

WRTG 3020: Writing in Political Science

2017 spring term

Instructor: Lev Szentkirályi Office: ENVD 1B50-C
 Email: szentkiralyi@colorado.edu Hours: Wednesdays 12-2pm and by appointment
 Phone: 303-735-4671

Additional virtual office hours: I am also happy to schedule (audio or video) calls *via* Skype.
 Find me in Skype's directory—search for levszentkiralyi.com—and add me to your contacts.

Course Overview

This advanced writing course, which teaches principles of academic writing through a careful examination of political science research, has two overarching and complementary aims. The first (WAC) goal is to have students develop fundamental and transferable skills of rhetorical analysis, information literacy, reading comprehension and critical thinking, and academic argumentation, which they can apply in all facets of their undergraduate education. Yet, by having students critically analyze a diverse selection of literature in American Politics, Public Policy, Comparative Politics, International Relations, and Normative Political Theory, the second (WID) goal is to have students build knowledge of key standards of research and conventions in writing within the discipline of political science and across its various subfields.

Designed primarily for those majoring or minoring in political science—or the social science fields more broadly—this course challenges students to develop a working understanding of basic principles of social scientific inquiry, to enhance their ability to interpret descriptive statistics and regression tables and to critically analyze the empirical analyses of peer-reviewed scholarship, and to emulate the thesis-driven and evidenced-based writing that they will be expected to complete in content-based political science courses. In this way, this writing-intensive class is intended to preface and to augment the advanced quantitative, qualitative, and analytical research methods students will be expected to learn and apply in their upper-division studies in political science. Students will also be strongly encouraged to think about their civic responsibilities as writers of political science, and how the knowledge their research and writing helps to generate may be used to improve the welfare of others.

Writing Objectives

This writing course meets two sets of requirements here on the CU-Boulder campus.

The first set consists in the requirements established by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education for all third-level “Communication General Education ‘Guaranteed Transfer’” (CO-3) courses in the state. These CO-3 courses are designed to ensure that students understand “how to summarize, analyze, and synthesize the ideas of others” and “learn more sophisticated ways of communicating knowledge...in the context of a specific discipline” (par. 3). This is achieved by extending “rhetorical knowledge,” “writing processes [and] conventions,” and “comprehension of content knowledge at the advanced level” (par. 6).

The second set consists in the requirements established by the Program for Writing and Rhetoric (PWR), which is the home program for this course. These include your capacities to:

- **develop rhetorical knowledge**, analyzing and making informed choices about purposes, audiences, and context as you read and compose texts.-
- **analyze texts in a variety of genres**, understanding how content, style, structure and format vary across a range of reading and writing situations.
- **refine and reflect on your writing process**, using multiple strategies to generate ideas, draft, revise, and edit your writing across a variety of genres.
- **develop information literacy**, making critical choices as you identify a specific research need, locate and evaluate information and sources, and draw connections among your own and others' ideas in your writing.
- **construct effective and ethical arguments**, using appropriate reasons and evidence to support your positions while responding to multiple points of view.
- **understand and apply language conventions rhetorically**, including grammar, spelling, punctuation and format. (PWR First Year Committee)

In light of these requirements, our writing course this semester will ask you to:

1. Develop rhetorical knowledge by reading and writing a range of academic arguments in environmental political theory—which will attend to a variety of rhetorical considerations (issues of context, audience, and purpose; appeals to ethos, pathos, and logos; conventions and principles of academic writing; etc.—while using effective evidence and providing appropriate analysis.
2. Develop an intimate understanding of writing processes and information literacy by drafting, revising, editing, and proofreading your own work; by reading and commenting upon the work of others; and by engaging in a number of research projects using primary and secondary source materials.
3. Understand and employ the conventions of “standard academic English” and clear prose style in your writing while exploring the potential social benefits and social costs of doing so.
4. Ask questions and make arguments about your educational goals and values.

To accomplish these goals, you will spend a great deal of time this semester working alone and in groups. You will also be required to meet with me for one-on-one conferences to discuss your paper assignments.

Required Textbooks

There are two required texts for this course:

- Anthony Weston. *A Rulebook for Arguments*, 4th ed. (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 2009).
- Todd Donovan and Kenneth Hoover. *The Elements of Social Scientific Thinking*, 11th ed. (Boston: Wadsworth, 2014).

All other required readings will be available on Desire2Learn (D2L) at <https://learn.colorado.edu/>.

University and Course Policies

Class Behavior: be respectful of and considerate toward your classmates. I am committed to establishing an atmosphere that fosters open, civil, and constructive lines of communication, and inappropriate or offensive conduct will not be tolerated. *If you feel uncomfortable at any time with any aspect of the class environment, I strongly encourage you to come discuss your concerns with me.*

Attendance Policy: While there is no formal attendance policy for this class, students are strongly encouraged to regularly attend class. In-class assignments cannot be made-up even if an absence is excused, whereas hard copies of homework and major writing assignments must be submitted in class.

Punctuality Policy: Persistent tardiness is unacceptable. Please make an effort to arrive on time.

Use of electronics: Students are expected to turn **OFF** all electronic devices when entering the classroom, with the exception of personal computers—which are to be used only for course-related purposes.

- Students should regularly check their University e-mail accounts for class announcements and information. Students should also check our course page on D2L each day to confirm regular reading and homework assignments, to view paper assignments, and to view syllabus updates.
- Students must bring either paper or electronic copies of each course reading with you to class on the day that it is due. Computer problems, broken printers, empty toner cartridges, or other technology problems will not excuse you from completing your assigned work on time or from bringing required materials with you to class.

Written Work and Due Dates: Students must type all writing assignments using 12-point font, 1-inch margins, and MLA, APA, or Chicago citation style, and they must submit all assignments to D2L by the assigned dates and times.

- Specific directions and grading rubrics will be provided in advance of each major writing assignment, which will also be posted on our D2L course page.
- Late work will be penalized one full letter grade (10%) per day that it is late.

Disability accommodations: If you qualify for accommodations because of a disability, please submit a letter to me from Disability Support Services (DSS) in a timely manner so that your needs may be accommodated. DSS requires that disabilities be documented, and can be contacted at 303.492.8671 or at dsinfo@colorado.edu.

If you have a temporary medical condition or injury, see Temporary Injuries under Quick Links at Disability Services website (<http://disabilityservices.colorado.edu/>) and discuss your needs with me.

Religious observances: Campus policy requires that faculty make every effort to reasonably and fairly accommodate students who have scheduling conflicts because of religious observances. Students who need to reschedule exams or assignments should inform me as soon as possible.

Addressing discrimination: No discrimination or harassment will be tolerated in this class. If you believe you have been discriminated against, you are strongly encouraged to contact the Office of Discrimination and Harassment at 303.492.2127, or the Office of Student Conduct at 303.492.5550. Information about University policies and resources can be found at <http://hr.colorado.edu/dh/>.

Honor code: Students are responsible for knowing and adhering to the academic integrity policy of this institution. Violations may include cheating, plagiarism, aiding others in academic dishonesty, deception, fabrication, and etc. All incidents of academic misconduct will be reported to the Honor Code Council (honor@colorado.edu; 303.735.2273). Students found to be in violation of the academic integrity policy will be subject to both academic sanctions from the faculty member and non-academic sanctions (including, but not limited to, university probation, suspension, or expulsion). Further details can be found at <http://colorado.edu/policies/honor.html>, and at <http://honorcode.colorado.edu>.

Plagiarism: If students have *any* doubt about what constitutes plagiarism, it is their responsibility to ask *before* submitting work as their own.

Plagiarism is the act of using others' words and/or ideas without proper attribution, either intentionally or unintentionally. The *MLA Style Manual* (2nd edition) requires that

[s]cholarly authors generously acknowledge their debts to predecessors by carefully giving credit to each source. Whenever you draw on another's work, you must specify what you borrowed—whether facts, opinions, or quotations—and where you borrowed it from. Using another person's ideas without acknowledging the source constitutes plagiarism (Gibaldi 151).

Intentional plagiarism will be strictly punished: a proven first offense will result in an automatic F for the final assignment grade, while a proven second offense will result in an automatic F for the course. Moreover, depending on the nature of the offense, engaging in plagiarism may result in further disciplinary action by the University. Consult the PWR or Campus Honor Code websites for more info.

Further Resources:

- Purdue Online Writing Lab: <https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/section/2/9/>
- <http://ucblibraries.colorado.edu/how/citationstyle.htm>
- <http://honorcode.colorado.edu/student-information>
- <http://colorado.edu/policies/honor.html>
- Joseph Gibaldi, *MLA Style Manual and Guide to Scholarly Publishing*, 2nd ed. (New York: Modern Language Association, 1999)

The Writing Center: Students should consider utilizing the Writing Center—a campus service offering free one-on-one feedback about academic writing—as a supplement to their learning in this course. (See <http://www.colorado.edu/pwr/writingcenter.html> for more information about the Center or to schedule an appointment.) Be warned, however, that the Center books up quickly, often up to one week in advance during peak times. Be sure to plan accordingly.

Course Requirements

The individual graded assignments are as follows. Specific directions about each writing assignment will be provided as we move through the semester.

- **Research Project Part 1: Literature Review for Research Paper** (10% of final course grade):
 - 5-7 pages in length
 - Students must submit both a rough draft and substantively revised final draft
 - The rough draft will be peer-reviewed
 - An individual conference with me to discuss the rough draft of the lit-review is mandatory
- **Research Project Part 2: Outline of Research Paper** (10% of final course grade):
 - 3-4 pages in length—single-spaced
 - Students must submit both a rough draft and substantively revised final draft
- **Research Project Part 3: Research Paper** (35% of final course grade):
 - 15-18 pages in length
 - Students must submit both a rough draft and substantively revised final draft
 - The rough draft will be peer-reviewed
 - An individual conference with me to discuss rough draft is mandatory
- **Conventions of Research and Writing Executive Summary** (5% of final course grade):
 - 3-4 pages in length—single-spaced
 - Collaborative project
 - Students will explore scholarship in their majors—identifying what counts as evidence within their respective fields of study, as well as some universal and discipline-specific conventions of research, analysis, and writing.
- **Reading Comprehension Quizzes** (20% of final course grade):
 - Over the course of the semester, there will be 13 short ($\frac{1}{2}$ -page) in-class writing assignments that will test students on specifics from the readings assigned for the week and/or will ask students to apply course material learned during the week.
 - Quizzes will be graded along an ordinal scale: fail, low-pass, pass, or high-pass (\cong D, C, B, A).
 - The lowest three grades will be dropped, so each quiz is worth 2% of the final course grade.
- **Random Audits of Note-Taking** (10% of final course grade):
 - Note-taking is a crucial skill to develop in order to enhance understanding of course material, and to improve long-term knowledge retention by better enabling students to apply lessons learned in the classroom to writing projects completed outside of class and in future courses.
 - To motivate better note-taking, on five unannounced occasions this semester, I will collect students' notes for the day and audit them for detail and accuracy. All material from my PowerPoint slides, my discussion-based lectures that expand on these ideas, and our broader class discussions, is relevant to your note-taking and will be part of these audits.
 - Audits will be graded along an ordinal scale: fail, low-pass, pass, or high-pass (\cong D, C, B, A).
 - The lowest grade will be dropped, so each audit is worth 2.5% of the final course grade.
- **Attendance** (10% of final course grade):
 - This is a discussion-based course in which students are asked to be actively involved in class discussions and workshops, and to complete all reading and in-class assignments.
 - Since the success of this class depends on student involvement, attendance is a prerequisite.
 - Students are permitted three unexcused absences without penalty. After the third unexcused absence, however, students will lose 5% of their attendance grade for each further absence.
 - NOTE: a generic slip provided by Wardenburg that notes that a student had an appointment on the day the student missed class will not be accepted as excusing the absence. Students missing class due to illness must provide a note signed by or an email sent from their doctor explaining that the absence from class should be excused.

Final class grades will be based on the following scale:

93 – 100% = A	87 – 89% = B+	77 – 79% = C+	67 – 69% = D+	< 60% = F
90 – 92% = A-	83 – 86% = B	73 – 76% = C	63 – 66% = D	
	80 – 82% = B-	70 – 72% = C-	60 – 62% = D-	

General Grading Guidelines for Research Paper Assignment:

The following represent my general grading criteria for the research paper you will be writing this semester. Specific rubrics will be provided for each component of the larger assignment.

An essay in the “A” Range will feature

- a strong thesis with a clear claim, reason, and warrant
- numerous specific examples drawn from appropriate sources (e.g., specific information from primary and secondary source material)
- consistently clear analysis of examples
- consistently appropriate and correct use of citation
- consistently clear and correct use of quotation, summary, and paraphrase
- careful attention to issues of grammar and style (especially sentence boundaries, clarity, coherence, and punctuation)
- meeting the minimum page requirements

An essay in the “B” Range will feature

- a generally good thesis with a clear claim, reason, and warrant
- several specific examples drawn from appropriate sources
- generally clear analysis of examples
- generally appropriate and correct use of citation
- generally clear and correct use of quotation, summary, and paraphrase
- generally strong attention to issues of grammar and style
- meeting the minimum page requirements

An essay in the “C” Range will feature

- a thesis lacking a clear claim, reason, and/or warrant
- few specific examples drawn from appropriate sources
- little specific analysis (often as a result of a poor thesis)
- minimally appropriate and correct use of appropriate citation styles
- minimally clear and correct use of quotation, summary, and paraphrase
- minimal attention to issues of grammar and style
- the meeting of minimum page requirements

An essay in the “D” Range will feature

- no real thesis
- few or no examples
- little or no analysis
- generally inappropriate or incorrect use of citation (but without lapsing into plagiarism)
- generally unclear or incorrect use of quotation, summary, and paraphrase
- significant problems with grammar and style
- the meeting of minimum page requirements

An essay in the “F” Range will feature

- no real thesis
- few or no examples
- little or no analysis
- generally unclear and incorrect use of citation styles (often in ways that lapse into plagiarism)
- generally inappropriate or incorrect use of quotation, summary, and paraphrase
- significant problems with grammar and style
- the failure to meet minimum page requirements

Reading and Assignment Schedule

Note that this schedule is subject to revision

Details about how course readings and assignments satisfy CCHE guidelines are provided throughout. 1: Rhetorical Knowledge, 2: Writing Processes, 3: Writing Conventions, 4: Content Knowledge

WEEK 1: ACADEMIC WRITING IN POLITICAL SCIENCE

Guiding Questions: What is writing and rhetoric? What is the study of political science?

Objectives: Understand what the writing process consists in, what the aims of writing are, how to structure academic papers, and the sort of research questions political science scholarship engages.

Wednesday, 18 January: Course Overview and the Politics in Political Science

- *Rulebook for Arguments*, introduction and chapter 1¹
- New York Times, “A Question of Environmental Racism in Flint” (21 Jan. 2016)¹
- Class activity: analyze reading to distinguish questions of politics from questions of political science¹

¹ Purpose: preview course and outline expectations

WEEK 2: POLITICAL SCIENCE AS A DISCIPLINE OF STUDY & ACADEMIC ARGUMENTATION

Guiding Questions: What are the different subfields in political science? What research questions do the different subfields engage? What types of academic arguments do research papers typically involve?

Objectives: Recognize there are various approaches to the study of political science and that different subfields within the discipline examine categorically different research questions. Understand what it means to critically analyze problems of political science.

Monday, 23 January: The Landscape of Political Science Scholarship

- Gabriel Almond, “Separate Tables: Schools and Sects in Political Science,” *Political Science and Politics*, Vol. 21, No. 4 (1988): 828-42¹
- J. Tobin Grant, “What Divides Us? The Image and Organization of Political Science,” *Political Science and Politics*, Vol. 38, No. 3 (2005): 379-86¹

¹ Purpose: appreciate different approaches to the study of political science; CCHE Goals: 3, 4

Wednesday, 25 January: Types of Arguments in Political Science

- *Rulebook for Arguments*, chapters 7-8¹
- Jennifer Fitzgerald and Vanessa Baird, “Taking a Step Back: Teaching Critical Thinking by Distinguishing Appropriate Types of Evidence,” *Political Science and Politics*, Vol. 44, No. 3 (2011): 619-24²
- **Reading comprehension quiz 1**³

¹ Purpose: review what academic argumentation consists in; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 3, 4

² Purpose: discriminate between descriptive, empirical, and normative arguments; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 4

³ Purpose: apply key lessons of the week; CCHE Goals: 1, 3, 4

WEEK 3: CONVENTIONS OF RESEARCH AND WRITING ACROSS THE DISCIPLINES

Guiding Questions: What is a Curriculum Vitae? Where do faculty members in students' respective home departments publish, and what sort of scholarship do they publish? What counts as evidence, and what are some observable conventions in research, analysis, and writing, across different academic disciplines?

Objectives: Understand the CV as a unique genre of academic writing. Develop a better understanding of the leading academic journals and publishing houses in students' respective majors by examining where faculty in their home department publish. Identify what seems to count as evidence in one's major, as well as universal and discipline-specific conventions of research, analysis, and writing in students' respective fields of study.

Monday, 30 January: The Curriculum Vitae and CU Faculty Survey

- No reading assigned
- **Students receive directions for the collaborative executive summary**¹
- Class activity: survey a CU faculty member's CV and publishing history²

¹ Purpose: analyze the CV as a genre and identify leading journals in one's major; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

² Purpose: understand requirements of this course's overarching writing assignment; CCHE Goal: 2

Wednesday, 1 February: Discipline-Specific Conventions of Research and Writing

No reading assigned

- Class activity: survey discipline-specific scholarship for conventions of research and writing¹

¹ Purpose: identify common and discipline-specific conventions in one's major; CCHE Goals: 1, 3, 4

WEEK 4: WRITING AS CONTEXT-DEPENDENT & THE UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH PAPER

Guiding Questions: How does context in writing matter? Why is it important for novice writers to sound academic? What does writing an undergraduate research paper consist in?

Objectives: Recognize that writing is context-dependent: authors have specific objectives, types of arguments have specific purposes, target audiences have specific expectations, and understanding any given "rhetorical situation" is necessary for successful writing. Understand what the central components of the research paper are.

Monday, 6 February: Heeding the Rhetorical Situation and Writing for Academic Audiences

- *Rulebook for Arguments*, Appendices I and II¹
- David Bartholomae, "Inventing the University," in *When Writers Can't Write: Studies in Writers' Block and Other Composing Process Problems*, Mike Rose, ed. (New York: Guilford, 1985)²
- Class activity: begin writing executive summary and debrief as a group³

¹ Purpose: review rhetorical situations, rhetorical appeals, logical fallacies; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 3, 4

² Purpose: discuss how writing requires engaging particular discourse communities; CCHE Goals: 1, 3, 4

³ Purpose: discuss common and discipline-specific conventions across the disciplines; CCHE Goals: 1, 3, 4

Wednesday, 8 February: Exploring the Traditional Political Science Research Paper

- Andrew Smith, "Going Beyond the Thesis," *English Journal*, Vol. 99, No. 6 (2010): 97-91¹
- Lisa Baglione, "Doing Good and Doing Well: Teaching Research-Paper Writing by Unpacking the Paper," *Political Science and Politics*, Vol. 41, No. 3 (2008): 595-602¹
- Class activity: grammar and style workshop 1²
- **Reading comprehension quiz 2**³
- **Executive summary must be uploaded to D2L by Friday (10th) at midnight—no hard copy is required**⁴

¹ Purpose: learn how to structure academic papers and arguments; CCHE Goals: 3, 4

² Purpose: rhetorical grammar, review punctuation and sentence components; CCHE Goal: 3

³ Purpose: apply key lessons of the week; CCHE Goals: 1, 3, 4

⁴ Purpose: complete first writing assignment; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 3, 4

WEEK 5: WRITING AS EVIDENCE-BASED & STANDARDS OF RESEARCH IN POLITICAL SCIENCE_1

Guiding Questions: What counts as evidence in the social sciences? What does it mean to think scientifically? What does the social scientific method entail?

Objectives: Understand that writing in political science requires developing strong inductive and deductive analytical skills and integrating empirical evidence. Understand that writing in our discipline consists in examining problems of political science in systematic, strategic, and objective ways, and that much political science research aims to generalize the causal inferences we draw about political phenomena by applying principles of scientific inquiry.

Monday, 13 February: Making Observations, Drawing Inferences, and Thinking Scientifically

- John Dewey, “Systematic Inference: Induction and Deduction,” in *How We Think* (New York: D.C. Heath, 1910): chapter 7, 80-101¹
- John Dewey, “Empirical and Scientific Thinking,” *ibid.*: chapter 11, 146-57²
- Class activity: *briefly* review rules of citation and how to avoid plagiarism³

¹ Purpose: understand notions and processes of scientific induction and deduction; CCHE Goals: 3, 4

² Purpose: understand that political science research draws on empirical evidence; CCHE Goals: 3, 4

³ Purpose: review summary, paraphrase, quotation, citation, and source information; CCHE Goals: 1, 3

Wednesday, 15 February: Quantitative Analysis and Generalizing Our Causal Inferences

- *Rulebook for Arguments*, chapter 5¹
- *Elements of Social Scientific Thinking*, chapter 2²
- **Reading comprehension quiz 3**³

¹ Purpose: review what a causal or empirical argument consists in; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 4

² Purpose: learn the central components of the social scientific method; CCHE Goals: 3, 4

³ Purpose: apply key lessons of the week; CCHE Goals: 1, 3, 4

WEEK 6: STANDARDS OF RESEARCH IN POLITICAL SCIENCE_2

Guiding Questions: What are concepts, variables, hypotheses, and theories? What does it mean to operationalize a concept, to measure a variable, to make a hypothesis, and to test a causal relationship? How does the social scientific method help us to analyze and generalize problems of political science? What are levels of analysis, populations, and representative samples? How do variables stand in relation to each other? How do we formulate a hypothesis? What do covariation, correlation, and causation mean?

Objectives: Understand that writing in the discipline consists in examining problems of political science in systematic, strategic, and objective ways, and that much political science research aims to generalize the causal inferences we draw about political phenomena by applying principles of scientific inquiry. Learn the very basics of quantitative research methods necessary to be able to interpret diverse representations of quantitative data—as a precursor to critically analyzing causal explanations.

Monday, 20 February: From the Social Scientific Method to Quantitative Research Design

- *Rulebook for Arguments*, chapter 2¹
- *Elements of Social Scientific Thinking*, chapter 3²
- **Students receive directions for the research paper**³
- Class activity: students workshop possible topics of interest for the research project

¹ Purpose: understand what defending a generalization consists in; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 4

² Purpose: understand the purpose of and approach to quantitative research design; CCHE Goals: 3, 4

³ Purpose: understand requirements of this course’s overarching writing assignment; CCHE Goal: 2

⁵ Purpose: apply key lessons of the week; CCHE Goals: 1, 3, 4

Wednesday, 22 February: Some Fundamental Concepts of Quantitative Analysis

- *Elements of Social Scientific Thinking*, chapter 4¹
- **Reading comprehension quiz 4**²

¹ Purpose: learn basics of correlative relationships and quantitative research design; CCHE Goals: 3, 4

² Purpose: apply key lessons of the week; CCHE Goals: 1, 3, 4

WEEK 7: STARTING YOUR RESEARCH PROJECT & INTERPRETING QUANTITATIVE DATA

Guiding Questions: How do we start writing research papers? What is a workable research question and a properly-formulated thesis? What are normal distributions, standard deviations, correlation coefficients, and confidence intervals, and why are these important concepts? What is regression analysis and statistical significance, and how do we interpret regression tables and descriptive statistics?

Objectives: Learn the basics of quantitative research methods necessary to be able to interpret diverse representations of quantitative data. Understand that the aim of independent research projects is to enter into a conversation with existing literature and to make a unique contribution to the discussion, and that every thesis and argument must be motivated by and justified by strong theoretical explanations.

Monday, 27 February: Research Questions, Theory-Building, and Thesis-Writing

- Mark Souva, "Fostering Theoretical Thinking in Undergraduate Classes," *Political Science and Politics*, Vol. 40, No. 3 (2007): 557-61¹
- Miguel Centellas, "Preaching What We Practice: Bringing Scope and Methods "Back In," *Political Science and Politics*, Vol. 44, No. 4 (2011): 817-22²
- *Rulebook for Arguments*, chapter 6³
- Class activity: students brainstorm possible thesis statements for the research project

¹ Purpose: reiterate need to construct arguments on strong theoretical foundations; CCHE Goals: 2, 3, 4

² Purpose: review components of research paper and elements of research design; CCHE Goals: 2, 3, 4

³ Purpose: emphasize the need to construct logically coherent arguments; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 4

Wednesday, 1 March: Interpreting Regression Tables and Statistical Significance

- *Elements of Social Scientific Thinking*, chapter 5¹
- Reading comprehension quiz 5²

¹ Purpose: learn how to interpret regression tables and descriptive statistics; CCHE Goals: 3, 4

² Purpose: apply key lessons of the week; CCHE Goals: 1, 3, 4

WEEK 8: STANDARDS OF RESEARCH IN POLITICAL SCIENCE_3

Guiding Questions: What is case study analysis, and how does this form of empirical research align with principles of the social scientific method? How do we select cases and conduct qualitative research? How do specific case studies help us to analyze problems of political science?

Objectives: Know that what counts as evidence in political science also includes qualitative data, that much political science research aims to substantiate nuanced, context-dependent causal mechanisms, and that case study analysis can be conducted in strategic and objective ways like its quantitative counterpart.

Monday, 6 March: Qualitative Analysis and Context-Dependent Causal Inferences

- Alexander George and Andrew Bennett, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2005): *only* 3-19¹
- T. W. Clark, "Fundamentals: A View of Individuals and Society," in *The Policy Process: A Practical Guide For Natural Resource Professionals* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002): 17-31²
- Class activity: students finalize their topic proposals and thesis statements for the research project

¹ Purpose: learn the purpose and central components of case study analysis; CCHE Goals: 3, 4

² Purpose: understand the salience of contextual factors in our empirical analyses; CCHE Goals: 3, 4

Wednesday, 8 March: Qualitative Analysis, Comparative Case Selection, and Good Examples

- Alexander George and Andrew Bennett, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2005): *only* 19-34¹
- James Mahoney and Gary Goertz, "The Possibility Principle: Choosing Negative Cases in Comparative Research," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 98, No. 4 (2004): 653-69²
- Reading comprehension quiz 6³

¹ Purpose: understand fundamental virtues and limitations of case study analysis; CCHE Goals: 3, 4

² Purpose: learn some basics of comparative and multiple case study analyses; CCHE Goals: 3, 4

³ Purpose: apply key lessons of the week; CCHE Goals: 1, 3, 4

WEEK 9: ORGANIZING YOUR RESEARCH OF SECONDARY SOURCES

Guiding Questions: Where do we start looking for supporting evidence and how do we evaluate the evidence we find? What is a literature review, what is its purpose, and what is its significance in the writing process? How do we write literature reviews?

Objectives: Reiterate how to navigate various research databases to find external sources. Understand that writing literature reviews enhances our ability to engage and contribute to scholarly debates, and that synthesizing scholarship is a prerequisite to writing effective arguments

Monday, 13 March: Information Literacy and the “Un-Research” Writing Workshop

- *Rulebook for Arguments*, chapter 4¹
- Allison Hosier, “Teaching Information Literacy Through Un-Research,” *Communications in Information Literacy*, Vol. 9, No. 2 (2015): 126-35²
- Students receive directions for the literature review³
- Students sign up for a mandatory conference with me to discuss their working research projects
- Class activities: review library and online databases¹, pre-research writing exercise²

¹ Purpose: reiterate where to find and how to evaluate academic sources; CCHE Goal: 2

² Purpose: learn value of articulating one’s argument before reviewing literature; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 3, 4

³ Purpose: understand requirements of the second writing assignment; CCHE Goal: 2

Wednesday, 15 March: Literature Reviews v. Annotated Bibliographies

- Jeffrey Knopf, “Doing a Literature Review,” *Political Science and Politics*, Vol. 39, No. 1 (2006): 127-32¹
- David Boote and Penny Beile, “Scholars Before Researchers: On the Centrality of the Dissertation Literature Review in Research Preparation,” *Educational Researcher*, Vol. 34, No. 6 (2005): 3-15¹
- Class activity: grammar and style workshop ²
- Reading comprehension quiz ³

¹ Purpose: understand elements of literature reviews and how to synthesize research; CCHE Goals: 2, 3, 4

² Purpose: understand notions of concision, parallelism, and precision; CCHE Goal: 3

³ Purpose: apply key lessons of the week; CCHE Goals: 1, 3, 4

WEEK 10: STANDARDS OF RESEARCH IN POLITICAL SCIENCE_4 & THE REVISION PROCESS

Guiding Questions: What is the relevance of normative political theory to quantitative and qualitative empirical studies, and how does normative theorizing help us analyze problems of political science? How do less-experienced writers revise their writing? What does it mean to critically reflect on one’s writing?

Objectives: Contrary to conventional understanding, recognize that all empirical research in our discipline is motivated—implicitly or explicitly—by normative judgments and arguments: that descriptive, empirical, and normative arguments are interdependent and not mutually exclusive. Understand the importance of the revision process, and that more experienced writers know how to critically reflect on and substantively revise their working drafts

Monday, 20 March: Intersection of Normative Political Theory and Empirical Analysis

- Catherine Elgin, “The Relativity of Fact and the Objectivity of Value,” *The Harvard Review of Philosophy*, Vol. 6, No. 1 (1996): 4-15¹
- Idean Salehyan et al., “Explaining External Support for Insurgent Groups,” *International Organization*, Vol. 65, No. 4 (2011): only 709-35²
- Class activity: explore the normative implications of one’s research project³

¹ Purpose: learn bias against and role of value judgments in political science research; CCHE Goals: 3, 4

² Purpose: critically analyze reading to consider relevance of normative theory; CCHE Goals: 3, 4

³ Purpose: reiterate that empirical research is grounded in value judgments; CCHE Goal: 4

WEEK 10 CONTINUED

Wednesday, 22 March: Peer-Review Workshop

- Emily Meyer and Louise Smith, *The Practical Tutor* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987): chapter 2¹
- Students must conference with me to discuss their progress on their research projects²
- Literature review rough draft must be uploaded to D2L before class and two hard copies due in class
- Class activity: peer-review workshop of literature review³
- Reading comprehension quiz 8⁴

¹ Purpose: discuss writing as a process and common difficulties novice writers have; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

² Purpose: discuss working draft; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 3, 4

³ Purpose: engage in peer review; CCHE Goal: 2

⁴ Purpose: apply key lessons of the week; CCHE Goals: 1, 3, 4

WEEK 11: SPRING BREAK

Monday, 27 March and Wednesday, 29 March

WEEK 12: POLITICAL THEORY AND PUBLIC POLICY

Guiding Questions: What are some common writing conventions in the Political Theory and Public Policy subfields? How, if at all, do the reading selections exemplify principles of good academic writing?

Objectives: Apply principles of rhetorical analysis and good academic writing in critically analyzing the reading selections. Articulate positive and negative aspects of the writing in each reading selection, and identify commonalities in writing conventions across the selections in each subfield. Apply principles of good academic argumentation and the social scientific method in critically evaluating the empirical analyses and theoretical arguments of each reading selection.

Monday, 3 April: April: Scholarship in Normative Political Theory

- Iris Marion Young, "Responsibility and Global Labor Justice," *Journal of Political Philosophy*, Vol. 12, No. 4 (2004): 365-88¹
- Judith Jarvis Thomson, "Self-Defense," *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, Vol. 20, No. 4 (1991): 283-310¹

¹ Purpose: critically analyze reading; CCHE Goals: 1, 3, 4

Wednesday, 5 April: Scholarship in Public Policy

- William Cronon, "Kennebott Journey: The Paths Out of Town," in *Under An Open Sky: Rethinking America's Western Past*, Cronon et al., eds. (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1992): 28-51¹
- Krister Andersson, "Understanding Decentralized Forest Governance: An Application of the Institutional Analysis and Development Framework," *Sustainability: Science, Practice, and Policy*, Vol. 2, No. 1 (2006): 25-35¹
- Literature review final draft must be uploaded to D2L before class and one hard copy due in class²
- Reading comprehension quiz 9³

¹ Purpose: critically analyze reading; CCHE Goals: 1, 3, 4

² Purpose: complete second writing assignment; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 3, 4

³ Purpose: apply key lessons of the week; CCHE Goals: 1, 3, 4

WEEK 13: OUTLINING THE RESEARCH PAPER & AMERICAN GOVERNMENT

Guiding Questions: What is the argument you want to make in your research paper, what evidence will you need to defend this argument how have others answered the research question you are engaging, what assumptions are you making in your argument or about your topic or about your audience, are these assumptions reasonable, what objections to your argument should you anticipate, and how will you respond to these counterarguments? What are some writing conventions in the American subfield and how, if at all, do these selections exemplify principles of good writing?

Objectives: Review the components of the traditional research paper and begin to organize your writing: articulate the reasons and evidence you will use to defend your central thesis, organize your argument around existing relevant scholarship, know contemporary debates in the literature about your topic and be able to identify the unique contribution your argument will make to the discussion. Also, apply principles of rhetorical analysis and good academic writing in critically analyzing the reading selections. Articulate positive and negative aspects of the writing in each of American selections, and identify commonalities in writing conventions across these readings. Apply principles of good academic argumentation in critically evaluating the normative arguments of the two readings.

Monday, 10 April: Writing Workshop

Independent research/reading

- Students receive directions for the research paper outline¹
- Students sign up for a mandatory conference with me to discuss their working research projects
- Class activity: drawing on their literature reviews, students begin writing detailed paper outlines²

¹ Purpose: understand requirements of the third writing assignment; CCHE Goal: 2

² Purpose: begin organizing the research paper; CCHE Goals: 2, 4

Wednesday, 12 April: Scholarship in American Government

- Robert Dahl, "On Removing the Impediments to Democracy in the United States," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 92, No. 1 (1977): 1-20¹
- James Stimson, *Tides of Consent: How Public Opinion Shapes American Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004): chapter 2 excerpt (viz., 23-36 or 23-50)¹
- Reading comprehension quiz 10²

¹ Purpose: critically analyze reading; CCHE Goals: 1, 3, 4

² Purpose: apply key lessons of the week; CCHE Goals: 1, 3, 4

WEEK 14: COMPARATIVE POLITICS AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Guiding Questions: What are some common writing conventions in the Comparative and International Relations subfields? How, if at all, do the selections exemplify principles of good academic writing?

Objectives: Apply principles of rhetorical analysis and good academic writing in critically analyzing the reading selections. Articulate positive and negative aspects of the writing in each reading selection, and identify commonalities in writing conventions across the selections in each subfield. Apply principles of good academic argumentation and the social scientific method in critically evaluating the empirical analyses and theoretical arguments of each reading selection.

Monday, 17 April: Scholarship in Comparative Politics

- David Laitin, "Three Patterns of Peripheral Incorporation," in *Identity in Formation: Russian-Speaking Populations in the Near Abroad* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998): 59-82¹
- Gerardo Munck and Carol Leff, "Modes of Transition and Democratization: South America and Eastern Europe in Comparative Perspective," *Comparative Politics*, Vol. 29, No. 3 (1997): 343-62¹
- Outline final draft must be uploaded to D2L before class and one hard copy due in class²

¹ Purpose: critically analyze reading; CCHE Goals: 1, 3, 4

² Purpose: complete third writing assignment; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 3, 4

WEEK 14 CONTINUED

Wednesday, 19 April: Scholarship in International Relations

- Sebastian Rosato, "The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 97, No. 4 (2003): 585-602¹
- Emilie Hafner-Burton, "Trading Human Rights: How Preferential Trade Agreements Influence Government Repression," *International Organization*, Vol. 59, No. (2005): only 593-620¹
- Students must conference with me to discuss their progress on their research projects²
- Reading comprehension quiz 11³

¹ Purpose: critically analyze reading; CCHE Goals: 1, 3, 4

² Purpose: discuss working draft; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 3, 4

³ Purpose: apply key lessons of the week; CCHE Goals: 1, 3, 4

WEEK 15: ETHICAL ASPECTS OF WRITING_1

Guiding Questions: What are our responsibilities as writers of political science? In what ways can the knowledge that our research and writing help to generate affect others? How can we give more helpful comments when reviewing the writing of our peers? How can we improve the way we revise our writing?

Objectives: Understand that political science research—and writing more broadly—can have substantial and lasting effects on others, that our discipline emphasizes the importance of civic engagement, and that we should consider our responsibility to direct the knowledge we gain through writing to improve the welfare of others. Reiterate the need to offer specific, constructive, and detailed comments on the writing of our peers.

Monday, 24 April: Writing as Community-Oriented—Knowledge, Power, and Accountability

- Robert Bullard, "Unequal Environmental Protection," in *Worst Things First*, Finkel and Golding, eds. (Washington: Resources for the Future, 1994)¹
- Tony Robinson, "Service Learning as Justice Advocacy: Can Political Scientists Do Politics?," *Political Science and Politics*, Vol. 33, No. 3 (2000): 605-12¹
- Class activity: explore the implications of one's research project¹

¹ Purpose: consider broader implications of our writing and responsibilities as writers; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

Wednesday, 26 April: The Revision Process Revisited and Writing Workshop

- Clifford Bob, "A Question and an Argument: Enhancing Student Writing through Guided Research Assignments," *Political Science and Politics*, Vol. 34, No. 3 (2001): 653-55¹
- Nancy Sommers, "Responding to Student Writing," *College Composition and Communication*, Vol. 33, No. 2 (1982): 148-56²
- Research paper rough draft must be uploaded to D2L before class and two hard copies due in class
- Class activity: peer-review workshop of working draft of essay 3³
- Reading comprehension quiz 12⁴

¹ Purpose: understand the importance of the peer-review and revision processes; CCHE Goal: 2

² Purpose: reiterate how to provide more helpful and constructive peer-review feedback; CCHE Goal: 4

³ Purpose: engage in peer review; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 4

⁴ Purpose: apply key lessons of the week; CCHE Goals: 1, 3, 4

WEEK 16: ETHICAL ASPECTS OF WRITING_2

Guiding Questions: What are our responsibilities as writers of political science? In what ways can the knowledge that our research and writing help to generate affect others?

Objectives: Recognize that knowledge can translate into political influence, that knowledge can therefore be manipulated for private gain, and that individuals—from scientists to academics and laypersons—must hold those in positions of epistemic authority accountable. Accordingly, we should consider again our responsibility to direct the knowledge we gain through writing to improve the welfare of others.

Monday, 1 May: Writing as Community-Oriented—Knowledge, Power, and Accountability

- Plato, excerpt from *The Republic*, Lee, trans. (New York: Penguin Publishing, 1987 [380 BCE])—on the “Allegory of the Cave” and aiding others out of the darkness of ignorance (Book VII) ¹
- Kristin Shrader-Frechette, “Human Rights and Duties to Alleviate Environmental Injustice: The Domestic Case,” *Journal of Human Rights*, Vol. 6, No. 1 (2007): *only* 107-18¹
- **Students must bring one hard copy of only the conclusion of their research paper**
- Class activity: further explore the implications of one’s research project and revise one’s conclusion¹

¹ Purpose: consider broader implications of our writing and responsibilities as writers; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

Wednesday, 3 May: Writing as a Protracted, Non-Linear Process and Writing Workshop

- Nancy Sommers, “Revision Strategies of Student Writers and Experienced Adult Writers,” *College Composition and Communication*. Vol. 31, No.4 (1980): 378-88¹
- **Hard copy of revised draft of research paper due in class**
- Class activity: second peer-review workshop of working draft of research paper²
- **Reading comprehension quiz 13³**

¹ Purpose: understand that writing is a cyclical and critically self-reflective process; CCHE Goals: 2, 4

² Purpose: engage in peer review; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 4

³ Purpose: apply key lessons of the week; CCHE Goals: 1, 3, 4

FINALS WEEK

Tuesday, 9 May: No final exam is scheduled—our class does not meet today

Research paper final draft must be uploaded to D2L by 7:30pm—no hard copy required¹

¹ Purpose: complete fourth writing assignment; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 3, 4