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This seminar provides an intensive introduction to political sociology, which is generally focused on understanding how power is constructed, distributed, legitimated, and transformed. We survey the field of political sociology, examining major theoretical perspectives, and exploring the ways these debates have been translated into empirical research using a variety of methodological approaches. We will explore power and politics by looking at nation-states, social movements, and the larger global political-economic context, and use a range of theoretical lenses, including pluralist, institutionalist, class, post-structuralist, race, feminist, and postcolonial approaches.

Although a survey course, this course is not able to cover all of the facets of political sociology. Courses in Sociology such as Social Movements, Welfare States, Transnational Feminist Movements, Postcolonial Theories, and Gender & Social Policy help address specialized topics in political sociology in greater depth. Courses in CPPA such as the Politics of the Policy Process, Comparative Public Policy, and Globalization also complement this one. A number of courses offered in Political Science are also worth considering for anyone thinking of specializing in political sociology; feel free to confer with me for ideas and suggestions.

As a seminar, this course is based on active involvement of all participants. You should complete assigned readings before class, and be prepared to take part in class discussion in a respectful, engaged, and thoughtful manner. This course is reading intensive, but also requires you to synthesize and write about the things we read. The workload for this course is high (though we will often do close readings of sections of books); however, you should also leave the course with a strong grounding in the field of political sociology.

There are two options for participating in this course. In both options, I expect students to attend classes and engage in discussion, lead class discussion once during the semester, and write a number of short papers. In one option, students will take a final exam in which they will answer two questions (out of four). In the second option, students will write an analytic literature review, research proposal, or research paper that takes a sociological approach to politics. The exam option is particularly appropriate for a student who is interested in getting a broad overview of political sociology. The second option is particularly appropriate for a student who is planning or working on a comps paper, capstone paper, or dissertation proposal related to politics. In both cases, it is important to me that students move forward in their intellectual work as a result of taking the course.

---

1 This syllabus owes thanks to suggested readings from a number of people, including Dustin Avent-Holt, Paula Chakravartty, Dan Clawson, Emily Erikson, Agustin Lao-Montes, David Mednicoff, Amy Schalet, and Millie Thayer.
Course Guidelines

Class Participation: As a seminar, this course is based on active involvement of all participants in discussing the topics we cover. You should complete assigned readings before class, and be prepared to take part in a web-based discussion of the readings that pose questions for discussion before each class session (by 48 hours before the class session, in order to give those leading class discussion some time to plan their session). Since the course will be held on a Monday, this means that you need to plan ahead! Keep in mind that I can tell whether you have read others’ posts, as well as read what you have posted, and I read the posts looking for signs of engagement with your classmates and the course materials. I expect the same level of active participation, which reflects respect and thought regarding points brought up by classmates and knowledge of the readings in the in-class discussions. Participating in the web board will make up 10% of the grade, participating in class will make up another 10% of the grade. The course website is at: “https://spark.oit.umass.edu/” (20% of grade)

Discussion Leading: You will lead or co-lead discussion for one class session during the semester. Organizing the class discussion involves developing a list of five questions – based on points and questions raised via the web discussion – for further discussion during the class session. Further criteria for discussion leading are listed at the end of this syllabus. (10% of grade)

Short Papers: You will write five short papers responding to the readings. In these 2 page single-spaced papers, you will discuss and critically evaluate the entire set of assigned readings for a particular date (this may include material for which you have led discussion). Short papers are due by the Sunday night before class; they should be uploaded as .pdf or .doc documents to the course website. Late papers will not be accepted. Detailed criteria for papers are listed below. Each paper will be worth 8% of your final grade (8% of grade each; 40% total)

Course Paper OR Final Exam:
As noted above, students have the option of either working on a course paper (which can be in for form of an analytic literature review, research proposal, or research paper) or answering questions on a final examination. Final paper topics should be discussed with me and decided by October 27. Rough drafts of the paper are due November 24, 10% will be deducted from the final if a draft is not submitted. The final version of the paper is due on December 15. Further details about the paper are listed below. For the final exam option, students will answer two out of four essay questions that will synthesize readings from across the semester. Detailed criteria regarding the exams are listed below. Final exams will be handed out on December 1, and will be due on December 15. (Course Paper/Final Exam: 30% of grade)

Class Participation 20%
Discussion-Leading 10%
Short Papers 40%
Course Paper/Final Exam 30%

Grades are assigned in the form of numeric grades and converted at the end of the semester to letter grades. The grading scale for this course is A=>93; A-=90-92.9; B+=87-89.9; B=83-86.9; B-=80-82.9, C+=77-79.9, C=<77.
Accommodation Policy Statement

The University of Massachusetts Amherst is committed to providing an equal educational opportunity for all students. If you have a documented physical, psychological, or learning disability on file with Disability Services (DS), Learning Disabilities Support Services (LDSS), or Psychological Disabilities Services (PDS), you may be eligible for reasonable academic accommodations to help you succeed in this course. If you have a documented disability that requires an accommodation, please notify me within the first two weeks of the semester so that we may make appropriate arrangements.

Graduate School Statement on Academic Honesty

It is the expressed policy of the University that every aspect of graduate academic life, related in whatever fashion to the University, shall be conducted in an absolutely and uncompromisingly honest manner by graduate students. Apparent and alleged breaches in this policy are covered in the Graduate Student Academic Policy (Sen. Doc. no. to 89-026). A copy of this policy is available in the Ombuds Office, Faculty Senate Office and the Office of the Dean of the Graduate School. See the full text at:

http://www.umass.edu/dean_students/codeofconduct/acad honesty/

Sanctions for acts of dishonesty range from receiving a grade of F on the paper/exam/assignment or in the course, loss of funding, being placed on probation or suspension for a period of time, or being dismissed from the University. All students have the right of appeal through the Academic Honesty Board.

Required Books (Texts are available at Food for Thought Books, 106 N. Pleasant, and on reserve in the W.E.B. DuBois Library):


Other required readings made available on the course website: "https://spark.oit.umass.edu/

Recommended Book (available at Food for Thought Books, 106 N. Pleasant, and on reserve in the W.E.B. DuBois Library):

COURSE SCHEDULE

September 8  Opening Session

September 15  Pluralism and Power


Recommended Readings:

September 22  Institutionalist and Class Theories

Recommended:

September 29 Poststructural and Postmodern Theory


Recommended:
October 6  
Feminist Theory and the State


Recommended:

October 14 (Monday Schedule)  
The Racial State


Recommended:
October 20  The Postcolonial State


Recommended:

October 27  “Developmental” States


Recommended:
November 3      Welfare States


Recommended:

November 10      Nationalism


Recommended:
November 17  Media & Politics


Recommended:

November 24  Labor Movements


Recommended:


December 1  

**Social Movements & Revolutions**


**Recommended:**


December 8  Globalization or Denationalization?


Recommended:

December 15  Final Paper/Final Exam Due!
Principles for Seminar Discussion, Adapted from Erik Olin Wright:

Preparation for Seminar Discussions: Above all: do the reading, and do it carefully. Although it requires planning, I expect everyone to do all of the readings for every class session (discussion leaders should note what to focus on in the following meeting). If we all start from a common set of texts and ask good questions about them, we can have an interesting, engaging discussion. Be sure to post at least one question about the readings (questions do not need to be grandiose or profound -- they can deal with issues of clarification, meaning, or interpretation) to the web board before class and try to respond to, amplify, and otherwise engage with questions raised by your classmates. Always enter the discussion with something you’d like to learn from it.

Comments & Brevity: Not every comment needs to be earth shattering. Students may feel intimidated in seminars when it seems that the only legitimate comments are those that show complete mastery of the subject matter. Yet, we will all be bringing a different perspective to these readings, and will have points to make that others have not considered. Every comment that reflects an attempt to engage the material seriously is valuable; indeed, simple questions often turn out to be the most difficult to answer. Comments asking for a clarification of the readings or of previous comments are always appropriate. In addition, comments should be kept short and to the point. Short comments and questions are more likely to elicit engaged discussions than long, drawn-out statements.

Listening & Equity: In a good seminar, comments from different participants are linked one to another. A given point is followed up, and the discussion has continuity. Sometime comments become disconnected, because participants are not listening to each other because they are trying to think of something original to say. It should be our collective goal to have both continuity and as equitable participation as possible. If you feel that you have dominated discussion, try to go 20 minutes without speaking; if you haven’t participated in the discussion for 20 minutes, ask a question or make a comment.

Arguments, Competitiveness, Consensus: Our seminar discussions are meant to expose theoretical debates. If we all agreed on a given issue or perspective, class would indeed be dull. However, arguments and debates must at all times be grounded on respect for others. Aggressiveness and competitiveness are not acceptable. While we won’t usually reach consensus, we should pursue cooperative conflict: theoretical advance that comes out of constructive but not antagonistic conflict.

Discussion Leading: In order for discussions to have continuity, equity, and the other dynamics mentioned above, it is necessary that the discussion leader take a strong role. The discussion leader needs to have the ability to tell someone to hold off a point that doesn’t relate to the current discussion, cut rambling points short, etc. However, seminar participants have the responsibility of letting the leader know when too much monitoring is going on.

My Role: I struggle with my role in graduate classrooms, because though I do have greater experience and may have more of a big picture understanding of debates, I learn as much from you as you will learn from me. I won’t lecture, but I will try to summarize what we have discussed at the end of each session. At any point, you can ask me questions, or push me to provide overviews. Work with me to help find a comfortable balance, and recognize that my respect for your ideas is what keeps me from “taking over.”

Collective Self-Evaluation: The success of a seminar is a collective responsibility of all participants. Professors (and discussion leaders) cannot waive magic wands to promote intellectually productive settings. It is essential that we treat the seminar as something under our collective control, and something that can be challenged and transformed. Any problems should be dealt with through open discussions.

We can work together to make the seminar exactly what we hope it will be.

Guidelines for Leading Class Discussion

You will be in charge of leading discussion of the course material for one week of class during the semester, either alone or with another student. You can structure discussion in any number of ways, including having small group discussions, partnered discussion, and full class discussions. All discussion leaders must aim for equitable participation from class members. Also, keep in mind that at the end of each class session, I will take 10 minutes to summarize what we have learned, but I also expect you to provide summaries throughout the session and at the end.

Many discussion leaders prefer to begin class by reviewing the required reading for the week (though it is not a requirement). This review might raise specific questions and issues for the week, and relate the material to previous readings and class discussions. If you take this approach, remember that your summary should not take more than 5 minutes. Your job is not to lecture, but to lead an engaging discussion about the material, based on the points raised both in class and before class on the web board. This discussion should lead to a clearer understanding of the readings.

The discussion leader must take a strong role, to ensure that the discussion covers the material, and that there is equity and continuity in the discussion. One of the major concerns in leading discussion is to ensure that the environment is secure enough for people to ask questions and become involved. Discussion leaders should be vigilant about maintaining equitable participation. Be creative in thinking about how to sustain discussion and involve all class members in discussion. Leading discussion makes up 10% of your grade. Another 20% of your grade will reflect your participation in discussion on the web board and in class. I evaluate discussion leading using the rubric below.

• **Organization:** I am looking for a well-organized session, where the discussion leader has mapped out the class session, and helps give the class members an overview of the organization of the class session. Using the posts on the discussion board and their own sense of the material, the discussion leader should develop thoughtful "big picture" discussion questions. It is important for the discussion leader to provide internal summaries when transitioning from one topic to another, as well as at the end of the class. Class should be paced well, with a short break about halfway through class.

• **Substantive Content:** It is most important that the discussion leader ensures that the readings are integrated into the discussion, so that it's not a "bull session" but a focused discussion that allows us all to come out of the discussion with a better understanding of the readings. Making connections to previous readings often helps give the class a better sense of how political sociology works as a subfield. Discussion leaders should also be able to clarify misunderstandings, or request help from me if they or others are confused.

• **Continuity & Equity:** One of the most difficult tasks for a discussion leader is ensuring that class members all take part in the discussion, and that they respond to one another to create continuity in the discussion. If everyone refuses to speak, or only a few students do, the discussion leader needs to think creatively about how to engage the entire class in a useful, stimulating discussion. While I try not to penalize the discussion leader for unprepared or shy classmates, I do expect every leader to make serious efforts to engage the entire class.

• **Credibility:** A credible discussion leader is one that wants to be there, and is prepared to be there. Discussion leaders should speak audibly (if English is a second language, we are all in awe of your ability to operate at such a high level in multiple languages), and with enthusiasm, and show that they understand the material and prepared for the session thoughtfully.

• **Rapport:** Developing a strong rapport with the class members is important to ensuring a good discussion. Rapport often means good eye contact, or other approaches that allow you to figure out when people are confused or not following the discussion. It also means requiring the thought and participation of the class, and responding to points constructively and positively (for example, noting points raised by class members in the discussion or on the web board). Rapport also means treating everyone with respect, and requiring every member of the class to treat one another with respect.

**Grading:** I will rate your answers to each question in each of five areas – organization, substantive content, continuity and equity, credibility, and rapport – as noted on the rubric (4 points for exemplary, 3 for acceptable, 2 for needs improvement, and 1 for unacceptable). Total points possible are 20. Grades will translate in the following way: 20=100, 19=96, 18=92, 17=88, 16=84, 15=80, 14=76, 13=72, 12=68, 11=64, 10=60, 9=56, 8=52, 7=48, 6=44, 5=40.
## Discussion Leading Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4—Exemplary</th>
<th>3—Acceptable</th>
<th>2—Needs improvement</th>
<th>1—Unacceptable in this form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization of Session</strong></td>
<td>Excellent discussion questions; clear summaries and transitions between new questions/topics; good pacing of class session.</td>
<td>Very good discussion questions; clear summaries and transitions between new questions/topics; OK pacing of class session.</td>
<td>Good discussion questions; Summaries/transitions are not consistently provided; OK pacing.</td>
<td>Weak discussion questions; No summaries or transitions; pacing weak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Handling of substantive content</strong></td>
<td>Integrates readings into discussion; makes connections to previous readings; helps clarify misunderstandings; students leave discussion with better understanding of the readings.</td>
<td>Integrates readings into discussion; misses some connections to previous readings; helps clarify misunderstandings; most students leave discussion with better understanding of the readings.</td>
<td>Integrates readings into discussion; misses some connections to previous readings; doesn't clarify misunderstandings; readings are clarified for most.</td>
<td>Doesn't integrates readings into discussion so readings aren't clarified; misses connections to previous readings; doesn't clarify misunderstandings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuity &amp; Equity</strong></td>
<td>Maintains continuity in the discussion, while also ensuring equitable participation.</td>
<td>Maintains continuity in the discussion, while also trying to ensure equitable participation.</td>
<td>Mostly maintains continuity in the discussion, while also trying to ensure equitable participation.</td>
<td>Continuity is weak, and a few class members dominate discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Credibility in role</strong></td>
<td>Well-prepared, understands material, enthusiastic, speaks audibly.</td>
<td>Well-prepared, mostly understands the material, relatively positive, and speaks audibly.</td>
<td>Preparation, understanding, and/or demeanor are somewhat lacking.</td>
<td>Unprepared or missing key points on the literature; demeanor less positive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rapport with class members</strong></td>
<td>Recognizes confusion, requires participation, responds to points constructively, treats everyone with respect, and requires respect between class members.</td>
<td>Mostly recognizes confusion, requires participation, responds to points constructively, treats everyone with respect, and requires respect between class members.</td>
<td>Sometimes recognizes confusion, treats everyone with respect, and tries to ensure respect between class members.</td>
<td>Does not require participation, and does not identify points of confusion, or does not treat others with respect, or allows other class members to act disrespectfully.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guidelines for Short Papers

Short papers are meant to assist you in carefully considering the readings, and what they suggest about a sociological understandings of politics. You should spend an appropriate amount of time reading and reflecting on the assigned materials before writing your memo. Memos should be 2 single-spaced pages in length (no longer), and are due at the beginning of the class session. They should also be uploaded as Word or pdf files to the course website, [https://spark.oit.umass.edu/](https://spark.oit.umass.edu/). You are required to turn in five short papers; you may turn in more than five short papers if you wish; only the five highest grades will count toward your final grade in the course. Late papers will not be accepted. The paper should present an argument based on the readings for the week. The grading rubric for papers appears below:

- **Focused Argument**: After completing the readings, you should develop one clear argument based on the readings. Resist the temptation to write about several different issues, because the papers are too short to allow you do more than one argument justice. Decide what argument or claim you want to make, and then organize the whole paper around it. Be sure to state this argument in the first paragraph.

- **Structure of argument**: Your paper should be organized effectively. This includes a clear introduction, which states your argument, the body of the paper presenting evidence for your argument in a clear and logical fashion, and a concluding paragraph that wraps it all up (rather than making new points). Plan to revise at least once — revision helps you organize your thoughts effectively and convey your arguments with brevity and clarity.

- **Evidence**: While you do not need to bring in outside research for the memos, you do need to make specific reference to the readings to back up your arguments and points. Your paper needs to be based on the readings, and should show that you are familiar with all of the readings for a given week. Go beyond pure description to integration and analysis. If you agree with a particular argument, explain why by pointing to specific points s/he made; if you disagree, point to things s/he said as evidence in support of your critique.

- **Quotations/Citations**: You should use citations (noting the author and year of a piece in either a footnote/endnote or parentheses) and quotations (noting author, year, and page number of the quotation) to support or illustrate your points. Be sure all direct quotations include quote marks and page numbers. Be careful to ensure that any citations or quotations directly relate to the argument you are making. Do not use long quotations. Your interpretation of the authors’ words (properly attributed) is what matters. Make sure that you are using the quotation or citation consistently with the author’s apparent intent. All citations should be in a consistent, recognizable format. You may choose to use footnotes, endnotes, or parentheses within the text, as long as you are consistent. Whenever you quote an author directly, provide the page number the quotation comes from. Everything you cite should be listed in full in the footnotes, endnotes, or a bibliography at the end of the paper. When in doubt, cite. Representing the words or ideas of another without citation or as one’s own work is plagiarism. I look closely for plagiarism so please be careful and if you have questions about what requires citation, ask me.

- **Writing Style**: The paper should be 2 single-spaced pages — and no longer, as it is an important skill to write with brevity. Use the smallest number of words, and most concrete words possible, to make your points. Avoid “throat-clearing” (example: “It is the opinion of this author that…”). If you use a word whose meaning isn’t obvious, like “democracy,” make sure you tell me how you’re defining it. Use the active voice whenever you can. Writing in the first person is fine. Try to avoid starting sentences with phrases like “I believe”; if you’re starting with “I believe” because you are not completely comfortable with the conclusion you’re drawing, then look for more evidence to support it. You may choose to use headings in the paper to guide me through your argument, though it is not necessary. However, a well-organized argument is necessary; be sure also to use transitions between sections.

**Grading**: I will rate your short paper in each of five areas — focus, structure of argument, evidence, quotations/citations, and writing style, as noted on the rubric (4 points for exemplary, 3 for acceptable, 2 for needs improvement, and 1 for unacceptable). Grades translate to: 20=100, 19=96, 18=92, 17=88, 16=84, 15=80, 14=76, 13=72, 12=68, 11=64, 10=60, 9=56, 8=52, 7=48, 6=44, 5=40.

---

3 These guidelines and rubric were adapted from materials developed by Katie McDermott.
## Short Paper Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4—Exemplary</th>
<th>3—Acceptable</th>
<th>2—Needs improvement</th>
<th>1—Unacceptable in this form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clear and focused argument</strong></td>
<td>Your argument is clear within the first paragraph, and the rest of the paper stays on-topic.</td>
<td>Argument is unclear at the beginning, but by the end of the paper I think I know what you’re talking about.</td>
<td>Argument is initially clear, but your attention to it wavers later in the paper.</td>
<td>Paper doesn’t identify or stick to an argument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure of the argument</strong></td>
<td>Paper states a main thesis or argument, presents evidence in support of it, and draws a logical conclusion.</td>
<td>Introduction or conclusion doesn’t do what it’s supposed to, or body of paper doesn’t develop an argument – just describes readings.</td>
<td>Body of paper fails to present evidence, or drifts away from original topic, or contains arguments that seem to contradict each other.</td>
<td>Organizational logic is unclear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integration</strong></td>
<td>All of the readings are integrated and analyzed (not simply described) and related to a specific case.</td>
<td>Readings are described more than integrated and analyzed, but are related to a specific case.</td>
<td>Readings are primarily described, rather than integrated and analyzed or some readings are left out.</td>
<td>Readings are not brought in effectively, and no attempt to relate to a specific case.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writing Style</strong></td>
<td>Adheres to writing guidelines completely or almost completely.</td>
<td>Makes one or two mistakes in a particular category, but also writes correctly elsewhere.</td>
<td>Makes consistent errors in one category</td>
<td>Multiple patterns of errors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appropriate use of quotations/citations</strong></td>
<td>Quotations or citations are always used correctly, and illustrate or support your points; author’s words are used in correct context.</td>
<td>Reason for a citation or quotation isn’t clear, or quotations are longer than necessary to back up your point.</td>
<td>One or more out-of-context quotation or direct quotation without a page number.</td>
<td>Missing citations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guidelines for Final Papers

If you choose, you may write a final course paper that will help you move forward intellectually. In this paper, you should do systematic research on a topic that relates to sociological analyses of politics. This final paper may be in the form of a policy analysis or it may be a detailed review of a specific literature, a research proposal, or a paper that engages in original research on a topic.

Final paper topics should be discussed with me during office hours, and submitted formally by email, with a preliminary outline for the paper, by October 27. Rough drafts of the paper are due by November 24. No grades will be given these drafts, but 10% will be deducted from the final grade if a draft is not submitted. The final version of the paper is due on December 15. The paper should be typed, double-spaced, and between 12-25 pages (length is negotiable). The paper makes up 30% of your final grade. A good paper has:

- A clear introduction, which provides a persuasive argument about the importance and relevance of the paper
- A clear and original argument, which draws from a review of the relevant literature. Show that you understand how your argument fits within the scholarship that already exists, and rely upon at least 12 sources (which may include readings from the syllabus).
- Methodological appropriateness, if you propose or actually do research for the paper.
- A conclusion that summarizes your findings and makes explicit the implications of your argument.
- Effective writing and organization, including transitions between paragraphs and sections, and footnotes for any information that is not crucial for your argument.

Finally, revise thoroughly. Revision is the difference between an “A” and a “B” paper. Two papers can be well conceptualized, theoretically sophisticated, and methodologically well executed, and yet if the first was never revised, it will be noticeably inferior to the second. Try to finish the paper at least a week before it is due. Then reorganize your argument, clear up fuzzy concepts, recheck your references, and fix spelling and grammatical errors. **You should revise your paper at least 3 times before submitting it for this course.**

Because the final paper can take many different forms, I will not give you a grading rubric for it. However, I encourage you to talk to me if you have any questions, and keep in mind the qualities that I look for in short papers.
Guidelines for Final Exam

If you choose to take the final exam, you will answer two questions (out of four), meant to help you integrate and solidify what you have learned over the course of this semester. Each of your answers should be between 3-6 double-spaced pages; the entire exam should be no longer than 12 double-spaced pages (with reasonable font size and margins, not counting references).

Each answer should incorporate at least five different sources that we have read for class this semester. Between the two questions, you should cite reading from at least seven different weeks of the course (some overlap between questions is OK as long as you adhere to these requirements). These sources should be fully integrated into the answers, and not only tangentially mentioned. While you may include citations to additional materials not assigned for the course, I do not expect you to do outside research for this exam. The exam will be handed out in class on December 1, 2008. The exam is due December 15, 2008, 3:30 pm. Turn in via SPARK; turn in the two answers as separate documents.

The grading rubric for the final exam follows; here I summarize the main elements:

- **Incorporation of Readings:** Each answer should incorporate at least five different sources that we have read for class this semester. Between the two questions, you should cite reading from at least seven different weeks of the course (some overlap is OK). Each source from the readings should be fully incorporated, and not only tangentially mentioned. While you may include citations to additional materials not assigned for the course, I do not expect outside research for the exam.
- **Integration:** You need to show that you have thought carefully about these readings, going beyond pure description.
- **Focus & Structure:** Each answer should be focused, and not go off onto tangents. Your answer should be organized effectively, including a clear introductory paragraph, that summarizes the argument and how the answer is structured, a body of the answer that provides evidence in support of your argument, and a concluding paragraph, that again summarizes your argument and wraps up (rather than introducing new points). Make sure your answers show a clear organizational logic.
- **Writing Style:** Each answer should be 3-5 double-spaced pages – and no longer, as it is an important skill to write with brevity. Your writing should be carefully revised. Be sure to write formally and to a general audience (for example, explain the argument in any reading you reference, rather than assuming particular knowledge). Use the smallest number of words, and most concrete words possible, to make your points. Avoid “throat-clearing” (example: “it is the opinion of this author that…”). If you use a word whose meaning isn’t obvious, like “democracy” or “power,” define it. Use the active voice whenever you can.
- **Quotations/Citations:** Use citations (noting the author and year of a piece in either a footnote/endnote or parentheses) and quotations (noting author, year, and page number of the quotation) to support or illustrate your points. All direct quotations must include quote marks and page numbers. Be careful to ensure that any citations or quotations directly relate to the argument you are making, and make sure that the author’s words are used in correct context. Do not use overly long quotations. **Your interpretation of the authors’ words (properly attributed) is what matters.** All citations should be in a consistent, recognizable format. You may choose to use footnotes, endnotes, or parentheses within the text, as long as you are consistent.

**Grading:** I will rate your answers to each question in each of five areas – incorporation of readings, integration, focus/structure, writing style, and quotations/citations – as noted on the rubric (4 points for exemplary, 3 for acceptable, 2 for needs improvement, and 1 for unacceptable). Total points possible for each answer are 20. Grades will translate in the following way: 20=50, 19=48, 18=46, 17=44, 16=42, 15=40, 14=38, 13=36, 12=34, 11=32, 10=30, 9=28, 8=26, 7=24, 6=22, 5=20. The two answers will add up to a possible of 100 for the exam as a whole (50+50=100).
# Rubric for Final Exam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4—Exemplary</th>
<th>3—Acceptable</th>
<th>2—Needs improvement</th>
<th>1—Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incorporation of readings</td>
<td>Effectively incorporates at least five different sources from reading (together, both answers bring in readings from seven different weeks).</td>
<td>Effectively incorporates three to four different sources from reading (together, both answers bring in readings from at least five or six different weeks).</td>
<td>Connections to reading are less clear – reading is only tangentially related to argument.</td>
<td>Connections not made to readings, or paper contains one or more factual errors about reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>Readings are integrated and analyzed (not simply described).</td>
<td>Readings somewhat integrated and analyzed, but described more.</td>
<td>Readings are primarily described, rather than integrated and analyzed.</td>
<td>Readings are not brought in effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus/Structure</td>
<td>Paper states a main thesis or argument, presents evidence in support of it, and draws a logical conclusion. Stays on topic throughout.</td>
<td>Introduction or conclusion does not do what it should or body does not support argument.</td>
<td>Introduction and conclusion does not do what they should or body does not support argument.</td>
<td>Organizational logic is unclear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Style</td>
<td>Adheres to writing guidelines completely or almost completely.</td>
<td>Makes one or two mistakes in a particular category, but also writes correctly elsewhere.</td>
<td>Makes consistent errors in one category</td>
<td>Multiple patterns of errors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotations/citations</td>
<td>Quotations or citations are always used correctly, and illustrate or support your points; author’s words are used in correct context.</td>
<td>Reason for a citation or quotation isn’t clear, or quotations are longer than necessary to back up your point.</td>
<td>One or more out-of-context quotation or direct quotation without a page number.</td>
<td>Missing citations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>