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**1. Teaching Philosophy, Strategies, and Goals**

My interest in teaching is shaped by a belief that a political science education has the potential to help form not only good political scientists, but also good citizens. In an age in which the formulaic presentation of talking points often passes for good political discourse, political science can help students go beyond these arguments, ideally creating a lifelong propensity toward higher quality argumentation and research. My task is to facilitate this development by encouraging active engagement with both the course material and other students. I do so by employing educational best-practices informed by pedagogical research and adapted to student feedback. My course development thus centres around the concept of constructive alignment – that is, a close connection between the intended learning outcomes for a course, the active student learning activities I employ, and the assessment tasks I assign.

From this perspective, I view learning as a student-centred process that entails not only engagement with new material, but also a shift toward thinking in new ways and applying new analytical frameworks to political issues and events. In a successful learning situation, students come to see how a topic can be understood differently from their initial response (whether or not that affects the conclusions that they draw). The goal is to have students apply contrasting theoretical frameworks to an issue or event – to understand why and how different conclusions could be reached from different perspectives. Implicit in this objective is the need to help students grasp the major theoretical frameworks, as well as the ways in which the findings of political science research can and cannot inform our arguments.

I aim to achieve these goals through constructive alignment. My course development process thus begins with me carefully defining intended learning objectives. Doing so helps me to ensure not only consistency across the course and my assessment methods, but also that students are aware of the skills they are meant to develop. I then align these objectives with related, non-assessed teaching/learning activities (e.g. writing an introductory paragraph for a practice essay question), with a particular focus on peer feedback. Through having students help one another, I help them to more critically assess their own work and to develop skills that align with both the learning objectives of the course and the associated assessment tasks they will perform.

While the intended learning objectives of my courses clearly vary, the key skill I ultimately try to help students develop is that of critical analytical thinking – that is, a more rigorous method of analysis and argumentation. In a successful lesson, active engagement with a topic leads students to find their intuitive stances on an issue challenged. My role as a teacher thus involves prompting and facilitating learning and the development of critical thinking skills, while also helping students to convey their knowledge and abilities both orally and in writing.

My approach to lesson planning reflects this perspective. I begin each class by briefly referencing a contemporary political issue, with two goals in mind: first, to connect the course material to current events and controversies; and second, to provide examples of common, often contrasting ways of thinking about an issue, so that they can be deconstructed later in the class. I also reinforce that while there may not necessarily be a correct or straightforward conclusion to reach, we must be careful to take an analytically sophisticated approach in our discussions and reasoning.

Before proceeding to those sorts of considerations, however, I first attempt to ensure that students have understood the assigned material. After providing a roadmap of the questions to be addressed over the course of the lesson, I therefore revisit key concepts through a combination of lecturing and having students, in pairs or small groups, engage with questions of understanding. I do so for two reasons: to ascertain how well students have grasped the argument; and to have students help each other understand the course material. This latter point is central in light of research suggesting the importance of active engagement for learning. It is also useful given that the knowledge gap between instructors and students can make it hard to predict the difficulties students will have.

Once students have a reasonable grasp of the material, I move on to more advanced learning objectives. This involves: applying the argument to an event or context; analysing the argument through the framework of another theory; and using the Socratic method to push discussions forward. I also employ a variety of group and class activities to ensure comprehension (e.g. small-group simulations, flipped classroom activities where students do the teaching, etc.) and develop critical thinking skills (e.g. “think-pair-share” activities, normative discussions about the assumptions implicit in the readings, etc.). Lastly, at various points in the semester I incorporate review sessions and writing workshops with peer feedback. This helps me to ensure that students are familiar with what is expected of them and are able to effectively communicate their ideas and arguments in writing.

Outside of the classroom, I make myself as accessible and approachable as possible, as one-on-one interactions with students provide an ideal occasion to encourage greater engagement with the subject matter. These interactions are particularly valuable with larger classes because they allow for a more tailored approach than is otherwise possible: with students who appear to grasp central arguments well, I can highlight complexities not addressed in the lessons; while with students who are having difficulties with the course material, I can provide individualised assistance in the form of additional background information, explanations, or general aid.

Overall, my work with students reflects my beliefs about the possibilities inherent in teaching political science. In particular, I believe the discipline has the potential to make us better citizens by increasing political literacy and critical reasoning skills. The most challenging aspect of this is to strike the right balance between those two goals given variation among students: to create learning environments in which I simultaneously engage students who are excelling in the course while also making sure that those who are having difficulties are not left behind. I look forward to a career in which I continually refine that balance, building from student feedback while experimenting with new pedagogical techniques and exploring new ways of engaging students.

**2. Teaching Experience**

Since beginning at Aarhus University, I have taught a BA core course, an MA core course, and two small-group MA seminars. In addition, I taught a BA course at McGill University on two occasions. Each of these courses put into practice the teaching philosophy laid out above, and here I briefly lay out an overview of the courses before providing more information on two of them (marked here with asterisks) in Section 4.

* **Co-Instructor, “Political Institutions”\***
  + **Overview:** Bachelor’s Core Course, Aarhus, Spring 2016 & 2017
  + **Duties**: Course design, lectures, exam design, and weekly seminars
  + **Enrolment:** 311 & 317
  + **Course Description**: A survey course on institutionalism and various domestic and supranational institutions (with a particular focus on the EU)
* **Co-Instructor, “Social Science Methods for Journalists”**
  + **Overview:** Master’s Core Course, Aarhus, Fall 2016
  + **Duties:** Course design, lectures, exam design, grading, and weekly seminars
  + **Enrolment:** 80
  + **Course Description**: An introduction to quantitative and qualitative social science methods
* **Instructor, “Democracy and Representation”**
  + **Overview:** Master’s Seminar, Aarhus, Fall 2015
  + **Duties:** Course design, instruction, exam design, and grading
  + **Enrolment:** 11
  + **Course Description**: An exploration of the link between public opinion and policy making.
* **Instructor, “Pragmatism and Politics”\***
  + **Overview:** Master’s Seminar, Aarhus, Spring 2015
  + **Duties:** Course design, instruction, exam design, and grading
  + **Enrolment:** 4
  + **Course Description**: An exploration of the challenges underlying the balance between technocracy and democracy
* **Instructor, “Politics: Contemporary Europe”**
  + **Overview:** Bachelor’s Course, McGill University, Summer & Fall 2013
  + **Duties:** Course design, lectures, exam design, and grading
  + **Enrolment:** 34 & 75
  + **Course Description:** A survey of welfare state, capitalist, and citizenship regime typologies, as well as the policy changes across them

**3. Professional Development**

I have participated in the following formal pedagogical courses from Aarhus University’s Centre for Teaching and Learning:

* Teacher Training Programme for Assistant Professors, 2016-2017
  + This programme consists of a three-day residential course (already completed) as well as three subsequent full-day workshops
  + Topics include Teaching Methods and Organisation, Integrated Course Design, Lecturing Skills, and Educational IT
* Challenges of the Multicultural Classroom in a Danish Context, 2016
  + This course consisted of a four-hour workshop on the Danish pedagogical approach to seminar-based teaching

In addition, I have attended numerous shorter workshops within my department’s Comparative Politics section, as they hold pedagogical sessions every semester with advisors from the Centre for Teaching and Learning. These workshops have covered issues such as blended learning, effective lecturing, and the use of active learning in large-class settings. Finally, I also received additional pedagogical training prior to my doctorate, as I previously worked as a high school teacher and taught preparatory courses for standardised tests (i.e. the SAT, GRE, and GMAT).

Furthermore, I am also consistently working to improve my mastery of the subject matter that I convey to students. I do so not only though work on my own research, but also through formal training to enhance my ability to help students better understand and carry out research. This training has included courses and workshops at the Essex Summer School in Social Science Data Analysis, the Institute for Qualitative and Multi-Method Research (at Syracuse University’s Maxwell School), and the Inter-University Centre for the Study of Democratic Citizenship.

**4. Sample Teaching Materials**

This section presents two examples of course syllabi and teaching materials that I have used.

***4.1 Sample Survey Course Syllabus***

Political Institutions: Western countries, the European Union and International Institutions

The course deals with political systems and their interactions. Its focus is on providing students with an understanding of how political systems work, as well as the causes and consequences of institutional differences for the representativeness and efficiency of political decision-making processes.

The course contains three core elements: 1) national political systems and institutional differences between these systems; 2) international cooperation and the interaction between political systems; and 3) the political system of the EU.

The first bloc of the course provides insights into the political systems of selected countries and the significance of key institutional differences. This includes differences between presidential and parliamentary systems, federal and unitary states, and the modes of operation in parliaments and governments.

The second bloc of the course concentrates on the interaction between political systems, transnational politics and related theories. In particular, we focus on theories aimed at explaining the formation and operation of international organisations, as well as different types of transnational governance.

The third bloc of the course focuses on the EU’s political system and the various theories that have been developed in relation to it. This includes theories about European integration, representation and elections in the EU, and the EU’s institutional structure, mode of operation and foreign policy.

The goal of the course is to give students a general knowledge of how political institutions at various levels of governance function, develop, and impact democratic representation and decision-making. Specifically, the course aims to give students the following competences:

* The student must be able to describe the political system of selected western countries, the EU, and international organizations.
* The student must be able to describe selected theories of how political actors interact in and through political institutions.
* The student must be able to compare key empirical differences between political systems and identify the differences and similarities.
* The student must be able to compare selected theories about the relationship between political actors and institutions and discuss the strengths and weaknesses of these theories.
* The student must be able to apply the general methods of political science to independently and systematically analyze issues regarding institutions, political systems and their interaction.
* The student must be able to apply the theories of the course to analyse empirical material and issues regarding institutions and their interaction to independently and systematically discuss and assess the relevance and scope of application of these theories.

These overall learning objectives can be divided into three major headings (as illustrated in Table 1): theoretical knowledge, empirical knowledge, and an ability to apply theories to empirical material.

**Table 1. Overall learning objectives for the course**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Theory** | **Empirical knowledge** | **Application** |
| The student must be able to describe selected theories of how political actors interact in and through political institutions.  They must be able to compare selected theories about the relationship between political actors and institutions and discuss the strengths and weaknesses of these theories | The student must be able to describe the political system of selected western countries, the EU, and selected international organizations. | The student must be able to apply the general methods of political science to independently and systematically analyze issues regarding institutions, political systems and their interaction.  The student must be able to apply the theories of the course to analyze empirical material and issues regarding institutions and their interaction. The goal here is to independently and systematically discuss and assess the relevance and scope of application of these theories. |

The course consists of four hours of teaching per week over 15 weeks: two hours of lectures and two hours of class discussions. To ensure that the teaching activities support the learning objectives, lectures will focus on concepts, typologies, and theories for defining, classifying, and understanding the function and structure of political institutions; classes, in turn, will focus on applying these concepts, typologies, and theories to empirical material. Finally, preparatory exercises for the classes will focus on 1) gathering and demonstrating empirical knowledge of selected political institutions (e.g. through class presentations) and 2) training writing skills through small weekly written assignments.

Lectures and classes will be taught in English, just as all written assignments must be in English. The final exam can be written in Danish or English.

**Organization of the course: Lectures and classes**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Week** | **Lecturer** | **Theme** |
| Week 1, L1 | HHP | Introduction: Institutionalism   * Hall & Taylor (1996) New institutionalism |
| Week 1, C1 |  | Institutionalism beyond comparative politics and international relations   * Jupille & Caporaso (1999) Institutionalism and the European Union |
| **Bloc 1: Political institutions in Western countries** | | |
| Week 2, L2 | AK | Electoral systems   * Repetition: Gallager, M. (2013) ‘Electoral systems’ * Benoit, K (2007) ‘Electoral laws as political consequences’ |
| Week 2, C2 |  | Electoral systems and women’s representation   * McAlister, I. and Studlar, D. (2002) ’Electoral systems and women’s representation: a long-term perspective’ |
| Week 3, L3 | HHP | Legislatures   * Kreppel, A. (2014) ‘Typologies and Classifications’ * Sieberer, U. (2011) The Institutional Power of Western European Parliaments |
| Week 3, C3 |  | Classifying legislatures   * Dalton, R. J. (2012) Politics in Germany * Schain, M. A. (2012) Politics in France |
| Week 4, L4 | HHP | Executives   * Cheibub et al. (2004) Government Coalition and legislative Success Under Presidentialism and Parliamentarism |
| Week 4, C4 |  | Executive efficiency and responsiveness   * Coleman (1999) Unified Government, Divided Government, and Party Responsiveness |
| Week 5, L5 | AK | Federalism   * Loughlin, J. (2011) ‘Federal and local government institutions’ * Beramendi, P. (2007) ‘Federalism’ |
| Week 5, C5 |  | Representation in federal systems   * Wlezien, C., and Soroka, S.N. (2011) ‘Federalism and Public Responsiveness to Policy.’ |
| **Bloc 2: International cooperation** | | |
| Week 6, L6 | RBP | Security cooperation   * Stein, Arthur A. (1982) Coordination and Collaboration: Regimes in an Anarchic World *International organization*, vol. 36, no. 2 spring 1982, pp. 299-324 |
| Week 6, C7 |  | NATO   * Schimmelfennig, Frank (2016) “NATO and institutional theories of international relations”, in Mark Webber and Adrian Hyde-Price (eds.) *Theorising NATO New perspectives on the Atlantic alliance*. London:Routledge. pp. 93-115. |
| Week 7, L7 | RBP | International governance   * Koremenos, Lipson og Snidal. 2001. The Rational Design of International Institutions. International Organization 55(4): 761-799. * Barnett and Finnemore. 2004. Rules for the World. Ithica: Cornell University Press. pp. 16 – 44. |
| Week 7, C7 |  | Institutional autonomy   * Barnett and Finnemore. 2004. Rules for the World. Ithica: Cornell University Press. pp. 45 - 72. |
| Week8,L8 | RBP | European integration   * Moravcsik, Andrew and Frank Schimmelfennig (2009). ‘Liberal Intergovernmentalism.’, in Antje Wiener and Thomas Diez (eds) European Integration Theory. 2nd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 67-87. * Niemann, Arne and Philipp C. Schmitter (2009). ‘Neo-functionalism.’, in Antje Wiener and Thomas Diez (eds) European Integration Theory. 2nd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 45-65. |
| Week 8, C8 |  | The Euro crisis   * Schimmelfennig, F. (2015) ‘Liberal intergovernmentalism and the euro area crisis’, *Journal of European Public Policy,* Vol. 22, No. 2, pp. 177-192. * Niemann, A., & Ioannou, D. (2015) ‘European economic integration in times of crisis: a case of neofunctionalism?’ *Journal of European Public Policy,* Vol. 22, No. 2, pp. 196-215. |
| **Bloc 3: EU** | | |
| Week 9, L9 | AK | The political system of the EU   * Hix, S., & Høyland, B. (2011). The political system of the European Union. Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 1-18. * Hargreaves, S., & Homewood, M.J. (2013) EU Law Concentrate: Law Revision and Study Guide. Oxford University Press, pp. 1-20. |
| Week 9, C9 |  | No readings – trial exam |
| Week 10, L10 | AK | Executive politics in the EU   * Hix, S., & Høyland, B. (2011). The political system of the European Union. Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 23-48. |
| Week 10, C10 |  | No readings – trial exam feedback |
| Week 11, L11 | DF | Legislative politics in the EU   * Hix, S., & Høyland, B. (2011). The political system of the European Union. Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 49-75. |
| Week 11, C11 |  | Trilogues   * Rasmussen, A., & Reh, C. (2013). The Consequences of Concluding Co decision early: trilogue and intra-institutional bargaining. * Häge, F.M. and M. Kaeding (2007). ‘Reconsidering the European Parliament’s Legislative Influence: Formal vs. Informal Procedures’ |
| Week 12, L12 | DF | Elections and democracy in the EU   * Hix, S., & Høyland, B. (2011). The political system of the European Union. Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 105-157. |
| Week 12, C12 |  | A democratic deficit?   * Føllesdal, Andreas & Simon Hix (2006). ”Why There is a Democratic Deficit in the EU: A Response to Majone and Moravscik” |
| Week 13, L13 | DF | Judicial politics in the EU   * Hix, S., & Høyland, B. (2011). *The political system of the European Union*. Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 75-105. |
| Week 13, C13 |  | A constrained court?   * Carruba, C.J. et al. 2008. Judicial Behavior under Political Constraints: Evidence from the European Court of Justice. * Dyevre, A. (2010). Unifying the Field of Comparative Judicial Politics. |
| Week 14, L14 | DF | The EU as a global actor   * Hix, S., & Høyland, B. (2011). The political system of the European Union. Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 302-331. |
| Week 14, C14 |  | The EU and trade negotiations   * Dür, A., & Zimmermann, H. (2007). Introduction: The EU in international trade negotiations. * Da Conceicao, E. (2010). Who controls whom? Dynamics of power delegation and agency losses in EU trade politics. |
| **Outro** | | |
| Week 15, L15 | RBP, DF, HHP, AK | Beyond Institutionalism? Wrap up and critical reflections and exam |
| Week 15, C15 |  | Review session |

***4.2 Sample Advanced Course Syllabus***

**Pragmatism and Politics**

Department of Political Science, Aarhus University

**Time:** Thursdays 11.00-14.00

**Location:** Building 1330, Rm. 018

**Lecturer:** Anthony Kevins

Office: Building 1331, Rm. 111

Email: [akevins@ps.au.dk](mailto:akevins@ps.au.dk)

Telephone: 87165649

**Course Objectives**

The course module offers a more extensive and more thorough analysis of a topic from within political science. To this end, the course module provides an overview and a critical discussion of the literature and the issues relevant for the topic of the seminar.  
  
This seminar trains students to:

* trace the shifting content of the “pragmatic consensus” in a variety of policy areas over time, and evaluate the reasons for those shifts.
* determine whether a given policy change reflects an underlying pragmatic or political position.
* understand and critically assess the distinction between pragmatism and politics, as well as the tensions between technocracy and democracy.
* assess the potential role and contributions of political science in a democratic society.

**Course Content**

What role has pragmatism played in western democracies? How and why has the content of “the pragmatic consensus” differed across countries and over time? Is pragmatism apolitical, and if so, is it preferable to politics? In this course, we will explore these questions through reference to various Western European policy trajectories, from the era of the post-war consensus through to today. In particular, we will focus on changes to the welfare state, economic policy, and approaches to immigration – as well as the relationship of the EU (and the Eurozone crisis) to member-state politics. In examining these developments, special attention will be paid to the use of pragmatism as a concept in politics and the tensions between technocracy and democracy. We will look at discourse and reform across different institutional settings, often with reference to literature on comparative political economy. This course is designed not only to help students better understand the relationship between pragmatism and politics in western democracies, but also to provide an exploration of the potential role of political scientists and their research in these societies.

## Comments on form of instruction

The seminar module requires active participation of students. At the beginning of the seminar module the lecturer and the students agree on specific "activity requirements" that the students have to fulfil.

The module consists of 15 tutorials of three hours over a period of 15 weeks

## Exam details

### Topic of student's choice, oral exam

*Grading:* External co-examination

*Assessment:* 7-point grading scale

*Notes:* The examination lasts approx. 30 minutes divided equally between examination in synopsis (800-1200 words, corresponding to approx. 2-3 pages) and in the general curriculum. There is no preparation.

Re-examination takes place in February and August. The assessment method is home assignment

*Exam time:* 30 minutes

## *Literature:* A collection of scanned book sections and electronic articles

## *Reading Load:* The readings total just under 1200 pages.

**COURSE OUTLINE AND READINGS**



*Week 1: February 5*

**The End of Ideology**

Lipset, S. M. (1964). "The Changing Class Structure and Contemporary European Politics." Daedalus **93**(1): 271-303.

MacIntyre, A. (1971). "The End of Ideology and the End of the End of Ideology," in Against the Self-Images of the Age: Essays on Ideology and Philosophy, pp. 3-11.

Lipset, S. M. (2001). "The Americanization of the European Left." Journal of Democracy **12**(2): 74-87.

Evans, G. and Tilley, J. (2012). “The Depoliticization of Inequality and Redistribution: Explaining the Decline of Class Voting.” The Journal of Politics **74**(4): 963-976.

*Week 2: February 12*

**State 2.0**

O’Reilly, T. (2013) “Open Data and Algorithmic Regulation.” inBeyond Transparency: Open Data and the Future of Civic Innovation, pp. 289-300. [Available online from the book’s website: <http://beyondtransparency.org/chapters/part-5/open-data-and-algorithmic-regulation/>]

Sunstein, C. (2014) Why Nudge?: The Politics of Libertarian Paternalism (Introduction, “Behaviorally Informed Paternalism”, pp. 3-22).

Hansen, P.G. and Jespersen, A.M. (2013) “Nudge and the Manipulation of Choice: A Framework for the Responsible Use of the Nudge Approach to Behaviour Change in Public Policy”. European Journal of Risk Regulation **3**: 3-28.

Legget, W. (2014). “The Politics of Behaviour Change: Nudge, Neoliberalism and the State.” Policy & Politics **42(**1): 3-19.

*Week 3: February 19*

**Democracy 1.0**

Walker, J.L. (1966). “A Critique of the Elitist Theory of Democracy” The American Political Science Review **60**(2): 285-295.

Shapiro, I. (2002). “Optimal Deliberation?” The Journal of Political Philosophy **10**(2): 196-211.

Ryfe, D.M. (2005). “Does Deliberative Democracy Work?” Annual Review of Political Science **8**: 49-71.

Dryzek, J.S. (2002). Deliberative Democracy and Beyond: Liberals, Critics, Contestations. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. (Chapter 1, “Liberal Democracy and the Critical Alternative”, pp. 8-30.) [Available as an e-resource from the library.]

*Week 4: February 26*

**Philosophical versus Everyday Pragmatism**

Bohman, J. (1999). “Democracy as Inquiry, Inquiry as Democratic: Pragmatism, Social Science, and the Cognitive Division of Labor.” American Journal of Political Science **43(**2): 590-607.

Shields, P. M. (2008). “Rediscovering the Taproot: Is Classical Pragmatism the Route to Renew Public Administration?” Public Administration Review, **68**: 205–221.

Hildebrand, D. L. (2008). “Public Administration as Pragmatic, Democratic, and Objective.” Public Administration Review, **68**:  222–229.

Somin, I. (2004) “Richard Posner’s Democratic Pragmatism and the Problem of Ignorance.” Critical Review: A Journal of Politics and Society **16**(1):1-22.

***Unit 2: Pareto-Optimal Obviousness – Three Examples***

*Week 5: March 5*

**Making Welfare Work**

Jenson, J. and Saint-Martin, D. (2003). “New Routes to Social Cohesion? Citizenship and the Social Investment State.” The Canadian Journal of Sociology / Cahiers canadiens de sociologie **28(**1): 77-99.

Taylor-Gooby, P. (2008). “The New Welfare State Settlement in Europe.” European Societies **10**(1): 3-24.

Van Kersbergen, K. and Hemerijck, A. (2012). “Two Decades of Change in Europe: The Emergence of the Social Investment State.” Journal of Social Policy **41**(3): 475-492.

Nolan, B. (2013). “What Use is ‘Social Investment’?” Journal of European Social Policy **23**(5): 459–468.

*Week 6: March 12*

**Dismantling the Welfare State**

Robert E. Goodin (1982). “Freedom and the Welfare State: Theoretical Foundations.” Journal of Social Policy **11**(2)**:** 149-176.

Offe, C. (1987). “Democracy against the Welfare State?: Structural Foundations of Neoconservative Political Opportunities.” Political Theory **15**(4): 501-537.

Larsen, C. A. (2008). “The Institutional Logic of Welfare Attitudes: How Welfare Regimes Influence Public Support.” Comparative Political Studies **41**(2): 145-168.

*Week 7: March 19*

**Managing Growth**

Mulas-Granados, C. (2006). Economics, Politics and Budgets: The Political Economy of Fiscal Consolidations in Europe. Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan. Pp. 17-24, 30-41.

Hopkin, J. & Blyth, M. (2012). “What can Okun teach Polanyi? Efficiency, regulation and equality in the OECD.” Review of International Political Economy, **19(**1): 1-33.

Blyth, M. (1997). “Moving the Political Middle: Redefining the Boundaries of State Action.” The Political Quarterly **68**: 231–240.

Schmidt V.A. and Thatcher, M. (2014). “Why are Neoliberal Ideas so Resilient in Europe’s Political Economy?” Critical Policy Studies **8(**3): 340-347.

*Week 8: March 26*

**Abandoning Growth**

Saad Filho, A. (2007). “Monetary Policy in the Neo-Liberal Transition: A Political Economy Critique of Keynesianism, Monetarism and Inflation Targeting.” In Albritton, R., Jessop, B., and Westra, R. (eds.) Political Economy and Global Capitalism: The 21st Century, Present and Future. London, UK: Anthem Press, pp. 89-119. [Available as an e-resource from the library.]

Van der Bergh, J.C.J.M. (2009). ”The GDP Paradox.” Journal of Economic Psychology **30**(2): 117-135.

Alexander, S. (2012). “Planned Economic Contraction: The Emerging Case for Degrowth.” Environmental Politics **21**(3): 349-368.

Piketty, T. (2014). Capital in the Twenty-First Century. (Read pages 86-96). [Available as an e-resource from the library.]

*(No class on April 2)*

*Week 9: April 9*

**Immigration as a Solution**

Ruhs, M. and Anderson, B. (2013) “Responding to Employers: Skills, Shortages and Sensible Immigration Policy.” In Jurado, E. and Brochmann, G. (eds.) Europe’s Immigration Challenge: Reconciling Work, Welfare and Mobility, pp. 95-104. [Available online through the library.]

Borjas, G.J. (2001) Heaven’s Door: Immigration Policy and the American Economy. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. (Chapter 1, “Reframing the Immigration Debate”, pp. 3-19.)

Seglow, J. (2005). “The Ethics of Immigration.” Political Studies Review, **3**(3): 317–334.

Foster, J. (2012). “Making temporary permanent: The silent transformation of the temporary foreign Worker Program,” Just Labour: A Canadian Journal of Work and Society **19**: 22-46.

*Week 10: April 16*

**Immigration as a Problem**

Hopkins, D.J. (2010) “Politicized Places: Explaining Where and When Immigrants Provoke Local Opposition.” The American Political Science Review **104**(1): 40-60.

Hainmueller, J. and Hiscox, M.J. (2010). “Attitudes toward Highly Skilled and Low-skilled Immigration: Evidence from a Survey Experiment.” American Political Science Review **104**(1): 61-84.

Portes, A. and Rumbaut, R.G. (2014). Immigrant America: A Portrait. Pp. 371-390.

Winter, E. (2015). “Rethinking Multiculturalism after its ‘Retreat’: Lessons from Canada.” American Behavioral Scientist: 1-21. Published online before print January 12, 2015, doi: 10.1177/0002764214566495.

***Unit 5: Consequences***

*Week 11: April 23*

**A Democratic Deficit?**

Follesdal, A. and S. Hix (2006). "Why There is a Democratic Deficit in the EU: A Response to Majone and Moravcsik." Journal of Common Market Studies **44**(3): 533-562.

Macartney, H. (2014). “The Paradox of Integration? European Democracy and the Debt Crisis.” Cambridge Review of International Affairs **27**(3): 401-423.

Norris, P. (2011). Democratic Deficit: Critical Citizens Revisited. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. (Chapter 12, “Conclusions and Implications”, pp. 236-246.)

Przeworski, A. (2010). Democracy and the Limits of Self-Government. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp. 99-117.

*Week 12: April 30*

**Populism?**

Dechezelles, S. and Neumayer, L. (2010). “Introduction: Is Populism a Side-Effect of European Integration? Radical Parties and the Europeanization of Political Competition.” Perspectives on European Politics and Society **11**(3): 229-236.

Mouffe, C. (2005). “The ‘End of Politics’ and the Challenge of Right-wing Populism.” In Panizza, F. (ed.) Populism and the Mirror of Democracy. London, UK: Verso, pp. 50-59, 65-71.

Rydgren, J. (2007). “The Sociology of the Radical Right.” Annual Review of Sociology **33**: 241-262.

Kaltwasser, C.R. (2012). “The Ambivalence of Populism: Threat and Corrective for Democracy.” Democratization **19**(2): 184-208.

*Week 13: May 7*

**Protest?**

Offe, C. (1985). “New Social Movements: Challenging the Boundaries of Institutional Politics.” Social Research **52**(4): 817-868.

FitzGibbon, J. (2013). “Citizens against Europe? Civil Society and Eurosceptic Protest in Ireland, the United Kingdom and Denmark.” Journal of Common Market Studies **51**(1): 105–121.

della Porta, D. and Andretta, M. (2013). “Protesting for Justice and Democracy: Italian Indignados?” Contemporary Italian Politics **5**(1): 23–37.

***Unit 4: Solutions***

*Week 14: May 14*

**Political Science?**

MacIntyre, A. (1981). After Virtue. (Chapter 8, “The Character of Generalizations in Social Science and their Lack of Predictive Power”, pp. 84-102).

Shapiro, I. (2002). “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): 596-619.

Shapiro, I. and Wendt, A. (2007). “The Difference that Realism Makes: Social Science and the Politics of Consent” in Shapiro, I. (ed.) Flight from Reality in the Human Sciences, pp. 19-50. [Available as an e-resource from the library]

*Week 15: May 21*

**Politics?**

Crick, B. R. (1972). In Defence of Politics. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. (Chapter 5, “A Defence of Politics against Technology”, pp. 92-110.)

Dahl, R.A. (1994). “A Democratic Dilemma: System Effectiveness versus Citizen Participation.” Political Science Quarterly **109**(1): 23-34.

Knight, J. and Johnson, J. (2007). “The Priority of Democracy: A Pragmatist Approach to Political-Economic Institutions and the Burden of Justification.” American Political Science Review **61**(1): 47-61.

Hay, C. (2007). Why We Hate Politics. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press. (Chapter 5, “Why Do We Hate Politics?”, pp. 153-162.)

***4.3 Sample Weekly Exercise***

Political Institutions, Spring 2016

**Class 5: Election outcomes and party system polarization**

This week’s class is about one of the causes of polarization in party systems. The article that you will read develops an argument about how parties that lose elections will behave. In your study groups, you will assess the article’s argument and empirics – most importantly by conducting your own research into the 2015 selection of Jeremy Corbyn as leader of the British Labour Party. You will do so by answering the following questions:

1. Why will parties tend to become more extreme after an electoral defeat?
2. What causes losing parties to eventually converge on the position of the winner?
3. Summarize the main results from the case studies and quantitative analysis, respectively. Which do you find more convincing? What are the main strengths and weaknesses of both? *(Study groups should answer question 3 in writing, uploading your one page response on the class blackboard site by Wednesday 23:59.)*
4. In the 2015 UK election, the Labour Party lost a second consecutive election. Following the loss, Jeremy Corbyn was elected new leader of the Party. Based on your own research\*, discuss to what extent the case fits with the theory and conclusions from Bækgaard and Jensen (2012). Think about the following questions in doing so:
   1. How is the Labour Party leader elected? What was Corbyn's support like from the party membership versus his support from the "Parliamentary Labour Party"?
   2. How does the distinction between the party membership and the "Parliamentary Labour Party" fit with the article's theory about the mechanism leading parties to become more extreme? According to Bækgaard and Jensen (2012), who are the actors driving the effect?

*(Study groups provide the answer for question 4 on 3 slides* *by Wednesday at 23:59.)*

\* Some potential sources include:

* <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Labour_Party_(UK)_leadership_election,_2015>

("Procedure", "Candidates", and "Result" sections)

* <http://www.economist.com/news/britain/21661653-jeremy-corbyn-will-probably-winbut-then-run-trouble-seeing-red>
* <http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2015/sep/12/jeremy-corbyn-wins-labour-party-leadership-election>
* <http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/politicsandpolicy/2015-the-year-british-politics-lost-its-opposition/>

*Readings*:

Martin Bækgaard and Carsten Jensen (2012), “The dynamics of competitor party behavior”, *Political Studies* 60 (1), pages 131-146 (16 pages).

***4.4 Sample Writing Workshop Activity***

Instructions:

1. Read through the examples on your own and mark down a grade for each
   * Contains three excerpts from a hypothetical introductory paragraph
   * Potential grades: A, B, C, and D
2. Turn to your partner and discuss why you assigned that grade

* Update the grade if you think you made a mistake

1. Then we’ll discuss your answers as a class

**The Question:** Will globalisation ultimately result in the convergence of Esping-Andersen’s “worlds of welfare” and thereby erase differences across welfare states?

**Excerpts:**

**Topic Introduction (i.e. first part of intro, before the thesis)**

1. Webster’s dictionary defines globalisation as “the act or process of globalizing: the state of being globalized; especially: the development of an increasingly integrated global economy marked especially by free trade, free flow of capital, and the tapping of cheaper foreign labor markets”.
2. Globalisation will ultimately result in the convergence of Esping-Andersen’s “worlds of welfare”.
3. Neo-liberalism and the fiscal austerity that goes with it have led to the substantial restructuring of welfare states across the globe. There remains much debate, however, as to what these changes mean to the future of welfare state institutions.

**The Thesis (i.e. your main argument; your answer to the question)**

1. Globalisation is a big issue that affects welfare state, capitalist, and citizenship regime institutions.
2. While some people argue that globalisation will result in convergence, others deny this.
3. I argue that globalisation will ultimately result in the convergence of Esping-Andersen’s “worlds of welfare”.
4. This essay will analyse and compare the validity of globalisationist and institutionalist theories through an examination of welfare state retrenchment as it has occurred in the United Kingdom and Sweden. While both states have indeed seen retrenchment, it has taken different forms under different institutional arrangements.

**Essay Structure Overview (i.e. your plan for the rest of the answer)**

1. I will make my argument by pointing to the impact of EU integration on everything from social policy to citizenship policies.
2. I will prove this point by referencing the research of Palier and Martin, Ferrera, and Taylor-Gooby.
3. In making this argument, the paper begins by tracing welfare state development within each case, and then examines the neoliberal restructuring which has occurred in social security and healthcare in recent decades. We then conclude with a brief analysis of the future prospects of welfare states.

**5. Evaluations of Teaching**

The remainder of the teaching portfolio contains evaluations of my teaching. This section begins with feedback from Ole Lauridsen, who is the Deputy Director of Aarhus University’s Centre for Teaching and Learning. I received the attached letter as feedback after he sat in on one of my classes as part of a pedagogical course. The remainder of the section then provides student evaluations from my courses, which are listed here in chronological order.