

PSCI 5609F / EURR 5106F
Selected Topics in European Integration Studies:
Democracy in the European Union
Thursdays, 2:35p.m – 5:25p.m.
Please confirm location on Carleton Central

Instructor: Professor Achim Hurrelmann
Office: A 629 Loeb Building
Office Hours: Thursdays, 12:00 – 2:00 and by appointment
Phone: (613) 520-2600 ext. 2294
Email: achim_hurrelmann@carleton.ca

Course description:

Over the past fifty years, European integration has made a significant contribution to peace, economic prosperity, and cultural exchange in Europe. By contrast, its effects on the democratic quality of government have been more ambiguous. While the European Union (EU) possesses more mechanisms of democratic input than any other international organization – most importantly the directly elected European Parliament (EP) – political and academic observers have diagnosed a ‘democratic deficit’ in EU politics. According to this view, the development of democratic institutions and practices at the EU level has not kept up with the incessant growth of EU policy-making responsibilities. In addition, the European integration process is said to have had negative implications for the quality of democracy at the member-state level.

This course approaches the debate about the ‘democratic deficit’ of the EU from two angles. In the first half, we will discuss recent empirical studies that analyze democratic institutions and practices in the European multilevel system: How does the EP work, and can it be considered an effective representative of the European citizens? How can interest groups and individual citizens influence EU decision-making? How have national democracies adapted to the growing importance of the EU? The second half of the course then turns to normative assessments of the EU’s democratic quality. In this more theoretical part of the course, we will discuss ‘realist’, liberal, republican, and deliberative perspectives on EU democracy, as well as various proposals for making the EU more democratic.

This course is designed for students who already possess a good knowledge of the EU’s political system and policy processes. It will introduce them to the most important positions in advanced academic debates about democracy in the EU. Beyond that, students will learn about research approaches, techniques, and results in state-of-the-art empirical work on topics such as parliamentarism and elections, parties and interest groups, contentious politics, and multilevel governance. Last not least, they will develop a good understanding of the most important arguments and approaches in contemporary democratic theory.

Texts:

This course is based on a specifically assembled reader; there is no required textbook. Master copies of all required readings can be obtained in the Political Science Resource Room, C666 Loeb Building, which is open from 8:15 am to 4:15 pm each weekday, or via Web CT. The required readings have also been put on reserve in the MacOdrum Library.

Evaluation:

Participation in class discussions	20%	
Class presentation	20%	
Paper #1	20%	(due 8 Oct. 2009)
Paper #2	20%	(due 5 Nov. 2009)
Paper #3	20%	(due 3 Dec. 2009)

Participation in class discussion: Each seminar session will be constructed around a detailed, text-based discussion of core readings. In addition, some sessions will make use of teaching methods that require particularly active student participation, such as group work, debates, or role-playing. For both reasons, it is essential that all students do all of the required readings for each session, and that they take the time to think about questions they would like to discuss about them. Please note that students who are not willing to engage with theoretical texts should not choose this course. Participation marks will be assigned according to the quality and quantity of contributions. Regular attendance is a prerequisite for obtaining a good participation grade.

Class presentation: Each student is expected to give a presentation on a topic that can serve as background information for the class discussion. Topics for the presentations will be assigned in consultation with the students in one of the first sessions. They might include (a) ‘classic’ contributions to the EU studies literature that still influence debates today, such as Lindberg and Scheingold’s concept of a ‘permissive consensus’ on European integration; (b) examples that illustrate how a democratic institution or practice works in a specific EU institution or member state, such as Denmark’s system for issuing parliamentary mandates for government ministers in the Council; or (c) current events that are not yet reflected in the literature but can be illustrated in its light, such as the 2009 EP elections. Students are welcome to suggest a topic for their presentation. Presentations should be no longer than 15 minutes; presenters are encouraged to use visualization methods (PowerPoint, overhead projector, handouts, etc.).

Papers: Students will have to complete three short papers using different formats. Each of the following formats must be used once; students are free to determine the order in which they hand in the three papers:

- (a) *Literature review:* The purpose of this paper is to summarize the academic debate on a particular topic (e.g., the participation of interest groups in EU decision-making). Literature reviews must list various approaches and perspectives taken on the issue, name the most important authors, identify and explain crucial dimensions and differences in their treatment of the issue, and highlight potential omissions or biases in the academic debate.
- (b) *Empirical case study:* The purpose of this paper is to discuss a specific aspect of democracy in the EU in a small original study, starting from some of the concepts discussed in this course, which then form the basis for the student’s own research. Topics of case studies can include EP decision-making and coalition-formation in a specific legislative process; interest group mobilization and political protest on a selected issue; or secondary analysis of public opinion data to answer a specific question.

(c) *Theoretical essay*: This purpose of this paper is to engage critically with theoretical arguments about democracy in the EU. Theoretical essays can discuss a particular theoretical position (e.g., republican approaches); the contribution of a specific author (e.g., Giandomenico Majone); a prominent issue or controversy (relationship between democracy and collective identity); or a specific reform proposal (e.g., introduction of referenda).

All types of papers have to be based on a clearly stated question. Students are encouraged to consult with the instructor about this question, preferably during his office hours. Each paper should be about 10-12 pages in length (double-spaced, i.e., 3000-3500 words). The papers are due in class every four weeks: 8 October, 5 November, and 3 December.

Grading:

All assignments 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

Papers must be handed in as *hardcopies* directly to the instructor. For late papers, the Department of Political Science’s drop 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). Papers sent per email will not be accepted. Papers will be returned in class; 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.

Students who fail to complete all required assignments (presentation and three papers) will be given a failing grade. Unless a medical (or equivalent) excuse is provided, or an extension of the deadline has been agreed on beforehand, late papers will be penalized by two percentage points per day (including weekends); papers more than a week late will receive a mark of 0%. Unexcused absence on the date of the presentation will likewise result in a mark of 0%.

Preliminary course outline:

- 10 Sept. 2009 Introduction: Debating the ‘Democratic Deficit’ of the European Union
Logistics, Administrative Details
- Hurrelmann and DeBardeleben 2009 [Web CT]

Part I – Democratic Politics in the EU: Empirical Perspectives

- 17 Sept. 2009 The European Parliament: A Normal Legislature?
- Hix, Noury and Roland 2007 [Resource Room]
- 24 Sept. 2009 The European Parliament: A Representative Institution?
- Franklin 2006 [Resource Room]
 - Farrell and Scully 2007 [Resource Room]
- 1 Oct. 2009 National Parliaments: A Meaningful Voice in EU Politics?
- O’Brennan and Raunio 2007 [Resource Room]
 - Raunio 2005 [Web CT]
 - Bengtson 2007 [Resource Room]
 - Benz 2006 [Resource Room]
- 8 Oct. 2009 Interest Group Participation: A Democratic Device?
- Greenwood 2007 [Resource Room]
 - Kohler-Koch 2008 [Web CT]
- [Paper #1 is due.]**
- 15 Oct. 2009 Transnational Politics: More than an Elite Affair?
- Balme and Chabanet 2008 [Resource Room]
 - Fligstein 2008 [Resource Room]
- 22 Oct. 2009 Public Opinion: End of the Permissive Consensus?
- Hooghe and Marks 2005 [Web CT]
 - Hooghe and Marks 2009 [Web CT]
 - Hurrelmann 2008 [Web CT]
- 29 Oct. 2009 Europeanization and the Member States: Is National Democracy Eroding?
- Schmidt 2006 [Resource Room]
 - Scharpf 2009 [Web CT]

Part II – Assessing (and Improving) the Democratic Quality of the EU: Normative Perspectives

- 5 Nov. 2009 Realist Conceptions of Democracy: Why Fix What Works?
- Majone 1998 [Web CT]
 - Moravcsik 2002 [Web CT]
 - Føllesdal and Hix 2006 [Web CT]
- [Paper #2 is due.]**
- 12 Nov. 2009 Republican Conceptions of Democracy: No-Demos, No Democracy?
- Greven 2000 [Resource Room]
 - Habermas 2001a [Resource Room]
 - Habermas 2001b [Web CT]

- 19 Nov. 2009 Liberal Conceptions of Democracy: The Promise of Partisan Politics
- Hix 2008 [Resource Room]
 - Bartolini 2006 [Web CT]
 - Magnette and Papadopoulos 2008 [Web CT]
- 26 Nov. 2009 Deliberative Conceptions of Democracy: Learning through Discourse?
- Sabel and Zeitlin 2008 [Web CT]
 - Bovens 2007 [Web CT]
- 3 Dec. 2009 Non-Conventional Proposals: Don't Hesitate, Innovate!
- Schmitter 2000 [Resource Room]
- [Paper #3 is due.]**

Literature

Introduction: Debating the ‘Democratic Deficit’ of the European Union (10 Sept. 2009)	
Required reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A. Hurrelmann and J. DeBardeleben (2009), ‘Democratic Dilemmas in EU Multilevel Governance: Untangling the Gordian Knot’, <i>European Political Science Review</i> 1:2, 229-247. [Web CT]
Background literature	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ D. Beetham and C. Lord (1998), <i>Legitimacy and the European Union</i> (London: Longman). ▪ D. N. Chrysochoou (1998), <i>Democracy in the European Union</i> (London: Tauris). ▪ J. DeBardeleben and A. Hurrelmann, eds. (2007), <i>Democratic Dilemmas of Multilevel Governance</i> (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan). ▪ A. Føllesdal (2006), ‘The Legitimacy Deficits of the European Union’, <i>Journal of Political Philosophy</i> 14:4, 441-468. ▪ B. Kohler-Koch and B. Rittberger, eds. (2007), <i>Debating the Democratic Legitimacy of the European Union</i> (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield). ▪ A. Warleigh (2003), <i>Democracy and the European Union: Theory, Practice, and Reform</i> (London: Sage).
European Parliament: A Normal Legislature? (17 Sept. 2009)	
Required reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ S. Hix, A. G. Noury and C. Roland (2007), <i>Democratic Politics in the European Parliament</i> (Cambridge: Cambridge UP), pp. 1-31, 87-104, 147-181, 216-220. [Resource Room]
Background literature	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ R. Corbett, F. Jacobs and M. Shackleton (2007), <i>The European Parliament</i>, 7th edition (London: John Harper). ▪ D. Judge and D. Earnshaw (2008), <i>The European Parliament</i>, 2nd edition (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan). ▪ A. Kreppel (2002), <i>The European Parliament and Supranational Party System: A Study in Institutional Development</i> (Cambridge: Cambridge UP).
European Parliament: A Representative Institution? (24 Sept. 2009)	
Required reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ M. Franklin (2006), ‘European Elections and the European Voter’, in J. Richardson, ed., <i>European Union: Power and Policy-Making</i>, 3rd edition (London: Routledge), 227-246. [Resource Room] ▪ D. M. Farrell and R. Scully (2007), <i>Representing Europe’s Citizens? Electoral Institutions and the Failure of Parliamentary Representation</i> (Oxford: Oxford UP), pp. 63-138. [Resource Room]
Background literature	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ C. van der Eijk, M. Franklin et al. (1996), <i>Choosing Europe? The European Electorate and National Politics in the Face of Union</i> (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press). ▪ M. Marsh, S. Mikhaylov and H. Schmitt, eds. (2007), <i>European Elections after Eastern Enlargement: Preliminary Results from the European Election Study 2004</i> (Mannheim: CONNEX). ▪ K. Reif and H. Schmitt (1980), ‘Nine Second-Order National Elections: A Systematic Framework for the Analysis of European Elections Results’, <i>European Journal of Political Research</i> 8:1, 3-44. ▪ H. Schmitt (2005), ‘The European Parliament Elections of 2004: Still Second-Order?’, <i>West European Politics</i> 28:3, 650-679.

National Parliaments: A Meaningful Voice in EU Politics? (1 Oct. 2009)	
Required reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ J. O'Brennan and T. Raunio (2007), 'Introduction: Deparliamentarization and European Integration', in J. O'Brennan and T. Raunio, eds., <i>National Parliaments within the Enlarged European Union</i> (London: Routledge), 1-26. [Resource Room] ▪ T. Raunio (2005), 'Holding Governments Accountable in European Affairs: Explaining Cross-National Variation', <i>Journal of Legislative Studies</i> 11:3/4, 319-342. [Web CT] ▪ C. Bengtson (2007), 'Interparliamentary Cooperation within Europe', in J. O'Brennan and T. Raunio, eds., <i>National Parliaments within the Enlarged European Union</i> (London: Routledge), 46-65. [Resource Room] ▪ A. Benz (2006), 'Policy-Making and Accountability in EU Multilevel Governance', in A. Benz and Y. Papadopoulos, eds., <i>Governance and Democracy: Comparing National, European and International Experiences</i> (London: Routledge), 99-114. [Resource Room]
Background literature	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A. Maurer and W. Wessels, eds. (2001), <i>National Parliaments on their Ways to Europe: Losers or Latecomers?</i> (Baden-Baden: Nomos). ▪ P. Norton, ed. (1996), <i>National Parliaments and the European Union</i> (London: Frank Cass). ▪ B. Kohler-Koch, ed. (2003), <i>Linking EU and National Governance</i> (Oxford: Oxford UP). ▪ T. Raunio and S. Hix (2000), 'Backbenchers Learn to Fight Back: European Integration and Parliamentary Government', <i>West European Politics</i>, 23:4, 142-168.
Interest Group Participation: A Democratic Device? (8 Oct. 2009)	
Required reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ J. Greenwood (2007), <i>Interest Representation in the European Union</i> (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan), 1-48, 177-211. [Resource Room] ▪ B. Kohler-Koch (2008), 'Does Participatory Governance Hold its Promises?', in B. Kohler-Koch and F. Larat, eds., <i>Efficient and Democratic Governance in the European Union</i> (Mannheim: CONNEX), 265-295. [Web CT]
Background literature	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ European Commission (2001), <i>European Governance: A White Paper</i>, COM (2001) 428 final (Brussels: European Commission). ▪ J. R. Grote and B. Gbikpi, eds. (2002), <i>Participatory Governance: Political and Societal Implications</i> (Opladen: Leske + Budrich). ▪ D. Naurin (2007), <i>Deliberation behind Closed Doors: Transparency and Lobbying in the European Union</i> (Colchester: ECPR Press). ▪ J. Steffek, C. Kissling and P. Nanz, eds. (2008), <i>Civil Society Participation in European and Global Governance: A Cure for the Democratic Deficit?</i> (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan).
Transnational Politics: More than an Elite Affair? (15 Oct. 2009)	
Required reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ R. Balme and D. Chabanet (2008), <i>European Governance and Democracy: Power and Protest in the EU</i> (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield), pp. 93-163. [Resource Room] ▪ N. Fligstein (2008), <i>Euro-Clash: The EU, European Identity, and the Future of Europe</i> (Oxford: Oxford UP), pp. 208-241. [Resource Room]

Background literature	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ S. Bartolini (2005), <i>Restructuring Europe: Centre Formation, System Building, and Political Structuring between the Nation State and the European Union</i> (Cambridge: Cambridge UP). ▪ D. Imig and S. Tarrow, eds. (2001), <i>Contentious Europeans: Protest and Politics in an Emerging Polity</i> (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield). ▪ G. Marks, L. Hooghe, M. Nelson and E. Edwards (2006), 'Party Competition and European Integration in the East and West. Different Structure, Same Causality', <i>Comparative Political Studies</i> 39:2, 155-175.
Public Opinion: End of the Permissive Consensus? (22 Oct. 2009)	
Required reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ L. Hooghe and G. Marks (2005), 'Calculation, Community and Cues: Public Opinion on European Integration', <i>European Union Politics</i> 6:4, 419-443. [Web CT] ▪ L. Hooghe and G. Marks (2009), 'A Postfunctionalist Theory of European Integration: From Permissive Consensus to Constraining Dissensus', <i>British Journal of Political Science</i> 39:1, 1-23. [Web CT] ▪ A. Hurrelmann (2008), 'Constructing Multilevel Legitimacy in the European Union: A Study of British and German Media Discourse', <i>Comparative European Politics</i> 6:2, 190-211. [Web CT]
Background literature	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ M. Bruter (2005), <i>Citizens of Europe? The Emergence of a Mass European Identity</i> (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan). ▪ S. Hug (2002), <i>Voices of Europe: Citizens, Referendums, and European Integration</i> (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield). ▪ L. Lindberg and S. Scheingold (1970), <i>Europe's Would-Be Polity: Patterns of Change in the European Community</i> (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall). ▪ L. McLaren (2006), <i>Identity, Interests and Attitudes to European Integration</i> (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan).
Europeanization and the Member States: Is National Democracy Eroding? (29 Oct. 2009)	
Required reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ V. Schmidt (2006), <i>Democracy in Europe: The EU and National Politics</i> (Oxford: Oxford UP), pp. 219-273. [Resource Room] ▪ F. W. Scharpf (2009), 'Legitimacy in the Multilevel European Polity', <i>European Political Science Review</i> 1:2, 173-204. [Web CT]
Background literature	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ T. R. Burns (1999), 'The Evolution of Parliaments and Societies in Europe: Challenges and Prospects', <i>European Journal of Social Theory</i> 2:2, 167-194. ▪ German Constitutional Court (2009), <i>Judgement on the Lisbon Treaty</i>, 30 June 2009, http://www.bundesverfassungsgericht.de/entscheidungen/es20090630_2bve000208en.html. ▪ H. Kriesi, E. Grande, R. Lachat et al. (2008), <i>West European Politics in the Age of Globalization</i> (Cambridge: Cambridge UP). ▪ S. J. Pharr & R. D. Putnam, eds. (2000), <i>Disaffected Democracies: What's Troubling the Trilateral Countries?</i> (Princeton: Princeton UP).
Realist Conceptions of Democracy: Why Fix What Works? (5 Nov. 2009)	
Required reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ G. Majone (1998), 'Europe's "Democratic Deficit": The Question of Standards', <i>European Law Journal</i> 4:1, 5-28. [Web CT] ▪ A. Moravcsik (2002), 'In Defence of the "Democratic Deficit": Reassessing Legitimacy in the European Union', <i>Journal of Common Market Studies</i> 40:4, 603-624. [Web CT] ▪ A. Føllesdal and S. Hix (2006), 'Why There Is a Democratic Deficit in the EU: A Response to Majone and Moravcsik', <i>Journal of Common Market Studies</i> 44:3, 533-562. [Web CT]

Background literature	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ G. Majone (2005), <i>Dilemmas of European Integration: The Ambiguities and Pitfalls of Integration by Stealth</i> (Oxford: Oxford UP). ▪ A. Moravcsik (2006), 'What Can We Learn from the Collapse of the European Constitutional Project', <i>Politische Vierteljahresschrift</i> 47:2, 219-241. ▪ J. H. H. Weiler (2003), 'In Defence of the Status Quo: Europe's Constitutional Sonderweg', in J. H. H. Weiler and M. Wind, eds. (2003), <i>European Constitutionalism beyond the State</i> (Cambridge: Cambridge UP), 7-23.
Republican Conceptions of Democracy: No-Demos, No Democracy? (12 Nov. 2009)	
Required reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ M. T. Greven (2000), 'Can the European Union Finally Become a Democracy?', in M. T. Greven and L. W. Pauly, eds., <i>Democracy beyond the State: The European Dilemma and the Emerging Global Order</i> (Toronto: University of Toronto Press), 35-61. [Resource Room] ▪ J. Habermas (2001a), <i>The Postnational Constellation: Political Essays</i> (Cambridge: Polity Press), pp. 58-112. [Resource Room] ▪ J. Habermas (2001b), 'Why Europe Needs a Constitution', <i>New Left Review</i> 42(11), 5-26. [Web CT]
Background literature	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A. Etzioni (2007), 'The Community Deficit', <i>Journal of Common Market Studies</i> 45:1, 23-42. ▪ D. Obradovic (1996), 'Policy Legitimacy and the European Union', <i>Journal of Common Market Studies</i> 34:2, 191-221. ▪ F. W. Scharpf (1999), <i>Governing in Europe: Effective and Democratic?</i> (Oxford: Oxford UP).
Liberal Conceptions of Democracy: The Promise of Partisan Politics (19 Nov. 2009)	
Required reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ S. Hix (2008), <i>What's Wrong with the European Union and How to Fix It</i> (Cambridge: Polity Press), pp. 89-165. [Resource Room] ▪ S. Bartolini (2006), 'Should the Union be "Politicised"? Prospects and Risks', in S. Hix and S. Bartolini, <i>Politics: The Right or the Wrong Sort of Medicine for the EU?</i> (Paris: Notre Europe), pp. 29-50. [Web CT] ▪ P. Magnette and Y. Papadopoulos (2008), 'On the Politicization of the European Consociation: A Middle Way between Hix and Bartolini', <i>European Governance Papers</i> No. C-08-01. [Web CT]
Background literature	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ C. Lord and D. Beetham (2001), 'Legitimizing the EU: Is There a "Postparliamentary Basis" for its Legitimation?', <i>Journal of Common Market Studies</i> 39:3, 443-462. ▪ P. Mair (2005), 'Popular Democracy and the European Union Polity', <i>European Governance Papers</i> No. C-05-03. ▪ B. Rittberger (2005), <i>Building Europe's Parliament: Democratic Representation beyond the Nation State</i> (Oxford: Oxford UP).
Deliberative Conceptions of Democracy: Learning through Discourse? (26 Nov. 2009)	
Required reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ C. Sabel and J. Zeitlin (2008), 'Learning from Difference: The New Architecture of Experimental Governance in the EU', <i>European Law Journal</i> 14:3, 271-327. [Web CT] ▪ M. Bovens (2007), 'New Forms of Accountability and EU Governance', <i>Comparative European Politics</i> 5:1, 104-120. [Web CT]
Background literature	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ C. de la Porte and P. Nanz (2004), 'The OMC: A Deliberative-Democratic Mode of Governance? The Cases of Employment and Pensions', <i>Journal of European Public Policy</i> 11:2, 267-288.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ E. O. Eriksen and J. E. Fossum, eds. (2000), <i>Democracy in the European Union: Integration through Deliberation?</i> (London: Routledge). ▪ C. Joerges and J. Neyer (1997), 'Transforming Strategic Interaction into Deliberative Problem-Solving: European Comitology in the Foodstuffs Sector', <i>Journal of European Public Policy</i> 4:4, 609-625. ▪ H.-J. Trenz and K. Eder (2004), 'The Democratizing Dynamics of a European Public Sphere: Towards a Theory of Democratic Functionalism', <i>European Journal of Social Theory</i> 7:1, 5-25.
Non-Conventional Proposals: Don't Hesitate, Innovate! (3 Dec. 2009)	
Required reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ P. C. Schmitter (2000), <i>How to Democratize the European Union ... and Why Bother?</i> (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield), pp. 1-74, 115-130.
Background literature	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ H. Abromeit (1998), <i>Democracy in Europe: Legitimising Politics in a Non-State Polity</i> (Oxford: Berghahn). ▪ Y. Papadopoulos (2005), 'Implementing (and Radicalizing) Art. I-47.4 of the Constitution: Is the Addition of Some (Semi-)Direct Democracy to the Nascent Consociational European Federation just Swiss Folklore?', <i>Journal of European Public Policy</i> 12:3, 448-267.



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 request for 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 16, 2009 for December examinations and March 12, 2010 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 University Senate defines plagiarism as “presenting, whether intentional or not, the ideas, expression of ideas or work of others as one’s own.” This can include:

- reproducing or paraphrasing portions of someone else’s published or unpublished material, regardless of the source, and presenting these as one’s own without proper citation or reference to the original source;
- submitting a take-home examination, essay, laboratory report or other assignment written, in whole or in part, by someone else;
- using ideas or direct, verbatim quotations, or paraphrased material, concepts, or ideas without appropriate acknowledgment in any academic assignment;
- using another’s data or research findings;

- failing to acknowledge sources through the use of proper citations when using another's works and/or failing to use quotation marks;
- handing in "substantially the same piece of work for academic credit more than once without prior written permission of the course instructor in which the submission occurs.

Plagiarism is a serious offence which cannot be resolved directly with the course's instructor. The Associate Deans of the Faculty conduct a rigorous investigation, including an interview with the student, when an instructor suspects a piece of work has been plagiarized. Penalties are not trivial. They include a mark of zero for the plagiarized work or a final grade of "F" for the course.

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: 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: All email communication to students from the Department of Political Science will be via Connect. Important course and University information is also distributed via the Connect email system. It is the student's responsibility to monitor their Connect account.

Carleton Political Science Society: The Carleton Political Science Society (CPSS) has made its mission to provide a social environment for politically inclined students and faculty. Holding social events, debates, and panel discussions, CPSS aims to involve all political science students in the after-hours academic life at Carleton University. Our mandate is to arrange social and academic activities in order to instill a sense of belonging within the Department and the larger University community. Members can benefit through numerous opportunities which will complement both academic and social life at Carleton University. To find out more, please email carletonpss@gmail.com, visit our website at poliscisociety.com, or come to our office in Loeb D688.

Official Course Outline: The course outline posted to the Political Science website is the official course outline.