

## **POLI 7961: APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF POLITICS**

*Read, write, think, repeat with deliberate practice.*

Fall 2017  
Fridays, 1:30-4:20pm  
210 Stubbs Hall

### **Instructor**

Christopher M. Sullivan  
Email: [csullivanlsu@gmail.com](mailto:csullivanlsu@gmail.com)

Office Hours: Weds and Fri 11:30am-12:30pm (and by appointment)  
Office: 219 Stubbs Hall

A note on office hours – please email me ahead of time to let me know what you would like to discuss during office hours so that I can prepare to assist in the best way possible.

Email “office hours”: 12:30-2, m-f

I prefer to structure my engagement with email. If you need a prompt response, please reach me during these hours.

**Course Description:** This course provides an overview of the scope, methods, and norms of empirical research in political science. After outlining the scientific method and its application in the various subfields of the discipline, we will move onto more specific discussions of concept formation, theoretical mechanisms, measurement development, and basic tests of cause-and-effect relationships. Within this general framework, we will examine cross-case and case-specific quantitative analysis, interview and survey methods, experimental design in both laboratory and field settings, mixed methods analysis, and formal theoretical and computational modeling. Finally and perhaps most importantly, priority will be placed on drafting a full-length research proposal.

### **Required Texts:**

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. *Designing social inquiry: Scientific inference in qualitative research*. Princeton university press, 1994.

Gerring, John. *Social science methodology: A unified framework*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Morgan, Stephen L., and Christopher Winship. *Counterfactuals and causal inference*. Cambridge University Press, 2014. (available as ebook <http://lib.lsu.edu/ebooks>)

### **Course Structure and Grading–**

Evaluation and course grades are based on (a) class engagement, including participation in seminar, two weeks leading the discussion and presenting a dissertation one week (33% if final grade); (b) a series of assignments, including a short draft of a funding

application, that will form the basis for a research design paper (33% of final grade); and (c) the final research design paper (34% of final grade).

### **(A) Class Engagement**

*Participation in Seminar:* This is a graduate research seminar class focused on group discussion. To help facilitate the class discussion, it is imperative that students come prepared to each class having read that week's materials. Emphasis will be placed on quality of participation, including responses to the readings and to other students' comments. In addition to participation in group discussion, students will occasionally be called upon at random to diagram the theoretical argument or empirical model employed in the texts under review, or to describe the contributions of a particular chapter within the broader book. The objective is to identify the core independent and dependent variables as well as the causal mechanisms underlying dynamic processes.

*Discussion leader:* While all students are expected to come to class prepared to discuss each week's readings, we also will have two official "discussion leaders" for each week. The chief responsibility of the discussion leaders is to come up with a set of three to five themes or questions around which to focus discussion during our class meeting. In doing so, the discussion leaders should consider the issues raised in the reaction papers, as well as in the readings themselves. The discussion leaders are not responsible for summarizing the readings; rather, his or her responsibility is to structure our discussion and, where necessary, to move the conversation along. The discussion leaders also are not responsible for leading discussion of the "professional socialization" reading(s). Signups for discussion leader duties also will occur during the first class meeting. One should not serve as discussion leader during a week when one is presenting a dissertation.

*Dissertation Presentation:* Each week one or more students will present a recently completed dissertation relating to their desired field of study. Dissertations should be chosen by the student. The only stipulations are that they have been completed (1) in the field of political science and (2) within the past 10 years. The presenter should spend 10-15 minutes articulating the dissertation's research question, surrounding literature, argument, hypotheses, research design, findings, and significance. The presenter should then spend 5-10 minutes providing his or her interpretation and critique of the dissertation. Presentation slides are encouraged, but not required. These presentations will then be followed by 5-10 minutes of question and answer, with the presenter standing in for the dissertation's author. Dissertations can be accessed from <https://search-proquest-com.libezp.lib.lsu.edu/>, individual university webpages, and by direct email with the author.

### **(B) Assignments**

Much of what we will read in this class is about *how* to select, design and implement

research projects in political science. We usually begin with a puzzle that motivates a research question; review existing literature on and approaches to the question or subject; develop a theoretical argument and a set of hypotheses; and then design an empirical analysis of the hypotheses (not to mention carrying out the analysis!).

Over the course of the semester, you'll be asked to engage in each of these steps. The topic is entirely up to you; this is a chance to begin to explore an issue in political science that interests you. On the given topic, you'll be asked to submit:

*Funding application draft:* One of the things you'll be asked to do in graduate school – and in your career after graduate school – is to craft proposals for fellowships, grants, summer research money, and the like. It's never too early to begin learning how to write a good funding application.

The National Science Foundation's Graduate Research Fellowship Program (GRFP) is one for which most first-year PhD students are eligible: it is open to U.S. citizens and permanent residents who are in their first year of graduate study during Fall 2014, or who have completed no more than twelve months of full time graduate study as of August 1, 2014. The fellowship provides a stipend of \$32,000 for three years, and it also covers some tuition-related expenses. In the most recent GRFP award cycle, seventeen of these fellowships were given to Political Science PhD students nationwide. The class Sakai site contains proposals and reviews from several UNC Political Science graduate students who have applied in recent years, and who received Honorable Mentions from the NSF GRFP program.

Applications for the GRFP are due on **October 23, 2017**, and they include three letters of reference from faculty members (due to the NSF on **October 26**), as well as three two-page statements – a Personal Statement Essay, Previous Research Essay, and a Proposed Research statement. Each may be no longer than two pages (single spacing is fine), in 12 point Times New Roman and with one inch margins.

Application instructions are at [https://www.nsf.gov/funding/pgm\\_summ.jsp?pims\\_id=6201](https://www.nsf.gov/funding/pgm_summ.jsp?pims_id=6201). Please consult these, as they will provide a sense of what the Proposed Graduate Study statement should contain. And please consider making a full application to the NSF GRFP. I'm happy to provide feedback on drafts of your essays. Ann Whitmer, Assistant Dean of Grants and Contracts, can help you with getting a password and access to the NSF Fastlane system (<[awhitme@lsu.edu](mailto:awhitme@lsu.edu)>). Faculty working in your intended subfield also can provide feedback on your proposal draft. For this class, everyone – **regardless of eligibility for the NSF fellowship** – is required to draft the Proposed Research Statement. This is due on **September 29**.

*Introduction:* A five-to-seven page introduction, articulating the puzzle/research question you hope to answer summarizing past research on your given topic (**due October 13**). Feel free to draw from your funding application statement (or to change

course from that statement). Your question should be framed in a way that is broad enough to be of interest not only to specialists in a sub-sub-field, but also narrow enough to be tractable in the space of a research paper, article or dissertation. Admittedly, it's difficult to necessarily know which questions need asking without knowing what's been done on a given topic, so while this is a short writing assignment, it will require some background reading and research. Feel free to ask faculty in your area of interest for suggestions about what to read and/or what questions have yet to be addressed satisfactorily.

Read some of the political science literature related to your chosen question, and decide how to situate your question/interests in this literature. What have others already argued? What have they found? How can their theoretical approaches be improved upon or synthesized? Note that the literature is not simply an annotated bibliography, or a "he said, she said" that summarizes a bunch of things you've read. Rather, a good literature review identifies what the state of knowledge is, discusses where the shortcomings/openings are, and sets up your own theoretical thinking on the subject.

*Theory and Hypotheses:* A five-to-seven page theory discussion (**due October 27**) in which you advance an argument about your chosen puzzle (e.g. under what conditions does multinational production lead to improvements in workers' rights, and why?), and develop one or more causal claims which flow from this argument. This document should culminate in the statement of one or more testable hypotheses.

*Data and Methods:* A five-to-seven page data and methods discussion (**due November 10**) presenting the planned empirical tests of your hypotheses. In that section of the research design, you should discuss how (using what sorts of methods, what kind of data, for which countries/cases etc) you would test your hypotheses, and why your chosen method and evidence is appropriate.

### **(C) Final Research Design Paper**

Once you have all of the pieces, you'll be able to combine them into your final course assignment, which is a full research design. This document (20 to 25 pages, double spaced) should deploy theoretical literature and an empirical puzzle to set up the research question, develop hypotheses, and present a methodology for testing the hypotheses. The research design does not require execution of the research project (e.g. it does not require doing statistical analyses or writing case studies); rather, it focuses on the theoretical development of a project, which might later be turned into a conference paper or article, or might be the basis for a grant or dissertation proposal. The final research design is due on **December 1 at noon**. You may turn this in as a hard copy, or you may submit electronically.

**Class Summary:**

Week	Subject	Discussion Leaders	Dissertation Presenter	Assignment
1. Aug 25	Introduction			
2. Sept 1	Ontology and Epistemology			
3. Sept 8	political SCIENCE			
4. Sept 15	Causality			
5. Sept 22	Sampling and Inference			
6. Sept 29	Counter-factuals			NSF Proposed Research Statement
7. Oct 6	Research questions			
8. Oct 13	POLITICAL science			Intro/Lit Review
9. Oct 20	No Class – Fall Break			
10. Oct 27	Theory and Mechanisms			Theory/Hypotheses
11. Nov 3	No Class - Conference			
12. Nov 10	Scope Conditions / Generalization			Data/Methods
13. Nov 17	Concepts and Measures			
14. Nov 24	No Class - Thanksgiving			
15. Dec 1	How to succeed			Final Paper

## **Survival Strategies and Recommendations** (generously shared by Josh Potter)

There are many ways to teach an introductory seminar in research design. Political science is an extremely diverse discipline with all manner of methodological outlooks and approaches. Practitioners of political science are steeped in different backgrounds and each approach comes with its fair share of biases and blinders. I have great respect for methodological pluralism and I hope to have discussions in this class that are inclusive of multiple approaches to research design.

You also have your own biases, whether you're aware of them at this point or not. To a large extent, your experience with the material is mediated by your academic background, your interests, and your ability to roll up your sleeves and put in a good day's work. For this reason, you will find that you and your peers will understand concepts at different rates, develop certain facilities with greater intensities, and harbor divergent preferences over which questions and manuscripts are interesting, effective, and successful. Here are some general principles to keep in mind:

You will not quickly "get" most things. Graduate school is a difficult process where you read hard materials, wrestle with challenging concepts, and labor intensively on nailing down seemingly minute details. You will feel lost and you may feel lost often. That's fine. Take a deep breath and plow ahead. Understanding comes with time and iteration. Patience and work trumps intelligence quotient. Get into the habit of working 12 hour days and weekends. Grow accustomed to running down rabbit holes, meticulously collecting data, and writing multiple drafts of course papers. Step away from the internet, set aside the cell phone, and turn off the television. The life of the successful scholar is characterized by focused, quiet contemplation. Brilliance is biological, but learnedness is acquired through labor.

There is no dignity here, but also no shame. If you spend time trying to maintain a facade of intelligence in front of your peers, you'll be wasting most of that time. We are all essentially idiots moonlighting as smart people. Learn to take criticism, internalize it, and adapt in line with its suggestions. Learn to hazard a guess, take a risk in discussion, and get corrected.

### *How to Read*

Of necessity, there is a rather large reading load in this course. You will probably find yourself getting overwhelmed at points and, to an extent, this is by design. Learning how to "skim" materials or read strategically is a valuable tool you need to develop in the course of your graduate education. This is not to say that you should read superficially; rather, read with a focused aim that extracts from manuscripts important pieces of information.

Our readings can be largely classified into two sets: first, those that are instructional in nature insofar as they summarize or detail an approach to research; second, those that are examples of said approaches. The latter set will be substantively grounded in one of the subfields of political science, while the

former set will present materials that are broadly applicable across all subfields. I would recommend “active” engagement while reading. Rather than simply highlighting or taking notations in the margins, get out a separate piece of paper (or a new Word document) and write (or type) summaries of specific important details within each manuscript. This will constitute a reading journal, of sorts, that you can use for the in-class discussion. Remember that retention is correlated with activity; passive reading will not help you.

### *How to Write*

I take the evaluation of your written work extremely seriously. There is, in short, no more important task an academic performs than writing. You will be put to a variety of writing tasks this semester, none of which is a full-length research manuscript, but all of which are designed with the underlying goal of preparing you for such a task. Practice clear, analytical writing across all of these assignments. Remember that in the context of this course, you are analysts rather than advocates.

Submitted manuscripts should be carefully proofread, free of typographical errors, and evince a high level of organization. I am very willing to read preliminary drafts and provide feedback in advance of the submission deadline; I am much less willing to read hastily assembled and poorly organized final submissions. Good time management and close consultation with the professor will result in stronger end-of-semester products.

### *How to Interact*

I exist for you as a resource. I do not keep set office hours because I am almost always willing to meet with students provided that they’ve given me a bit of notice ahead of time. I’m around a lot and I try to be accessible to you.

In general, building rapport with your professors is the sine qua non of a successful graduate school career. I want to know what you’re interested in working on; I don’t mind hashing out half-formed research ideas; I very much enjoy reading students’ work while it is in-progress; and I am happy to provide advice or support if you find yourself in a bind during the semester. As problems or confusions arise, please be proactive and come talk to me. The sooner I am aware of a situation, the more helpful I can be.

**Cell / Internet Policy** – Put your cell phones on vibrate and refrain from using them during class. Laptops can be used for note taking. But your attention should be directed exclusively to the subject matter being discussed in class. Most of us are wired most of the time. Your engagement in the course and opportunities for collective learning will be enhanced by maintaining focus on the classroom here and now.

**Late Papers** – Late papers will not be accepted except in instances of medical necessity (with a doctor’s note) or death of an immediate relative (with an obituary or other official notice).

**Course Outline:**

Week 1 – August, 23rd

- Introduction and Discussion

Students are Strongly Encouraged to attend one of the following webinars put on by the NSF explaining the Graduate Research Fellowship application process:

Date	Time	Direct Link	Access Code
Monday, August 28, 2017	11:00 am EDT	<a href="http://tinyurl.com/yboy2rdv">http://tinyurl.com/yboy2rdv</a>	743 986 952
Tuesday, August 29, 2017	2:00 pm EDT	<a href="http://tinyurl.com/ybg7pwd7">http://tinyurl.com/ybg7pwd7</a>	748 804 468
Thursday, August 31, 2017	1:00 pm EDT	<a href="http://tinyurl.com/ycouj77c">http://tinyurl.com/ycouj77c</a>	743 306 800

**To Teleconference in:**

Direct Call-in Number: [1-415-655-0002](tel:1-415-655-0002) (Use Access Code from table above to connect to your meeting)

**To join the online meeting through the WebEx Website:**

1. Click NSF WebEx link: <https://nsf.webex.com>.
2. Enter the WebEx Meeting ID (Access Code from the table above), then click "Join Meeting."
3. When requested, enter your name and email address and passcode; it is EPSCoR17!
4. Click "Join"

Week 2 – September 1st

- Politics and Science, Ontology and Epistemology

- o **Readings**

- Silver, Skim all, read closely pp 6-61, 132-167, 196-212, 302-303, 328-372
- Grix, Jonathan. "Introducing students to the generic terminology of social research." *Politics* 22.3 (2002): 175-186.
- Almond, Gabriel A., and Stephen J. Genco. "Clouds, clocks, and the study of politics." *World politics* 29.4 (1977): 489-522.



- \*A short blog post on graduate school: <http://www.whiteoliphaunt.com/duckofminerva/2014/07/an-open-letter-from-the-new-dgs.html>
- \* McMahan, John – Critical Reading <http://johnmcmahan.ws.gc.cuny.edu/files/2013/10/critical-reading-workshop-handout.pdf>

Week 3 – September 8<sup>th</sup>

- political SCIENCE

○ **Readings**

- KKV Ch 1-3
- Gerring Ch 1-2
- Karl Popper, *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*
  - -Chapter 1: “A Survey of Some Fundamental Problems” (provided)
  - Chapter 2: “On the Problem of a Theory of Scientific Method” (provided)
- Geddes, Barbara. 1990. "How the Cases You Chose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics." *Political Analysis*, 2: 131-150.
- \*Stephen B. Rothman. 2008. “Comparatively Evaluating Potential Dissertation and Thesis Projects.” *PS: Political Science and Politics* (April): 367-

Week 4 – September 15<sup>th</sup>

- Causality

○ **Readings**

- MW, Ch 1-3
- Gerring, ch 3, 8-9
- Gerring, John, and Rose McDermott. "An experimental template for case study research." *American Journal of Political Science* 51.3 (2007): 688-701.
- \*Monroe, Kristen Renwick, Jenny Choi, Emily Howell, Chloe Lampros-Monroe, Crystal Trejo and Valentina Perez. 2014. “Gender Equality in the Ivory Tower and How Best to Achieve It.” *PS: Political Science and Politics* (April), 418-426.

Week 5 – September 22<sup>nd</sup>

- Sampling and Inference

○ **Readings**

- KKV Ch 4-5
- MW Ch 4-5
- Gerring, Ch 4

- Wedeen, Lisa. "Conceptualizing culture: Possibilities for political science." *American Political Science Review* 96.4 (2002): 713-728.
- \*Przeworski, Adam and Frank Salomon. "On the Art of Writing Proposals." Social Science Research Council.

Week 6 – September 29<sup>th</sup>

- Counter-factual Argumentation

o **Readings**

- KKV, Ch 6
- MW, Ch 10
- Karl Popper, *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*
  - -Chapter 4: "Falsifiability" (provided)
- Fearon, James D. "Counterfactuals and Hypothesis Testing in Political Science." *World Politics* vol.43 no.2 (January 1991): 169-195.
- Sekhon, J.S. 2004. "Quality Meets Quantity: Case Studies, Conditional Probability and Counterfactuals." *Perspectives on Politics*, Vol. 2: 281-293
- James Mahoney and Gary Goertz. 2004. "The Possibility Principle: Choosing Negative Cases in Comparative Research." *American Political Science Review*. 98, pp. 653-669.
- \*Andrew Little, 2016. Three Templates for Introductions to Political Science Articles (provided)

Week 7 – October 6<sup>th</sup>

- Research Questions

o **Readings**

- Gerring Ch 5-7
- Rogowski, Ronald. "The Role of Theory and Anomaly in Social-Scientific Inference." *American Political Science Review* vol.89 no.2 (June 1995): 467-470.
- Tilly, Charles (1999). "The Trouble with Stories" in in Ronald Aminzade & Bernice Pescosolido, eds., *The Social Worlds of Higher Education*. (1999) Handbook for Teaching in a New Century. Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press (provided)
- Bates, Robert, et al. "Analytic narratives revisited." *Social Science History* 24.4 (2000): 685-696.
- Eidlin, Fred. "The method of problems versus the method of topics." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 44.4 (2011): 758-761.
- \*Knopf, Jeffrey. 2006. "Writing a Literature Review." *PS: Political Science and Politics* (January): 127- 132.

Week 8 – October 13<sup>th</sup>

- POLITICAL science

o **Readings**

- Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, (selected chapters) (provided)
- Imre Lakatos. "Falsification and the Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes," in Imre Lakatos and Alan Musgrave (eds.), *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (provided).
- Ioannidis, John PA. "Why most published research findings are false." *PLoS medicine* 2.8 (2005): e124.
- Loken, Eric, and Andrew Gelman. "Measurement error and the replication crisis." *Science* 355.6325 (2017): 584-585.
- Gelman, Andrew. "The failure of null hypothesis significance testing when studying incremental changes, and what to do about it." (2017). Unpublished manuscript
- Gerber, Alan, and Neil Malhotra. "Do statistical reporting standards affect what is published? Publication bias in two leading political science journals." *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 3.3 (2008): 313-326.
- \* Mead, Lawrence M. "Scholasticism in political science." *Perspectives on Politics* 8.2 (2010): 453-464.

Week 9 – October 20<sup>th</sup>

- **Fall Break – No Class**

Week 9 – October 27<sup>th</sup>

- Theories and Mechanisms

o **Readings**

- MW, Ch8
- Shapiro, Ian. "Problems, methods, and theories in the study of politics, or what's wrong with political science and what to do about it." *Political Theory* 30.4 (2002): 596-619.
- Elster, Jon. "Marxism, Functionalism, and Game Theory." *DEBATES IN CONTEMPORARY POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY* (2003): 22-40 (provided)
- Greif, Avner, and David D. Laitin. "A theory of endogenous institutional change." *American political science review* 98.4 (2004): 633-652.
- Gerring, John. "The mechanistic worldview: Thinking inside the box." *British journal of political science* 38.1 (2008): 161-179.
- Huber, John. 2013. "Is Theory Getting Lost in the Identification Revolution?" *Political Economist* newsletter, Summer 2013.
- \* LaPorte, Jody. "Confronting a Crisis of Research Design." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 47.02 (2014): 414-417.

-

Week 10 – November 3<sup>rd</sup>

- **Peace Science – No Class**

<b>11/03</b>	<b>Final date for dropping courses, 4:30 p.m., deadline</b>
--------------	---

Week 11 – November 10<sup>th</sup>

- Concepts and Measures

○ **Readings**

- Gerring, Ch 7
- McCamant, John F. "Governance without Blood: Social Science's Antiseptic View of Rule; or The Neglect of Political Repression." *The state as terrorist* (1984): 11-42. (provided)
- Robert Adcock and David Collier, "Measurement Validity: Toward a Shared Framework for Qualitative and Quantitative Research," *American Political Science Review* 95 (3) (September 2001).
- Collier, David, Jody LaPorte, and Jason Seawright. 2012. "Putting Typologies to Work: Concept Formation, Measurement, and Analytic Rigor." *Political Research Quarterly*. 65(1): 217- 232.
- Seawright, Jason, and David Collier. "Rival strategies of validation: Tools for evaluating measures of democracy." *Comparative Political Studies* 47.1 (2014): 111-138.
- Wedeen, Lisa. "Reflections on ethnographic work in political science." *Annual Review of Political Science* 13 (2010): 255-272.
- \* Refsum Jensenius, Francesca. 2014. "The Fieldwork of Data Collection." *PS: Political Science and Politics*. 47(2): 402-404.

Week 12 – November 17<sup>th</sup>

- Scope Conditions and Generalization

○ **Readings**

- Gerring, Ch 11-14
- Falleti, Tulia G., and Julia F. Lynch. "Context and causal mechanisms in political analysis." *Comparative political studies* 42.9 (2009): 1143-1166.
- Ziblatt, "Of Course Generalize, But How? Returning to Middle Range Theory in Comparative Politics," (Forum on Middle Range Theory) *American Political Science Association- Comparative Politics Newsletter*, Vol. 17, No. 2. [E]
- Evan S. Lieberman, E. S. (2001). "Causal Inference in Historical Institutional Analysis: A Specification of Periodization Strategies." *Comparative Political Studies* 34( 9) (2001): 1011-1035.
- Tilly, Charles. (2006) "Why and How History Matters, in *Oxford*

*Handbook of Contextual Political Analysis* (provided)

- \* Miller, Beth, Jon Pevehouse, Ron Rogowski, Dustin Tingley, and Rick Wilson. 2013. "How to be a Peer Reviewer: A Guide for Recent and Soon-To-Be PhDs." *PS: Political Science and Politics*. 46(1): 120-123.

Week 13 – November 24<sup>th</sup>

- **Thanksgiving – No Class**

Week 14 – December 1<sup>st</sup>

- Work, in Process

- **Readings**

- Gerring, Postscript
- \*Rich, Timothy. 2013. "Publishing as a Graduate Student: A Quick and (Hopefully) Painless Guide to Establishing Yourself as a Scholar." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 46(2): 376-379.
- \* Polsky, Andrew J. 2007. "Seeing Your Name in Print: Unpacking the Mysteries of the Review Process at Political Science Scholarly Journals." *PS: Political Science and Politics*. 40(3): 539- 543.
- \*Garand, James C., Micheal W. Giles, André Blais, and Iain McLean. 2009. "Political Science Journals in Comparative Perspective: Evaluating Scholarly Journals in the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom." *PS: Political Science and Politics*. 42(4): 695-717.

**Final Papers due by midnight on December 1<sup>st</sup>.**

**Pro forma Material:**

**Grading Policy:** The grading breakdown is as follows:

<b>Highest</b>	<b>Lowest</b>	<b>Letter</b>
99.99 %	93.00 %	A
92.99 %	90.00 %	A-
89.99 %	87.00 %	B+
86.99 %	83.00 %	B
82.99 %	80.00 %	B-
79.99 %	77.00 %	C+
76.99 %	73.00 %	C

<b>Highest</b>	<b>Lowest</b>	<b>Letter</b>
72.99 %	70.00 %	C-
69.99 %	67.00 %	D+
66.99 %	63.00 %	D
62.99 %	60.00 %	D-
59.99 %	0.00 %	F

- The letter grade A, including A+ and A-, denotes distinguished mastery of the course material.
- The letter grade B, including B+ and B-, denotes good mastery of the course material.
- The letter grade C, including C+ and C-, denotes acceptable mastery of the course material.
- The letter grade D, including D+ and D-, denotes minimally acceptable achievement.
- F denotes failure.

### **General Statement on Academic Integrity:**

Louisiana State University adopted the Commitment to Community in 1995 to set forth guidelines for student behavior both inside and outside of the classroom. The Commitment to Community charges students to maintain high standards of academic and personal integrity. All students are expected to read and be familiar with the LSU Code of Student Conduct and Commitment to Community, found online at [www.lsu.edu/saa](http://www.lsu.edu/saa). It is your responsibility as a student at LSU to know and understand the academic standards for our community.

Students who are suspected of violating the Code of Conduct will be referred to the Office of Student Advocacy and Accountability. For undergraduate students, a first academic violation could result in a zero grade on the assignment or failing the class and disciplinary probation until graduation. For a second academic violation, the result could be suspension from LSU. For graduate students, suspension is the appropriate outcome for the first offense.

### **Plagiarism and Citation Method:**

As a student at LSU, it is your responsibility to refrain from plagiarizing the academic property of another and to utilize appropriate citation method for all coursework. The most frequently used citation method in political science is internal citation (e.g., Sullivan 2015). I would encourage you to follow this format and include footnotes where relevant; leaving full citations for a ‘Works Referenced’ page that follows the main text.<sup>1</sup>

Ignorance of the citation method is not an excuse for academic misconduct. Remember there is a difference between paraphrasing and quoting and how to properly cite each respectively. If you have questions regarding what is appropriate, please consult with the library’s tutorials on avoiding plagiarism and proper citation formats.

### **Group work and unauthorized assistance:**

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.lib.umd.edu/tl/guides/citing-chicago-ad>

All work must be completed without assistance unless explicit permission for group or partner work is given by the faculty member. This is critical so that the professor can assess your performance on each assignment. If a group/partner project is assigned, the student may still have individual work to complete. Read the syllabus and assignment directions carefully. You might have a project with group work and a follow up report that is independently written. When in doubt, e-mail the faculty member or ask during a class session. Seeking clarification is your responsibility as a student. Assuming group/partner work is okay without permission constitutes a violation of the LSU Code of Student Conduct.

**Students requiring special accommodation:**

Louisiana State University is committed to providing reasonable accommodations for all persons with disabilities. Any student with a documented disability needing academic adjustments is requested to speak with the Disability Services and the instructor, as early in the semester as possible. All discussions will remain confidential. This publication/material is available in alternative formats upon request. Please contact the Disability Services, 115 Johnston Hall, (225) 578-5919.