

## Political Science 9531A<sup>1</sup>

<b>Course Title:</b>	Canadian Politics
<b>Day:</b>	Wednesdays
<b>Time:</b>	10:30am to 1:30pm
<b>Location:</b>	SSC 4105

<b>Instructor:</b>	Dr. Chris Alcantara
<b>Office Hours:</b>	Wednesdays 1:45pm to 2:45pm or by Appointment or if my office door is open
<b>Office Location:</b>	SSC 4144
<b>Email:</b>	<a href="mailto:calcanta@uwo.ca">calcanta@uwo.ca</a>
<b>Telephone:</b>	Ext. 85171

### Prerequisite(s):

Unless you have either the requisites for this course or written special permission from your Dean to enroll in it, you may be removed from this course and it will be deleted from your record. This decision may not be appealed. You will receive no adjustment to your fees in the event that you are dropped from a course for failing to have the necessary prerequisites.

### Course Description

This course provides an introductory overview of how political scientists study the politics of Canada. Rather than focusing solely on the nuts and bolts of particular institutions, actors, histories, or events, students will instead encounter and grapple with the main theoretical and methodological approaches used in the literature to analyze Canadian politics. Each week, the instructor and students will focus on a particular approach and discuss its analytical utility by assessing its underlying assumptions and its empirical applications to a variety of political phenomena and trends. No prior knowledge of Canadian politics is necessary, although having such knowledge would be an asset.

### Student Learning Objectives

At the end of this course, students should be able to:

- Describe the main approaches and perspectives used by political scientists to study the politics of Canada;
- Explain the strengths and weaknesses of the different approaches and how they complement and come into conflict with each other in theory and in practice;
- Apply the approaches to analyzing an empirical phenomenon or theoretical puzzle similar to what they might do for a thesis or MRP;
- Identify theoretical, conceptual, and empirical avenues of future research as they relate to the subfield;
- Synthesize and assess information on Canadian political phenomena and trends from a variety of academic sources;
- Communicate ideas regarding the nature of Canadian politics in a variety of written and oral mediums to a diverse set of audiences.

### PhD-Specific Learning Objectives

In addition to the learning objectives above, PhD students at the end of this course should be able to:

- Situate new social science literature and political trends within the analytical approaches discussed in the course;

---

<sup>1</sup> Version date: 26 June 2019. This syllabus may be altered at any time up until the first meeting of the class in September. Please make sure you check the website for new versions of this syllabus prior to that date.

- Specify the ontological (e.g. what we know) and epistemological (e.g. how we know) bases of the Canadian politics literature;
- Map out the broad themes and debates in Canadian politics in preparation for the Qualifying Field Exam.

**Course Materials**

A number of books are available for purchase at the bookstore and are on-reserve at the library. Approximate portions of the book to be read are listed below besides each book.

Cross, William. Ed. 2010. *Auditing Canadian Democracy*. Vancouver: UBC Press. ISBN: 9780774819206 (Chapters 1, 3-8).

Poelzer, Greg and Ken S. Coates. 2015. *From Treaty Peoples to Treaty Nation: A Road Map for All Canadians*. Vancouver: UBC Press. ISBN: 9780774827546 (Chapters 1-5).

Wiseman, Nelson. 2007. *In Search of Canadian Political Culture*. Vancouver: UBC Press. ISBN: 9780774813891 (Introduction, Chapters 1-3, and 7).

All other readings are available through OWL under the “course readings” tab or through the library.

**Methods of Evaluation for MA Students**

Case Study Paper	5%	<u>Due Week 3 before the start of class</u>
Essay 1	15%	<u>Due Week 6 before the start of class</u>
Essay 2	20%	<u>Due Week 10 before the start of class</u>
Essay 3	20%	<u>Due Week 13 before the start of class</u>
Weekly Presentations	20%	<u>Due Week 13</u>
Seminar Participation	20%	<u>Continuous</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	

**Methods of Evaluation for PhD Students**

Case Study Paper	5%	<u>Due Week 3 before the start of class</u>
Essay 1	15%	<u>Due Week 6 before the start of class</u>
Essay 2	20%	<u>Due Week 10 before the start of class</u>
Essay 3	20%	<u>Due Week 13 before the start of class</u>
Weekly Presentations	20%	<u>Continuous and Week 13</u>
Reading Summaries	Pass/Fail	<u>Continuous</u>
Seminar Participation	20%	<u>Continuous</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	

**Necessary Condition for Passing this Course**

In order to receive a passing grade in this course, you must attend at **least 10 full classes** beginning in week 2. Failure to attend at least 10 classes will result in an automatic failure in the course regardless of the grades received on the written and oral assignments.

For the PHD students, you must hand in a summary of each reading to pass this course. Details below.

**Written Assignments**

For all written assignments, please use the formatting (double spaced, headings, etc) and referencing style (Harvard, in-text) of the *Canadian Journal of Political Science*. All in-text citations **MUST INCLUDE PAGE NUMBERS** for all materials quoted, paraphrased, or summarized. These guidelines are available

online at <https://www.cpsa-acsp.ca/documents/pdfs/Editorial%20Style%20Guidelines%202008.pdf> or in a hard copy of the journal post-2005. Make sure you get a hardcopy published after 2005 when Cambridge University Press took over the journal.

**SUBMIT ALL ASSIGNMENTS TO THE ASSIGNMENT FOLDER ON OWL (except for PHD reading summaries).**

- **CASE STUDY PAPER:** Write a **two to four page paper (maximum)** describing any problem or issue relating to Canadian politics. Choose a problem/issue and provide a concise and general description of the problem/issue and any other details that you think might be relevant for a non-expert to understand your case study. **Make sure you use at least two academic sources to support your description.** You may draw upon other non-academic sources, as needed. Students will use their case study to help write their subsequent three essays.
- **ESSAY 1:** Write a **five to seven page essay (maximum)** that applies and assesses any one analytical approach from the previous weeks to analyzing the political problem/issue in your case study paper. The essay should have three parts: First, the paper should begin by describing the analytical approach (1 page maximum). Second, it should apply that approach to the problem/issue at hand, demonstrating how the approach could help you make sense of or perhaps explain the problem/issue (approximately 2-3 pages). Third, the paper should end with an assessment of the approach as it relates to your problem/issue (approximately 2-3 pages maximum). **Your paper should only rely on the course readings and the sources you drew upon originally for your case study paper.**

PhD students: Please write **an eight to twelve page essay (maximum)** following the above instructions.

- **ESSAY 2:** Same instructions as above except you cannot write about the approaches you wrote about in your previous essay.
- **ESSAY 3:** Same instructions as above except you cannot write about the approaches you wrote about in your previous essays.
- **PHD STUDENTS ONLY – Reading Summaries:** Given that this course is partially designed to help students prepare for the Canadian comprehensive exam, PhD students are required to write (in point form or using full sentences) a one to two page summary of each reading using the following headings: Summary of Main Argument; Key Concepts: Relevance to Debates in the Discipline; and Key Words. These summaries will NOT be marked but must be submitted online to the **OWL DROP BOX** before each class. **You must hand in a summary of each reading. Failure to hand in even one summary will result in an automatic failure for the course.**

### **Optional Assignments in Lieu of Essays 2 and 3**

Students have the option of completing a different assignment in lieu of Essays 2 and 3. Please speak to the instructor as soon as possible if you wish pursue any of these options.

- **MA Students:**
  - **OPTION 1:** Students may write two book reviews in lieu of essays 2 and 3. These book reviews are to be 8-12 pages maximum and must accomplish the following three tasks: 1) summarize the main arguments and findings of the book (2 pages); 2) communicate what government officials might learn from the book and how they might apply it in practice (3-5 pages); and 3) communicate what certain civil society groups might learn from the

book and how they might apply it in practice (3-5 pages). For tasks (2) and (3), it is expected that students will draw upon course readings and other literature to justify how the book's lessons might apply to government and NGO actors (e.g. if you are examining a book's lessons for the department of finance, then you will likely need to draw upon the relevant literature relating to the department of finance, government decision making, and Canadian public administration to help describe and ground your suggestions in reality). Only books in English that have won the CPSA's Donald Smiley book prize since 2006 are eligible to be reviewed for this assignment. A list of the winning books can be found here: <https://www.cpsa-acsp.ca/prizes.php>. These book reviews are due on the same dates as essays 2 and 3.

- OPTION 2: Students may choose to write one 20-page graphic non-fiction essay (or two 10-page essays) that summarizes at least two weeks of readings in lieu of essays 2 and 3. An example of graphic academic non-fiction is Bryan Caplan and Zach Weinersmith's "Open Borders: The Science and Ethics of Immigration": <https://www.amazon.ca/Open-Borders-Science-Ethics-Immigration/dp/1250316960>. Another example is Laura Locker and Julia Schelle's "American Politics: A Graphic History": <https://www.amazon.com/American-Politics-Graphic-Laura-Locker/dp/1785783459>. See also Kent Worcester, 2017. "Comics, comics studies, and political science" in the *IPSR* 38(5): 690-700. This assignment is due before the start of class on week 13 (or on the due dates of essays 2 and 3 if two essays are to be handed in).
- PhD Students
  - If you have successfully completed POL 9590A: Methodology, you may choose to write a 7000 to 8000 word research paper in lieu of essays 2 and 3. This paper would be due before the start of class on week 13. The paper should be an original piece of research with a proper research question, theory/concepts section, methods, data and results section, and conclusion. The instructor must approve the paper topic at least five weeks prior to the due date of the paper. Please speak to the instructor as soon as possible if this option is of interest to you.

## Oral Assignments

- SEMINAR PRESENTATIONS: Each student will be responsible for making two types of presentations:
  - 1) Weekly in-class presentations, which are designed to mimic what occurs at academic conferences:
    - **AUTHOR:** Each student will be assigned one reading to present to the class. The presentation should be **5 minutes long maximum** and should briefly summarize the research question, theory/main concepts, methods/empirical strategy, findings, and contribution to the Canadian politics. The idea is to pretend you are the author and to present the paper as strongly as possible but to also acknowledge the limits of the paper if necessary.
    - **DISCUSSANT:** Each student will also be assigned as the discussant for each reading. The discussant's job, in **10 minutes maximum**, is the following<sup>2</sup>:
      - "You should attempt to re-express your target's position so clearly, vividly, and fairly that your target says, "Thanks, I wish I'd thought of putting it that way." (1 minute)
      - You should list any points of agreement (especially if they are not matters of general or widespread agreement). (1-2 minutes)

---

<sup>2</sup> Taken from <https://www.rightattitudes.com/2017/06/16/rapoport-rules-criticism/>

- You should mention anything you have learned from your target. (1-2 minutes)
    - Only then are you permitted to say so much as a word of rebuttal or criticism.” (at least 5 minutes) These criticisms may include:
      1. What are the main weaknesses, if any, of the paper?
      2. How well does the argument hold up when applied to other real world events or hypothetical examples relevant to Canada?
      3. How internally consistent is the reading in terms of the research question, concepts, theories, methods and conclusions?
      4. Does the reading connect meaningfully to the readings and ideas from previous weeks?
      5. Please avoid any discussion of the organization, writing style, or clarity of the article. What we are looking for is an in-depth analysis of the ideas, research design and choices, arguments, conclusions, and contributions to the literature.
    - Need additional advice on how to be a good discussant? Read Dr. Jack Lucas’s excellent advice here: <http://praxispolisci.ca/how-to-be-a-discussant-by-jack-lucas/>
  - After the author and discussant present, the “author” will have a chance to briefly respond to the discussant before the rest of the class is invited to participate in the discussion. Details about the class discussion are below under “seminar participation.”
- 2) Final Presentation on the last day of class
- The presentation, maximum 5 minutes in length, will provide your final assessment of the approaches that we read and discussed throughout the term by answering the following question: which approach or approaches seem to best explain the politics of Canada? This presentation will occur in class on week 13.
  - Presentations will be evaluated on the following criteria:
    - Presentation style (e.g. clarity and logic of organization and delivery)
    - Presentation substance (e.g. sufficient details about the problem/issue and institution, and justification of argument or substantive choices).
- **HOW TO DELIVER AN EFFECTIVE PRESENTATION: SOME TIPS**
    - The most important thing you can do is to PREPARE! Preparation is 95% of the battle. Prepare the talk well in advance and then **PRACTICE IT** many times. Presentations “live and die” depending on the amount of time the presenter has put into preparing and practicing it.
    - **In terms of organization, the first sentence of you presentation should be the title of your talk (“The title of my talk today is...”); the second sentence should be the main argument of the presentation (“The main argument of my presentation is...”); the third sentence should be a quick road map of the structure of the presentation (To develop and defend my argument, I have divided my presentation into three parts. First...).** These three sentences are crucial to a good presentation and you should memorize them if possible.
    - In terms of presentation style, eye contact is key! Try to make eye contact with everyone during your presentation, not only the Prof.! You don’t have to look directly at everyone; rather, you can look at the top of their heads or foreheads.
    - Avoid reading off of a prepared text if you can.

- Minimize distractions – that means if you are sitting, move your computer or water bottle to the side so that they do not form a barrier between yourself and the audience. Don't hold things in your hands (like pens, or water bottles).
  - Bring a water bottle! Use it to hydrate yourself, but also it can be a great tool when you are stuck. Let's say you hit a snag in your presentation and can't remember the next part – you can buy yourself some time by taking a drink of water.
  - When you practice, ask someone to listen to you or film yourself. Minimize hand movements and walking around – use these techniques for emphasizing the three or four crucial points in your presentation. Watch out for “ums” and “ahhs” and “sniffles”, etc. And vary the tone of your voice.
- SEMINAR PARTICIPATION. Each week, students will be expected to PARTICIPATE in class discussion on the readings. **There is no grade for attendance.**
    - After each presentation by the “author” and “discussant”, each student is expected to provide at least ONE comment on the reading.
      - This comment can be in response to one of the presentations or to another student's comment in the ensuing conversation or can be something original that you thought of when you did the reading yourself.
      - As much as possible, take a stand on the reading and on the arguments offered by the presenters.
    - Effective participation requires careful preparation (reading and thinking critically about the readings) and actively contributing to class exercises and discussions by responding to the conversations generated by the instructor and classmates. Participation will be evaluated according to whether students:
      1. demonstrated that they have read, understood, and thought critically about the course materials and themes;
      2. participated in discussions in a civil, respectful, and thoughtful manner, avoiding personal attacks and offensive language;
      3. showed a willingness to take decisive stands on issues in a way that fostered intelligent conversation;
      4. demonstrated that they are open to changing their opinions as a result of debate and discussion.

#### Participation Grading Scheme

- 10/10 = demonstrated mastery of all readings in terms of summarizing, analyzing, and applying their content to class discussions;
- 9/10 = demonstrated mastery of most of the readings in terms of summarizing, analyzing, and applying their content to class discussions;
- 8/10 = demonstrated mastery of some of readings in terms of summarizing, analyzing, and applying their content to class discussions;
- 7/10 = demonstrated mastery of one or two readings in terms of summarizing, analyzing, and applying their content to class discussions;
- < 6 = failure to demonstrate any mastery of course readings as they relate to class discussions.

#### Class and Reading Schedule

Each week, read the assigned materials with the following questions in mind:

- How would you describe the approach used in the readings this week?
  - What assumptions and concepts (usually about human beings, but it could also be about groups, organizations, or governments) are at the core of the analytical approach?

- What methodologies and analytical strategies do the authors use this week?
- What is the main argument of each reading this week?
- Do you agree or disagree with the arguments presented in the readings?
  - Assess the main argument by focusing on
    - the assumptions and their applicability to the phenomena,
    - plausible alternative explanations found in or alluded to in the reading or from previous weeks and whether they work better than the approach in the reading,
    - the nature of the empirical evidence, and
    - the application of the theory to other similar cases.

**Please note below that the readings each week are grouped according to ALL (indicating all students should read the readings) and PHD (indicating a set of readings that only the PHD students are to complete). The PHD students are expected to summarize briefly and bring the PHD only readings into the discussion when called upon or when feasible/appropriate.**

### **Week 1: Introductions and Orientation (Sept. 11)**

Meet Canadian politics faculty.

Read the syllabus and be prepared to discuss the following questions:

- Getting into graduate school is a major achievement. What were the reasons or factors in your life that allowed you to achieve this distinction?
- What are the most pressing problems facing Canada today?
- Why do these problems exist?
- What forces facilitate or prevent Canadians from solving these problems?

### **Week 2: Rational Choice and Game Theory (Sept. 18)**

ALL: Green, Donald and Ian Shaprio. *The Pathologies of Rational Choice Theory*. Yale University Press. Chapter 2.

Belanger, Éric and François Pétry, 2005. "The Rational Public? A Canadian Test of the Page and Shapiro Argument." *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 17: 190-212

Blais, Andre. 2002. "Why is there so little strategic voting in Canadian plurality rule elections?" *Political Studies* 50: 445-454.

Godbout, JF and Bjorn Hoyland. 2011. "Legislative Voting and the Canadian Parliament", *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 44 (2): 367-388.

Flanagan, Tom. *Game Theory and Canadian Politics* Toronto: UTP Chapter 2.

Manfredi, Christopher 2003. "Strategic Behaviour and the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms." in Patrick James et al., *The Myth of the Sacred: The Charter, the Courts, and the Politics of the Constitution in Canada*. McGill-Queens University Press.

PHD ONLY: Kam, Christopher 2000. "Not Just Parliamentary 'Cowboys and Indians': Ministerial Responsibility and Bureaucratic Drift," *Governance* 13: 365-392.

### **Week 3: Institutions and Historical Institutionalism (case study paper due today) (Sept. 25)**

ALL: Hodgson, Geoffrey M. 2006. "What are Institutions?" *Journal of Economic Issues* XL (1): 1-25.

Fioretos, Orfeo and Tulia G. Falleti and Adam Shingate. 2016. "Historical Institutionalism in Political Science." *Oxford Handbook of Historical Institutionalism* Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199662814.013.1

Broschek, Jorg. 2012. "Historical Institutionalism and the Varieties of Federalism in Germany and Canada." *Publius: Journal of Federalism* 42 (4): 662-687.

Alcantara, Christopher and Gary Wilson. 2014. "The Dynamics of Intra-Jurisdictional Relations in the Inuit Regions of the Canadian Arctic: An Institutional Perspective." *Regional and Federal Studies* 24 (1): 43-61.

Lucas, Jack. 2017. "Urban Governance and the American Political Development Approach." *Urban Affairs Review* 53 (2): 338-361.

Maioni, Antonia. 1997. Parting at the crossroads: The development of health insurance in Canada and the United States, 1940-1965. *Comparative Politics*, 29 (4): 411-431.

### **Week 4: Discursive Institutionalism (Oct. 2)**

ALL: Schmidt, Vivian. 2008. "Discursive Institutionalism: The Explanatory Power of Ideas and Discourse." *Annual Review of Political Science* 11: 303-326.

Alcantara, Christopher. 2013. "Ideas, Executive Federalism and Institutional Change: Explaining Territorial Inclusion in Canadian First Ministers' Conferences." *Canadian Journal of Political Science*. 46 (1): 27-48.

Bhatia, Vandna and William Coleman. 2003. "Ideas and Discourse: Reform and Resistance in the Canadian and German Health Systems." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 36 (4): 715-739.

Howlett, Michael. 2000. "Beyond Legalism? Policy Ideas, Implementation Styles, and Emulation-Based Convergence in Canadian Environmental Policy." *Journal of Public Policy* 20 (3): 305-329.

Aucoin, Peter. "New Political Governance in Westminster Systems: Impartial Public Administration and Management Performance at Risk" *Governance* 25 (2): 177-99.

PHD: Gecelovsky, Paul. 2009. "Constructing a Middle Power: Ideas and Canadian Foreign Policy." *Canadian Foreign Policy Journal* 15 (1): 77-93.

### **Week 5: Sociological Institutionalism (Oct. 9)**

ALL: Mackay, Fiona and Surya Monro and Georgina Waylen. 2009. "The Feminist Potential of Sociological Institutionalism." *Gender and Politics* Vol. 5 No. 2: 253-262.



Wiseman, Nelson. 2007. *In Search of Canadian Political Culture*. Vancouver: UBC Press. READ ONLY the Introduction, Chapters 1-3, and 7.

McGrane, David and Loleen Berdahl. 2019. "Reconceptualizing Canadian Federal Political Culture: Examining Differences between Quebec and the Rest of Canada." *Publius: Journal of Federalism* <https://doi.org/10.1093/publius/pjz010>

PHD: DiMaggio, Paul J. and Walter W. Powell. 1983. "The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields." *American Sociological Review* 48 (2): 147-160.

### **Week 6: Regionalism and Scale (Oct. 16) (Essay 1 due)**

ALL: Cochrane, Christopher and Andrea Perrella. 2012. "Regions, Regionalism and Regional Differences in Canada: Mapping Economic Opinions." *CJPS* 27: 829-854.

Rocher, Francois. 2002. "The Evolving Parameters of Quebec Nationalism." *International Journal on Multicultural Societies* 4 (1): 1-21.

Horak, Martin. 2013. "State rescaling in practice: urban governance reform in Toronto" *Urban Research & Practice* 6:3. pp. 311-328.

Henderson, Ailsa. 2004. "Regional Political Cultures in Canada". *CJPS* 37(3): 595–615.

Johnston, R. "Alignment, Realignment and Dealignment in Canada: The View from Above" *CJPS* 46: 2 (June, 2013), 245-71.

PHD: Cutler, Fred. 2008. Whodunnit? Voters and responsibility in Canadian federalism. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 41(03), 627-654.

### **Week 7: Canadian Political Economy (Oct. 23)**

ALL: Mahon, Rianne. 1993. "The New Canadian Political Economy Revisited: Production, Space, Identity," In R. Mahon, et al., eds., *Production, Space, Identity: Political Economy Faces the 21st Century*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press, pp. 1-21.

Pilon, Dennis. 2006. "Explaining Voting System Reform in Canada: 1874 to 1960," *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 40:3 (Autumn), pp. 135-61.

Haddow, Rod. 2014. "Power Resources and the Canadian Welfare State: Unions, Partisanship and Interprovincial Differences in Inequality and Poverty Reduction." *CJPS* 47 (4): 717-739.

McBride, Stephen. 2003. "Quiet Constitutionalism in Canada: The International Political Economy of Domestic Institutional Change." *CJPS* 36:2, pp. 251-274.

Flanagan, Tom and Christopher Alcantara. "Individual Property Rights on Canadian Indian Reserves." *Queens Law Journal* Vol. 29 No. 2 Spring, pp. 489-532.

MacDonald, Fiona. 2011. "Indigenous Peoples and Neoliberal "Privatization" in Canada: Opportunities, Cautions and Constraints." *CJPS* 44 (2): 257-273.

PHD: Skogstad, Grace. 2003. "Who Governs? Who Should Govern?: Political Authority and Legitimacy in Canada in the Twenty-First Century." *CJPS* 36:5, pp. 955-974.

**Week 8: "Old" Identities (Oct. 30)**

ALL: Cochrane, Christopher. 2010. "Left/Right Ideology and Canadian Politics." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 43 (3): 583-605.

Stewart, Marianne and Harold Clarke. 1998. "The Dynamics of Party Identification in Federal Systems: The Canadian Case." *American Journal of Political Science* 42 (1): 97-116.

Bittner, Amanda and Elizabeth Goodyear-Grant. 2017. "Sex isn't Gender: Reforming Concepts and Measurements in the Study of Public Opinion." *Political Behavior* 39: 1019-1041.

Goodyear-Grant, Elizabeth and Julie Croskill. 2011. "Gender Affinity Effects in Vote Choice in Westminster Systems: Assessing "Flexible" Voters in Canada." *Politics & Gender* 7 (2): 223-250.

Findlay, Tammy. 2015. *Femocratic Administration: Gender, Governance, and Democracy in Ontario*. Toronto: UTP. Chapter 2.

Sabin, Jerald. 2014. "Contested Colonialism: Responsible Government and Political Development in Yukon." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 47 (2): 375-396.

**Week 9: READING WEEK - NO CLASS (Nov. 6)**

**Week 10: "New" Identities (Essay 2 due) (Nov. 13)**

ALL: Poelzer, Greg and Ken S. Coates. 2015. *From Treaty Peoples to Treaty Nation: A Road Map for All Canadians*. Vancouver: UBC Press. (Chapters 1-5).

Cole, Peter. 2002. "Aboriginalizing Methodology: Considering the Canoe." *Qualitative Studies in Education* 15: 447-459.

Nath, Nisha, Ethel Tungohan and Megan Gaucher. 2018. "The Future of Canadian Political Science: Boundary Transgressions, Gender and Anti-Oppression Frameworks." *CJPS*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008423918000197>

Orsini, Michael. 2002. "The Politics of Naming, Blaming and Claiming: HIV, Hepatitis C and the Emergence of Blood Activism in Canada." *CJPS* 35 (3): 475-498.

**Week 11: Canadian Democracy (Nov. 20)**

ALL: Cross, William. Ed. 2010. *Auditing Canadian Democracy*. Vancouver: UBC Press. Chapters 1, 3-8.

Hogg, Peter H. and Allison Bushell. "The Charter Dialogue Between Courts and Legislatures (Or Perhaps the Charter Of Rights Isn't Such a Bad Thing)." *Osgoode Hall Law Journal* 35 (1997): 75-105.

Kelly, James, B. "Reconciling Rights and Federalism during Review of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms: The Supreme Court of Canada and the Centralization thesis, 1982 to 1999." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 34, no. 2 (2001): 325-55.

**Week 12: Can we study Canadian political institutions without the tools of comparative politics? (Nov. 27)**

ALL: Vipond, Rob. 2008. "The Comparative Turn in Canadian Political Science." In White, Simeon, Vipond, and Wallner, Eds. *The Comparative Turn in Canadian Political Science* Vancouver: UBC Press.

Turgeon, Luc. 2014. "Introduction" In Turgeon, Papillon, Wallner, and White, Eds. *Comparing Canada: Methods and Perspectives on Canadian Politics*. Vancouver: UBC Press: 3-19.

Noel, Alain. 2014. "Studying Your Own Country: Social Scientific Knowledge for Our Times and Places." *CJPS* 47 (4): 647-666.

Smith, Miriam. 2005. "Institutionalism in the Study of Canadian Politics: The English-Canadian Tradition." In Andre Lecours, ed, *New Institutionalism: Theory and Analysis*, UofT Press, pp. 101-127.

Broschek, Jorg. 2014. "Pathways of Federal Reform: Australia, Canada, Germany, and Switzerland." *Publius: Journal of Federalism* 45 (1): 51-76.

PHD: Lijphart, Arend. 1971. "Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method." *American Political Science Review* 65 (3): 682-693.

**Week 13: Conclusions (Essay 3 and Presentation Due) (Dec. 4)**

No readings.

### **Due dates and Non-medical and medical accommodation**

Assignments must be submitted on the dates specified above by the beginning of class. **Failure to turn in an assignment on time will result in a penalty of FIVE percentage points for each day or partial day it is late.** Only papers accompanied by a doctor's note (stating that the illness occurred before the due date) or proper documentation in the case of family emergencies will be exempt from late penalties. Please speak to the instructor to arrange for an extension BEFORE the due date. If documentation is required for either medical or non-medical academic accommodation, then such documentation must be submitted directly to the appropriate Faculty Dean's office and not to the instructor. Only the Dean's office can determine if accommodation is warranted. Further information is found in the Policy on Accommodation for Medical Illness (<https://studentservices.uwo.ca/secure/index.cfm>).

**Essays MUST be submitted online to the appropriate assignment folder in OWL.** Students are also responsible for ensuring that their paper has successfully been submitted to the appropriate assignment folder on OWL. Please be aware that internet servers tend to slow down near the deadlines as dozens of students try to submit their papers at the same time so submit early. No extensions will be granted on the basis of technological failures or unexpected slowdowns with the OWL server.

Under no circumstances should assignments be physically handed in, emailed, or slipped under any door. Students should always keep a copy of any work that is handed in, at least until it is graded and returned. Students should also keep all rough and draft work.

### **Statement on Contact**

If you have questions or concerns, or wish to meet with me in person, you can contact me via email, campus phone, or by attending posted office hours. Please expect at least a 24 hours delay in getting responses to emails, though responses may come sooner. Email contact should be for clarification purposes; more in-depth concerns should be addressed in a scheduled meeting or in office hours

**Only emails sent from a valid UWO email address will be read.**

Phone contact can only be made during posted office hours; the phone message systems will not be monitored. Alternative appointment times may be arranged if the office hours are not accessible.

The most preferred form of contact is in person. I am more than happy to meet with students during posted office hours or by mutually convenient appointment.

### **Statement on Use of Electronic Devices**

Laptops, iPads, smartphones and related devices are amazing tools, with remarkable capabilities. Among other things, they allow us to download PowerPoint slides, maintain a portable work station, keep neatly typed lecture notes, and stay in touch with friends through social networking sites, texting, and instant messaging. Because activities that provide entertainment for an individual (e.g., movie trailers, party photos, status updates) often prove distracting for others, there is a need to follow basic rules of electronic etiquette in a classroom setting. Whether you are sitting with friends or by yourself, please consider the impact of your electronic activities on those who are attempting to listen to lectures, watch class films, and participate in discussions. **All students are expected to comply with a simple principle: if it might distract someone sitting beside you or near you, don't do it.**

### **Statement on Academic Offences**

Scholastic offences are taken seriously and students are directed to read the appropriate policy, specifically, the definition of what constitutes a Scholastic Offence, at the following Web site: [http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/handbook/appeals/scholastic\\_discipline\\_undergrad.pdf](http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/handbook/appeals/scholastic_discipline_undergrad.pdf).

**Statement on Turnitin:**

“All required papers may be subject to submission for textual similarity review to the commercial plagiarism detection software under license to the University for the detection of plagiarism. All papers submitted for such checking will be included as source documents in the reference database for the purpose of detecting plagiarism of papers subsequently submitted to the system. Use of the service is subject to the licensing agreement, currently between The University of Western Ontario and Turnitin.com ( <http://www.turnitin.com> ).”

Students may NOT use the DRAFT option from any other course and doing so will result in a 0 on the paper.

**APPENDIX TO COURSE OUTLINES  
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE**

**Prerequisite checking - the student's responsibility**

"Unless you have either the requisites for this course or written special permission from your Dean to enroll in it, you may be removed from this course and it will be deleted from your record. This decision may not be appealed. You will receive no adjustment to your fees in the event that you are dropped from a course for failing to have the necessary prerequisites."

**Security and Confidentiality of Student Work** (refer to current Western Academic Calendar (<http://www.westerncalendar.uwo.ca/>))

"Submitting or Returning Student Assignments, Tests and Exams - All student assignments, tests and exams will be handled in a secure and confidential manner. Particularly in this respect, leaving student work unattended in public areas for pickup is not permitted."

**Duplication of work**

Students who submit similar assignments on closely related topics in two different courses must obtain the consent of both instructors prior to the submission of the assignment. If prior approval is not obtained, each instructor reserves the right not to accept the assignment.

**Grade adjustments**

In order to ensure that comparable standards are applied in political science courses, the Department may require instructors to adjust final marks to conform to Departmental guidelines.

**Academic Offences**

Scholastic offences are taken seriously and students are directed to read the appropriate policy, specifically, the definition of what constitutes a Scholastic Offence, at the following Web site: [http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/handbook/appeals/scholastic\\_discipline\\_grad.pdf](http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/handbook/appeals/scholastic_discipline_grad.pdf)

**Submission of Course Requirements**

ESSAYS, ASSIGNMENTS, TAKE-HOME EXAMS MUST BE SUBMITTED ACCORDING TO PROCEDURES SPECIFIED BY YOUR INSTRUCTOR (I.E., IN CLASS, DURING OFFICE HOURS, TA'S OFFICE HOURS) OR UNDER THE INSTRUCTOR'S OFFICE DOOR.

**THE MAIN OFFICE DOES NOT DATE-STAMP OR ACCEPT ANY OF THE ABOVE.**

Note: Information excerpted and quoted above are Senate regulations from the Handbook of Scholarship and Academic Policy. <http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/handbook/>

Students registered in Social Science should refer to <http://counselling.ssc.uwo.ca/> <http://counselling.ssc.uwo.ca/procedures/havingproblems.asp> for information on Medical Policy, Term Tests, Final Examinations, Late Assignments, Short Absences, Extended Absences, Documentation and other Academic Concerns. Non-Social Science students should refer to their home faculty's academic counselling office.

**Plagiarism**

"Plagiarism: Students must write their essays and assignments in their own words. Whenever students take an idea, or a passage from another author, they must acknowledge their debt both by using quotation

marks where appropriate and by proper referencing such as footnotes or citations. Plagiarism is a major academic offence." (see Scholastic Offence Policy in the Western Academic Calendar).

**Plagiarism Checking:** "All required papers may be subject to submission for textual similarity review to the commercial plagiarism detection software under license to the University for the detection of plagiarism. All papers submitted for such checking will be included as source documents in the reference database for the purpose of detecting plagiarism of papers subsequently submitted to the system. Use of the service is subject to the licensing agreement, currently between The University of Western Ontario and Turnitin.com ( <http://www.turnitin.com> )."

**Multiple-choice tests/exams:** "Computer-marked multiple-choice tests and/or exams may be subject to submission for similarity review by software that will check for unusual coincidences in answer patterns that may indicate cheating."

Note: Information excerpted and quoted above are Senate regulations from the Handbook of Scholarship and Academic Policy. <http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/handbook/>

### **PLAGIARISM\***

In writing scholarly papers, you must keep firmly in mind the need to avoid plagiarism. Plagiarism is the unacknowledged borrowing of another writer's words or ideas. Different forms of writing require different types of acknowledgement. The following rules pertain to the acknowledgements necessary in academic papers.

**A. In using another writer's words, you must both place the words in quotation marks and acknowledge that the words are those of another writer.**

You are plagiarizing if you use a sequence of words, a sentence or a paragraph taken from other writers without acknowledging them to be theirs. Acknowledgement is indicated either by (1) mentioning the author and work from which the words are borrowed in the text of your paper; or by (2) placing a footnote number at the end of the quotation in your text, and including a correspondingly numbered footnote at the bottom of the page (or in a separate reference section at the end of your essay). This footnote should indicate author, title of the work, place and date of publication, and page number.

Method (2) given above is usually preferable for academic essays because it provides the reader with more information about your sources and leaves your text uncluttered with parenthetical and tangential references. In either case words taken from another author must be enclosed in quotation marks or set off from your text by single spacing and indentation in such a way that they cannot be mistaken for your own words. Note that you cannot avoid indicating quotation simply by changing a word or phrase in a sentence or paragraph which is not your own.

**B. In adopting other writers' ideas, you must acknowledge that they are theirs.**

You are plagiarizing if you adopt, summarize, or paraphrase other writers' trains of argument, ideas or sequences of ideas without acknowledging their authorship according to the method of acknowledgement given in 'A' above. Since the words are your own, they need not be enclosed in quotation marks. Be certain, however, that the words you use are entirely your own; where you must use words or phrases from your source, these should be enclosed in quotation marks, as in 'A' above.

Clearly, it is possible for you to formulate arguments or ideas independently of another writer who has expounded the same ideas, and whom you have not read. Where you got your ideas is the

important consideration here. Do not be afraid to present an argument or idea without acknowledgement to another writer, if you have arrived at it entirely independently. Acknowledge it if you have derived it from a source outside your own thinking on the subject.

In short, use of acknowledgements and, when necessary, quotation marks is necessary to distinguish clearly between what is yours and what is not. Since the rules have been explained to you, if you fail to make this distinction your instructor very likely will do so for you, and they will be forced to regard your omission as intentional literary theft. Plagiarism is a serious offence which may result in a student's receiving an 'F' in a course or, in extreme cases in their suspension from the University.

\*Reprinted by permission of the Department of History  
Adopted by the council of the Faculty of Social Science, October, 1970; approved by the Dept. of History  
August 13, 1991

**Accessibility at Western:** Please contact [poliscie@uwo.ca](mailto:poliscie@uwo.ca) if you require any information in plain text format, or if any other accommodation can make the course material and/or physical space accessible to you.

**Mental Health at Western:** If you or someone you know is experiencing distress, there are several resources here at Western to assist you. Please visit <http://www.uwo.ca/uwocom/mentalhealth/> for more information on these resources and on mental health.