	10	60-62	C-	4
77-79	B+	9	57-59	D+	3
73-76	B	8	53-56	D	2
70-72	B-	7	50-52	D-	1

All assignments must be handed in as *hardcopies* directly to the instructor. For late assignments, the Department of Political Science's drop-off box may be used (located outside B640 Loeb Building, the box is emptied every weekday at 4 p.m. and papers are date-stamped with that day's date). **Assignments sent per email will not be accepted.** Assignments will be returned in class or in the tutorials; they can also be picked up during the instructor's office hours. If handed in with a self-addressed stamped envelope, they will be returned by mail.

Unless a medical (or equivalent) excuse is provided, late assignments will be penalized by two (2) percentage points per day (including weekends); assignments more than a week late will receive a mark of 0%. Students who fail to complete all required assignments and examinations will be given a failing grade.

Preliminary Course Outline:

Introduction: Industrialized States – and Why to Compare Them

8 Sept. 2008 Introduction, Logistics, Administrative Details, Tutorials

15 Sept. 2008 Defining Industrialized States: Economic and Political Development

- Hague & Harrop, Ch. 1 – Politics and Government
- Hague & Harrop, Ch. 2 – The State in a Global Context
- Hague & Harrop, Ch. 3 – Democracy

Fareed Zakaria (1997), *The Rise of Illiberal Democracy*, *Foreign Affairs*, November/December.

<http://www.foreignaffairs.org/19971101faessay3809/fareed-zakaria/the-rise-of-illiberal-democracy.html>

- 22 Sept. 2008 Comparing Industrialized States: Research Objectives and Design
- Hague & Harrop, Ch. 5 – The Comparative Approach
- ** Richard Rose (1991), ‘Comparing Forms of Comparative Analysis,’ *Political Studies* Vol. 39, No. 3, pp. 446-462.
- Explore field of comparative politics by looking at journal publications such as:
 Comparative Political Studies <http://cps.sagepub.com/archive/2008.dtl>
 The Journal of Comparative Politics <http://web.gc.cuny.edu/jcp/issues.htm>
 Comparative European Politics <http://www.palgrave-journals.com/cep/index.html>

Part I: State-Society-Relations – Comparing Political Processes

- 29 Sept. 2008 Political Ideologies
- **K. Newton and J. W. van Deth (2005), *Foundations of Comparative Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP), Ch. 13 – Political Ideologies [on reserve]

Political Culture: Citizen Attitudes and Behavior

- Hague & Harrop, Ch. 6 – Political Culture
- Hague & Harrop, Ch. 9 – Political Participation

Explore Robert Putnam’s website: www.bowlingalone.com

- 6 Oct. 2008 Interest Intermediation: Parties, Interest Groups and the Media
- Hague & Harrop, Ch. 7 – Political Communication
 - Hague & Harrop, Ch. 11 – Interest Groups
 - Hague & Harrop, Ch. 12 – Political Parties
- Explore Barack Obama (www.barackobama.com) and John McCain (www.johnmccain.com) websites.

[*Take-home test is due.*]

- 13 Oct. 2008 NO CLASS - THANKSGIVING

Part II: State Structures – Comparing Political Institutions

- 20 Oct. 2008 Participation Regimes: Representative and Direct Democracy
- Hague & Harrop, Ch. 10 – Elections and Voters
- The Onion: Pretend You Care About The Election - http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DXY_8cJIGMc
 The Onion: Diebold Accidentally Leaks Results Of 08 Election - <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LBrDzZCOQtI>
- Direct Democracy
- ** L. LeDuc (2003), *The Politics of Direct Democracy: Referendums in Global Perspective* (Peterborough: Broadview Press), Ch. 1+2 [on reserve]
- Explore Swiss website on direct democracy: <http://direct-democracy.geschichte-schweiz.ch/>

- 27 Oct. 2008 Legislative-Executive Relations: Presidentialism and Parliamentarism

- Hague & Harrop, Ch. 15 – Legislatures
- Hague & Harrop, Ch. 16 – The Political Executive

Explore Inter-Parliamentary Union website:

<http://www.ipu.org/english/home.htm>

[Paper outlines are due.]

- 3 Nov 2008 Levels of Government: Unitary States and Federations
- Hague & Harrop, Ch. 14 – Multilevel Governance
 - ** R. L. Watts (1999), *Comparing Federal Systems*, 2nd edition (Montreal: McGill-Queen's UP), Ch. 3+4, 9 [on reserve]
- 10 Nov. 2008 Implementation and Adjudication: Public Administration and Courts
- Hague & Harrop, Ch. 13 – Constitutions and the Legal Framework
 - Hague & Harrop, Ch. 17 – Public Management and Administration

Part III: State Activity – Comparing Public Policy and Political Economy

- 17 Nov. 2008 Public Policy: Policy Cycles and Policy Styles
- Hague & Harrop, Ch. 18 – Public Policy
 - ** F. van Waarden (1995), 'Persistence of National Policy Styles: A Study of their Institutional Foundations', in B. Unger and F. van Waarden, eds., *Convergence or Diversity? Internationalization and Economic Policy Response* (Aldershot: Avebury) [on reserve]

Immigration Policy: Citizenship Regimes and Social Integration

- ** P. Weil (2001), 'Access to Citizenship: A Comparison of Twenty-Five Nationality Laws' in T. A. Aleinikoff & D. Klusmeyer, eds., *Citizenship Today: Global Perspectives and Practices* (Washington: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace) [on reserve]

- 24 Nov. 2008 Economic and Social Policy: Varieties of Capitalism and Welfare Regimes
- Hague and Harrop, Ch. 8 – Political Economy
 - ** K. Newton and J. W. van Deth (2005), *Foundations of Comparative Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP), Ch. 16 - Welfare [on reserve]
- Explore UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre – Innocenti Report Cards – Child well-being in rich nations http://www.unicef-irc.org/research/article.php?id_article=28

[Research Papers are due.]

1 Dec. 2008 *Conclusion: The Future of Industrialized States*

- ** G. Sørensen (2004), *The Transformation of the State: Beyond the Myth of Retreat* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan), Ch. 1+9 [on reserve]

Selection of Literature for Further Study:

Textbooks – ON RESERVE

- G. Almond, R. J. Dalton, G. B. Powell & K. Strøm, eds. (2006), *Comparative Politics Today: A World View*, 8th edition (New York: Pearson Longman). [combines systematic treatment of core concepts with country studies]
- M. Ethridge & H. Handelman (2007), *Politics in a Changing World: A Comparative Introduction to Political Science*, 4th edition (Belmont, CA: Thompson Wadsworth). [insightful introduction to key concepts, combined with country studies]
- C. Hauss (2006), *Comparative Politics: Domestic Responses to Global Challenges*, 5th edition (Belmont, CA: Thompson Wadsworth). [country studies]
- M. Kesselman, J. Krieger & W. A. Joseph, eds. (2007), *Introduction to Comparative Politics*, 4th edition (Boston: Houghton Mifflin). [country studies]
- T. Landman (2003), *Issues and Methods in Comparative Politics: An Introduction*, 2nd edition (London: Routledge). [extensive discussion of research design and methods]
- J. McCormick (2007), *Comparative Politics in Transition*, 5th edition (Belmont, CA: Thompson Wadsworth). [country studies]
- K. Newton & J. W. van Deth (2005), *Foundations of Comparative Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP). [concise definition of core concepts]
- P. O’Neil & R. Rogowski (2006), *Essential Readings in Comparative Politics*, 2nd edition (New York: W.W. Norton & Co). [introduction to classic works and ideas in the field of comparative politics]
- M. G. Roskin (2007), *Countries and Concepts: Politics, Geography, Culture*, 9th edition (New York: Pearson Longman). [country studies]
- M. J. Sodaro (2007), *Comparative Politics: A Global Introduction*, 3rd edition (New York: McGraw-Hill). [combines discussion of core concepts, research design, and country studies]

Industrialized States: Development and Characteristics

- G. Gill (2003), *The Nature and Development of the Modern State* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan). [good overview of the history of the modern state]
- S. P. Huntington (1991), *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press). [influential study of democratization processes]
- G. Poggi (1990), *The State: Its Nature, Development and Prospects* (Cambridge: Polity Press). [good overview of the history of the modern state]
- C. Tilly (2007), *Democracy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press). [seeks to explain democratization and de-democratization]
- H. Wiarda (2004), *Political Development in Emerging Nations: Is There Still a Third World?* (Belmont, CA: Thompson Wadsworth). [good introduction to the concept of political development]

Comparing Political Institutions

- M. Burgess (2006), *Comparative Federalism: Theory and Practice* (London: Routledge). [advanced discussion of different models of federalism]

- S. E. Finer, V. Bogdanor & B. Rudden (1995), *Comparing Constitutions* (Oxford: Clarendon Press). [comparative study of constitutions, focusing on the US, the UK, Germany, France and Russia]
- M. Gallagher & P. Mitchell, eds. (2005), *The Politics of Electoral Systems* (Oxford: Oxford UP). [country studies on electoral systems, sorted by type]
- H. M. Kritzer, ed. (2002), *Legal Systems of the World: A Political, Social, and Cultural Encyclopedia* (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO). [comprehensive overview of legal systems around the world]
- M. Laver & N. Schofield (1990), *Multiparty Government: The Politics of Coalition in Europe* (Oxford: Oxford UP). [comparative study of European coalition governments]
- L. LeDuc, R. G. Niemi & P. Norris, eds. (2002), *Comparing Democracies 2: New Challenges in the Study of Elections and Voting* (London: Sage). [excellent source on electoral systems, elections, and parties]
- A. Lijphart, ed. (1992), *Parliamentary versus Presidential Government* (Oxford: Oxford UP). [collection of classic and more recent sources on parliamentarism and (semi-)presidentialism]
- A. Lijphart (1999), *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries* (New Haven: Yale University Press). [comprehensive discussion of the distinction between the majoritarian and consensus models of democracy]
- D. M. Olson (1994), *Democratic Legislative Institutions: A Comparative View* (Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe). [comparative study on legislatures]
- B. G. Peters (2000), *The Politics of Bureaucracy*, 5th edition (London: Routledge). [introduction to public administration with some comparative elements]
- M. Qvortrup (2005), *A Comparative Study of Referendums: Government by the People*, 2nd edition (Manchester: Manchester UP). [theoretically informed study of direct democracy]
- A. Shah, ed. (2006), *Local Governance in Industrial Countries* (Washington: World Bank). [country studies on systems of municipal government]
- G. Tsebelis (1995), 'Decision making in Political Systems: Veto Players in Presidentialism, Parliamentarism, Multicameralism and Multipartism', *British Journal of Political Science*, 25:4, 289-325. [first and relatively non-technical statement of veto player theory]

Comparing Political Processes

- G. Almond & S. Verba (1965), *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations* (Boston: Little, Brown) [classic discussion of variations in political culture]
- H. Eckstein (1992), *Regarding Politics: Essays on Political Theory, Stability, and Change* (Berkeley: University of California Press). [includes a concise statements of congruence theory]
- R. Inglehart & C. Welzel (2005), *Modernization, Cultural Change, and Democracy: The Human Development Sequence* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP). [the latest statement of the theory of value change leading to postmaterialism]
- R. S. Katz & W. J. Crotty, eds. (2006), *Handbook of Party Politics* (London: Sage). [comprehensive collection on political parties and party systems]
- P. Norris (2000), *A Virtuous Circle: Political Communication in Postindustrial Societies* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP). [balanced assessment of the mass media's role in modern democracies]
- P. Norris (2002), *Political Phoenix: Reinventing Political Activism* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP). [details changes in patterns of political participation]

- R. Putnam (2000), *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community* (New York: Simon & Schuster). [introduces the concept of social capital]
- C. S. Thomas, ed. (2004), *Research Guide to U.S. and International Interest Groups* (Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers). [comprehensive study of interest groups]
- P. Webb, D. M. Farrell & I. Holliday, eds. (2002), *Political Parties in Advanced Industrial Democracies* (Oxford: Oxford UP). [country studies on political parties]

Comparing Public Policy

- G. Esping-Andersen (1990), *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism* (Princeton: Princeton UP). [classic source for the distinction between three welfare state regimes]
- P. A. Hall & D. Soskice, ed. (2001), *Varieties of Capitalism: The Institutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage* (Oxford: Oxford UP). [introduces the distinction between two forms of capitalism]
- M. Hill (2006), *Social Policy in the Modern World* (Oxford: Blackwell). [comparative introduction to social policy]
- M. Howlett & M. Ramesh (2003), *Studying Public Policy: Policy Cycles and Policy Subsystems*, 2nd edition (Oxford: Oxford UP). [excellent textbook on public policy analysis]
- R. Koopmans & P. Statham, ed. (2000), *Challenging Immigration and Ethnic Relations Policy* (Oxford: Oxford UP). [comparative perspectives on immigration and social integration policy]

Future of Industrialized States

- A. Hurrelmann, S. Leibfried, K. Martens & P. Mayer, eds. (2007), *Transforming the Golden-Age Nation State* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan) [assesses the interplay of industrialized states and internationalized governance in various policy fields]
- S. D. Krasner (1999), *Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy* (Princeton: Princeton UP). [argues that globalization does not undermine the sovereign state]
- S. Leibfried & M. Zürn, eds. (2005), *Transformations of the State?* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP). [study of privatization and internationalization processes affecting western states]
- S. Strange (1996), *The Retreat of the State: The Diffusion of Power in the World Economy* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP). [discusses the declining importance of states in an age of globalization]
- D. Swank (2002), *Global Capital, Political Institutions, and Policy Change in Developed Welfare States* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP). [focuses on the impact of globalization on the welfare state]



Academic Accommodations

For students with Disabilities: Students with disabilities requiring academic accommodations in this course must register with the Paul Menton Centre for Students with Disabilities (500 University Centre) for a formal evaluation of disability-related needs. Registered PMC students are required to contact the centre (613-520-6608) every term to ensure that the instructor receives your letter of accommodation. After registering with the PMC, make an appointment to meet with the instructor in order to discuss your needs **at least two weeks before the first assignment is due or the first in-class test/midterm requiring accommodations**. If you require accommodation for your formally scheduled exam(s) in this course, please submit your request for accommodation to PMC by **November 7, 2008 for December examinations, and March 6, 2009 for April examinations**.

For Religious Observance: Students requesting accommodation for religious observances should apply in writing to their instructor for alternate dates and/or means of satisfying academic requirements. Such requests should be made during the first two weeks of class, or as soon as possible after the need for accommodation is known to exist, but no later than two weeks before the compulsory academic event. Accommodation is to be worked out directly and on an individual basis between the student and the instructor(s) involved. Instructors will make accommodations in a way that avoids academic disadvantage to the student. Instructors and students may contact an Equity Services Advisor for assistance (www.carleton.ca/equity).

For Pregnancy: Pregnant students requiring academic accommodations are encouraged to contact an Equity Advisor in Equity Services to complete a *letter of accommodation*. Then, make an appointment to discuss your needs with the instructor at least two weeks prior to the first academic event in which it is anticipated the accommodation will be required.

Plagiarism: The Undergraduate Calendar defines plagiarism as: "to use and pass off as one's own idea or product, work of another without expressly giving credit to another." The Graduate Calendar states that plagiarism has occurred when a student either: (a) directly copies another's work without acknowledgment; or (b) closely paraphrases the equivalent of a short paragraph or more without acknowledgment; or (c) borrows, without acknowledgment, any ideas in a clear and recognizable form in such a way as to present them as the student's own thought, where such ideas, if they were the student's own would contribute to the merit of his or her own work. Instructors who suspect plagiarism are required to submit the paper and supporting documentation to the Departmental Chair who will refer the case to the Dean. It is not permitted to hand in the same assignment to two or more courses. The Department's Style Guide is available at: <http://www.carleton.ca/polisci/undergrad/Essay%20Style%20Guide.html>

Oral Examination: At the discretion of the instructor, students may be required to pass a brief oral examination on research papers and essays.

Submission and Return of Term Work: Papers must be handed directly to the instructor and will not be date-stamped in the departmental office. Late assignments may be submitted to the drop box in the corridor outside B640 Loeb. Assignments will be retrieved every business day at **4 p.m.**, stamped with that day's date, and then distributed to the instructor. For essays not returned in class please attach a **stamped, self-addressed envelope** if you wish to have your assignment returned by mail. Please note that assignments sent via fax or email will not be accepted. Final exams are intended solely for the purpose of evaluation and will not be returned.

Approval of final grades: Standing in a course is determined by the course instructor subject to the approval of the Faculty Dean. This means that grades submitted by an instructor may be subject to revision. No grades are final until they have been approved by the Dean.

Course Requirements: Students must fulfill all course requirements in order to achieve a passing grade. Failure to hand in any assignment will result in a grade of F. Failure to write the final exam will result in a grade of ABS. FND (Failure No Deferred) is assigned when a student's performance is so poor during the term that they cannot pass the course even with 100% on the final examination. In such cases, instructors may use this notation on the Final Grade Report to indicate that a student has already failed the course due to inadequate term work and should not be permitted access to a deferral of the examination. Deferred final exams are available ONLY if the student is in good standing in the course.

Connect Email Accounts: The Department of Political Science strongly encourages students to sign up for a campus email account. Important course and University information will be distributed via the Connect email system. See <http://connect.carleton.ca> for instructions on how to set up your account.

Appendix 1

OECD Member Countries

Australia
Austria
Belgium
Canada
Czech Republic
Denmark
Finland
France
Germany
Greece
Hungary
Iceland
Ireland
Italy
Japan
Korea
Luxembourg
Mexico
Netherlands
New Zealand
Norway
Poland
Portugal
Slovak Republic
Spain
Sweden
Switzerland
Turkey
United Kingdom
United States

G8 Members

Canada
France
Germany
Italy
Japan
Russia
United Kingdom
United States
European Union

Appendix 2

Elements of a good research paper

Topic

- topic can be supported by research found in appropriate sources.
- topic has the potential to be focussed into a statement with a point of view, it is neither too broadly nor too narrowly defined

Research strategy

- appropriate sources have been consulted
- within boundaries set by the topic, there is evidence of adequate coverage
- the paper reflects a systematic search of the literature of the field

Thesis

- main idea or point of view about the topic is clearly expressed

Evaluation of sources

- when determining which sources to consult keep in mind:
 - scope or content (comprehensive and objective rather than superficial and/or biased)
 - intended audience (written for an informed audience rather than for the general public)
 - authority (written by someone with expertise and presented objectively)
 - timeliness (historical perspective will require different material than will recent theories)

Point of view

- evaluation and analysis of information is balanced, accurate and fair
- writer's point of view is clear and objective
- differing points of view are acknowledged

Documentation

- material taken from others is acknowledged, credit is given for both direct and indirect quotations
- quotations are accurate, they are neither taken out of context nor distorted
- citations are consistent with format chosen

Writing skills

- general organization of the paper is clear
- paragraphs follow each other, within each paragraph sentences follow each other
- sentences are checked for usage, punctuation and style

Useful Resources:

L. Baglione (2007) *Writing a research paper in political science: a practical guide to inquiry, structure and methods* (Belmont, CA: Thomson Higher Education).
JA86 .B34 2007

D. Schmidt (2005) *Writing in political science: a practical guide* (New York: Pearson Longman),
3rd edition.
REF JA86 .S36 2005

G. Scott (2006) *The political science student writer's manual* (Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson/Prentice Hall), 5th edition.
REF JA86 .S39 2006

Appendix 3

Research Paper Grading Rubric¹

CRITERIA	POOR	GOOD	EXCELLENT
Introduction – 5% Title, Thesis, Orientation to reader	1-No reference to topic, to audience 2-No statement or thesis 3-Title is inappropriate – does not describe topic	1-The writer makes reader aware of overall problem. 2-Thesis is stated but not clearly 3-Title does not adequately describe topic	1-The writer introduces the topic and its relevance to the discipline and the audience. The central point of the comparison is stated. 2-Thesis is clearly stated. 3-Title is appropriate.
Body – 20% Structure, flow, organization, development	1-Little or no direction 2-Text is repetitious. 3-Information disorganized – has little to do with main topic. 4-Lacks a thesis or controlling idea. 5-Sentences do not relate to paragraph’s main idea. 6-Paragraphs do not clearly relate to the paper’s thesis.	1-Basic flow from one section to the next. 2-Ideas are clear – lacking in extra information. 3-Information relates to main topic but information is sparse. 4-Includes a basic thesis or controlling idea. 5-Sentences mostly relate to the paragraph’s main idea. 6-Paragraphs generally though not always relate to the thesis.	1-Paper flows from general ideas to specific conclusions and/or vice versa. Sections flow in logical order. Transitions tie together sections and paragraphs. 2-Ideas are clear, original, and focused. Main idea stands along with details. 3-Sufficient information included – relates clearly to main thesis – includes supporting details and/ or examples. 4-Provides a clear and compelling thesis. 5-Sentences clearly relate to the paragraph’s main idea. 6-Paragraphs clearly and effectively relate to and support thesis.

¹ Adapted from: “Sample Rubric for Grading a Term Paper,” <http://deoracle.org/learning-objects/sample-rubric-for-grading-a-term-paper.html>. 1-

	7-Examples are either lacking or do not related to main idea.	7-Examples are usually included, reader needs specific details/quotes.	7-Quotes and examples are provided that add depth to the writer's ideas.
<p>Content – 35%</p> <p>Weaving together literature through synthesis by applying thematic categories that provide exploration and/or explanation</p>	<p>1-Major sections of relevant content is missing or content is irrelevant.</p> <p>2-Material is over-quoted and irrelevant.</p> <p>3. Ideas have little significance to the discipline and/or the audience.</p> <p>4-Text is repetitious. There is no central theme. Ideas are irrelevant or not worthy of the reader's consideration.</p>	<p>1-Relevant content is included in all sections but not covered in as much depth or detail as expected.</p> <p>2-Quotations are appropriate in most of the document.</p> <p>3-Ideas are clear, but more information is needed.</p> <p>4-Ideas in the paper are mostly (but not all) relevant and worthy of the reader's consideration.</p>	<p>1-Content is covered in all sections in depth and detail but without redundancy.</p> <p>2-Sources are cited when specific statements are made.</p> <p>3-The significance of quotes, when used, is apparent.</p> <p>4-The length is appropriate. Ideas are clear, original, and focused. Main idea stands out, along with details.</p> <p>Ideas in the paper are compelling, even original; they are not self-evident.</p>
<p>Clarity and correctness of the writing – 15%</p>	<p>1-It is difficult for the reader to understand what the writer is trying to express. Writing is convoluted.</p> <p>2-Paper contains spelling and grammatical errors as well as improper punctuation.</p> <p>3-Writing rambles; the paper appears hastily written.</p>	<p>1-The writing is generally clear, but unnecessary words are occasionally used. Meaning is sometimes hidden.</p> <p>2-Some mistakes in grammar, spelling, and/or punctuation exist, but they do not cause confusion; they suggest negligence, not indifference.</p> <p>3-Writing might ramble; the paper is not carefully written.</p>	<p>1-The writing is clear and concise.</p> <p>2- There are no (or very few) mistakes in grammar, spelling, and/or punctuation.</p> <p>3- The writing does not ramble; the paper is carefully written and edited.</p>

<p>Conclusions – 15%</p> <p>Synthesis of ideas that culminates in a research question/statement or suggestions for further research, or finalizing with a clear position on the topic.</p>	<p>1-There is little or no indication that the writer tried to synthesize the information or draw conclusions based on the literature under review.</p> <p>2-No research question(s) or suggestions are offered to the reader, or the position is not restated and made clear to the reader as a conclusion.</p>	<p>1- The writer provides concluding remarks that show an analysis and synthesis of ideas and information. Some of the conclusions, however, are not supported in the body of the review.</p> <p>2-A follow-up research question or suggestion is offered to the reader, or the writer’s position is restated to make it clear to the reader.</p>	<p>1-The writer makes succinct and precise conclusions based on the review of literature.</p> <p>2-Insights into the problem/topic are appropriate. Conclusions are strongly supported within the paper.</p>
<p>Sources, Citations, and Correct Citation Format – 10%</p>	<p>1-In-text citations are not included.</p> <p>2-References that are included in the References or Works Cited list are not cited in the text.</p> <p>3-An insufficient number of sources are cited and/or not accurately documented.</p> <p>4-Scholarly sources are not cited in text and reference list.</p> <p>5-Sources are primarily from the popular press and/or</p>	<p>1-In-text citations are included but there are some formatting problems or missing elements.</p> <p>2-An acceptable number of sources is cited. All sources are accurately documented, but some are not in the desired format.</p> <p>3-Sufficient sources are cited but with some errors.</p> <p>4- Most sources are scholarly and cited, but with some errors.</p> <p>5- Personal opinions are kept to a minimum though may not be</p>	<p>1-All necessary citations are included in the body of the review and in the right format.</p> <p>2-The references in the list match the in-text citations and all are properly cited in a consistent citation style.</p> <p>3-Numerous sources are cited. All sources are accurately documented using consistent citation style.</p> <p>4-The majority of sources are scholarly and cited correctly in both text and reference list.</p> <p>5-Personal opinions are delayed and stated succinctly in the conclusion.</p>

	the paper consists primarily of personal opinions.	delayed in the paper.	
--	--	-----------------------	--