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## Course Description

This is an unusual course; it is neither a seminar nor a lecture but rather a Q-Team. It is based on the principles of inquiry-based learning. It is highly collaborative; we will work in groups and we will do a lot of practical, working sessions. Collectively, we want to answer the following question: *What is known from the existing literature published between 1969 and 2018 about how power sharing contributes to democratic stability across the globe?* 1969 is chosen because the power sharing theory was first conceptualized and heavily influenced by Arend Lijphart, whose 1969 article *Consociational Democracy* is considered the classic expression of the theory (Lijphart 2008, 3). Power sharing was first applied to four European consociational democracies namely Austria, Belgium, the Netherlands and Switzerland but has since been studied in several countries across the globe.

Students will be divided into groups based on regional interest: Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America, etc. Together we will carry out a pioneering scoping review of the vast power sharing literature. A scoping review is a more advanced and structured form of a literature review. It maps the concepts in addition to evidence sources and types in a particular field (Mays, Roberts, and Popay 2001, 194). Contrary to systemic reviews or meta-analysis that synthesize and evaluate evidence supporting or contradicting a specific research question, a scoping review maps the field and points out to research gaps (Arksey and O'Malley 2005, 20). The Q-Team will use Arksey and O'Malley’s (2005) widely-cited methodological framework on how to carry a scoping review. The framework consists of five stages: 1) identifying the research question, 2) identifying the relevant studies, 3) study selection, 4) charting the data and 5) collating, summarizing and reporting the results. The outline of the Q-Team is organized around these five stages.

## Course Goals and Learning Outcomes

The course aims to produce a scoping study of the power sharing literature between 1969 and 2018 that meets high academic methodological standards to qualify for publishing in an academic journal.

By the end of the course, students will be able to:

* Understand and explain the following terms to others: power sharing and its different types, divided societies, a scoping review.
* Apply the latest methodological advances in undertaking scoping reviews.
* Analyze the content of articles to judge whether they meet the scoping review’s inclusion and exclusion criteria.
* Evaluate the quality of other scoping reviews.

## Teaching Philosophy

I strongly believe in inclusion and equity. I understand that some people are introverts while others are extraverts. I will respect who you are. My responsibility is to provide an environment where everyone is encouraged to ask questions, voice opinions even if they go against the course majority’s opinion. This does not mean to become cynical. This is unhealthy and unproductive. I believe that a balanced critical mindset is important.

I do not believe that students are lazy by nature. I believe psychology professor Devon Price who argues that [laziness does not exist](https://humanparts.medium.com/laziness-does-not-exist-3af27e312d01). I believe that every human procrastinates at some point. Most of the time, it goes back to the structural conditions and context that you surround yourself or are surrounded with. If you found yourself procrastinating, think about what is holding you back. It is not about you, rather the strategies that you use or the context that you are immersed in.

I believe in mutual and horizontal accountability: my accountability towards you, your accountability towards me and your accountability towards each other. We all have joined the course for a purpose and we want to achieve the course goals by the end of the semester.

I do not claim to know or have all the answers. I will do however my best to guide you to find answers to your questions. In order to do that, you first need to voice your questions.

## Office Hours and Communication

Office hours will be scheduled by appointment. Please feel free to email me to schedule an appointment. My office address is: Luisenstr. 56, 10099 Berlin (Berlin Graduate School of Social Sciences, room 402).

Please communicate with me via email.

Please allow 48 hours for a response. If you need an urgent response such as feedback on an upcoming assignment, please write “Urgent” in the title.

When you write to me, please start your very first line in the email with the goal of the email saying for example: “I am writing to inquire whether… or Could you please tell me ….?” Being clear about what you want will help me in providing the best answer I can.

## Course Material

The course readings and material have been uploaded to Moodle.

## Course Requirements

Q-teams are not graded courses. You will not receive a grade at the end of the semester. You will receive 5 ECTS points (LPs) if you passed the course and met the requirements below. Failing to meet the requirements below will result in failing the course.

Please bring your laptop with you to the course. We will do a lot of working sessions. If this is not possible, please ensure that at least each group has two laptops per session.

* 1. **Regular participation:** The sessions are built on each other. Missing one session could significantly affect your ability to catch up and contribute to your group work. I however understand that emergencies happen. Only three unjustified absences will be allowed. Any additional absences will result in automatic course failure unless justified by evidence such as a doctor’s note in the case of illness.
  2. **Contributing to group work:** Much of the work will be done via group work. As we strive towards one goal, we need to equally contribute to the end goal, that is the scoping review. Free riding is therefore not acceptable. If you are not contributing to the group work, your group can decide to remove you from the group. If this happens, it will be your responsibility to find another group that will accept you to join them. If you could not find another group, this might lead to your inability to continue the course and thus failing the course. It is natural that each of us has particular strength. Try to know each other and divide the work of the group in order to capitalize on your strengths. Some of you might be good at research, others at writing or visualization, etc. Use your strengths, but divide the work equally!
  3. **Three papers to be presented by each group:**

*Papers:* The first two papers prepared by each group should be five pages each, while the third one should be 10 pages (double spaced, Times New Roman or Garamond 12 font size or Arial 11 font size, 2.5 cm all margins). The papers should include the following: 1) a cover page with the title, names of group members and an abstract, 2) introduction, 3) body text (divided into sections) on the analysis, 4) conclusion and 5) references if applicable.

The papers’ due dates are as follows:

First paper: Deadline is 18.11 2019 at 18:00

Second paper: Deadline is 09.12.2019 at 18:00

Third paper: Deadline is 31.01.2020 at 18:00

The papers document the progress of each group on undertaking the scoping review and present the findings and challenges so far. It will also justify the decisions taken by each group. I will provide more details on the content of each paper in due course. The papers should be uploaded on Moodle to be accessible by everyone before the deadline.

*Presentations:* For the first two papers, each group will present their paper in the session, due the following day after submitting the paper. For the first two papers, each group will be given only 15 minutes to present their paper using a power point presentation. For the third paper, the Africa-Americas and Asia Groups will present on 04.02.2020 while the Europe Group will present on 11.02.2020 to allow time for a thorough discussion and reflection on each paper. Groups will be given 20 minutes to present their third paper. You have three options: bring the presentation on a flash drive and I will show it on my laptop, send me the presentation at 11 am at the latest on the same day of the course or bring your laptop with you to show the presentation.

## Publishing the Scoping Review

All students who successfully pass the course will be automatically listed as contributors to the scoping review, once hopefully published in an academic journal.

If you want to become a co-author, please let me know at the end of the semester. A co-author will contribute to extra work required after the official end of the course to put the findings of the different groups into a coherent academic paper to be potentially published. This will require more time and effort from you. There is also the possibility that after putting this effort, the paper could be rejected from publication. In this case, we will try to revise and resubmit to another journal. A journal that accepts the article could also ask for revisions, be it significant or minor.

## Session Plan

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Session 1  15.10.2019 | **Welcome and introduction to the Q-Team** |
| Session 2  22.10.2019 | **Power sharing and its critics**  A debate activity on the virtues and criticisms of power sharing. Without reading the articles, you will not be able to contribute to and benefit from the debate!  *Required readings (please read the first article and either the second or third article):*   * Lijphart, Arend. 2008. *Thinking about Democracy: Power Sharing and Majority Rule in Theory and Practice.* Oxon, New York: Routledge (Chapter 1, 3-22). * Binningsbø, Helga M. 2013. “Power sharing, peace and democracy: Any obvious relationships?” *International Area Studies Review* 16 (1): 89–112. doi:10.1177/2233865912473847. * Horowitz, Donald L. 2014. “Ethnic Power Sharing: Three Big Problems.” *Journal of Democracy* 25 (2): 5–20.   *Additional readings:*   * Andeweg, Rudy B. 2000. “Consociational Democracy.” *Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci.* 3 (1): 509–36. doi:10.1146/annurev.polisci.3.1.509. * Lijphart, Arend. 1969. “Consociational Democracy.” *World Pol.* 21 (02): 207–25. |
| Session 3  29.10.2019 | **The why and how of scoping studies - What are the relevant studies and how to identify them?**  A group activity on the different stages of scoping studies. You will also understand how to idenitfy the studies and how to add them to a cloud-project such as Citavi or JBI Sumari. A group working session on identifying study.  *Required readings:*   * Arksey, Hilary, and Lisa O'Malley. 2005. “Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework.” *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 8 (1): 19–32. doi:10.1080/1364557032000119616. * Levac, Danielle, Heather Colquhoun, and Kelly K. O'Brien. 2010. “Scoping Studies: Advancing the Methodology.” *Implementation Sci* 5 (1): 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-5-69>. * Peters, Micah D. J., Christina M. Godfrey, Hanan Khalil, Patricia McInerney, Deborah Parker, and Cassia Baldini Soares. 2015. “Guidance for Conducting Systematic Scoping Reviews.” *International journal of evidence-based healthcare* 13 (3): 141–46. https://doi.org/10.1097/XEB.0000000000000050.   *Examples of scoping reviews:*   * Tricco, Andrea C., Erin Lillie, Wasifa Zarin, Kelly O’Brien, Heather Colquhoun, Monika Kastner, Danielle Levac et al. 2016. “A Scoping Review on the Conduct and Reporting of Scoping Reviews.” *BMC Med Res Methodol* 16 (1): 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-016-0116-4>. * Campana, Aurélie, and Luc Lapointe. 2012. “The Structural “Root” Causes of Non-Suicide Terrorism: A Systematic Scoping Review.” *Terrorism and Political Violence* 24 (1): 79–104. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09546553.2011.611547>.   *Examples of article datasets:*   * Pelke, Lars, and Paul Friesen. 2019. “Democratization Articles Dataset: an introduction.” *Democratization* 26 (1): 140–60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2018.1504778>. * Schedler, Andreas, and Cas Mudde. 2010. “Data Usage in Quantitative Comparative Politics.” *Political Research Quarterly* 63 (2): 417–33. https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912909357414. |
| Session 4  05.11.2019 | **Identifying relevant studies: Progress made, challenges faced and how to overcome them**  Group exchange on identified studies so far and challenges faced. Discussion on how to overcome challenges based on other groups’ experience. In-class group working session. |
| Session 5  12.11.2019 | **What studies have we found so far and what are the gaps?**  Group exchange on identified studies so far, the gaps and discussion on how to overcome them. In-class group working session. |
| Session 6  19.11.2019 | **Finalizing identification of relevant studies**  Group presentations by students on the final list of identified studies by region. Celebrating the first milestone! |
| Session 7  26.11.2019 | **Inclusion and exclusion criteria of identified studies**  Why inclusion and exclusion criteria? Developing the criteria together. A practical group working session to apply criteria by the students. |
| Session 8  03.12.2019 | **What have we included so far and challenges faced?**  Group exchange on included and excluded studies so far and challenges faced. Discussion on how to overcome challenges based on other groups’ experience. |
| Session 9  10.12.2019 | **Finalizing study selection**  Group presentations by students on the final studies included. Celebrating the second milestone! |
| Session 10  17.12.2019 | **Which information to extract and where to save it?**  Which information to extract? How to add the extracted data to Google Forms? A practical group working session to apply the criteria. Mid-term evaluation. |
| Break  24.12.2019 and 31.12.2019 | |
| Session 11  07.01.2020 | **Charting the data and challenges faced**  Group exchange on extracted data from studies so far and challenges faced. Discussion on how to overcome challenges based on other groups’ experience.  **Diving deep into the theory of power sharing**  A lecture answering the following questions: What is the difference between democratic and authoritarian power sharing? How can we build a typology of power sharing and majoritarian democratic regimes? What are the philosophical origins of power sharing? What are the different definitions and types of power sharing? What is a divided society and what is the nature of those divisions? Is power sharing still relevant in today’s globalized world?  *Readings on democratic power sharing:*   * Lijphart, Arend. 1968. “Typologies of Democratic Systems.” *Comparative Political Studies* 1 (1): 3–44. * Horowitz, Donald L. 1993. “Democracy in Divided Societies.” *Journal of Democracy* 4 (4): 18–38. * O'Leary, Brendan. 2005. “Debating Consociational Politics: Normative and Explanatory Arguments.” In *from Power Sharing to Democracy: Post-Conflict Institutions in Ethnically Divided Societies*, edited by S. J. R. Noel, 3–43. Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press. * Lustick, Ian. 1979. “Stability in Deeply Divided Societies: Consociationalism versus Control.” *World Pol.* 31 (03): 325–44. doi:10.2307/2009992.   *Readings on authoritarian power sharing:*   * Svolik, Milan. 2009. “Power-Sharing and Leadership Dynamics in Authoritarian Regimes.” *American Journal of Political Science* 53 (2). https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.860744. * Svolik, Milan. 2012. *The Politics of Authoritarian Rule.* 1. publ. Cambridge studies in comparative politics. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press (Chapter 1: Introduction). * Magaloni, Beatriz. 2008. “Credible Power-Sharing and the Longevity of Authoritarian Rule.” *Comparative Political Studies* 41 (4-5): 715–41. https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414007313124. |
| Session 12  14.01.2020 | **Finalizing charting of the data and summarizing the findings**  Group exchange on the final extracted data. Is there anything pending and when to finish that? Methodological best practice on collating and summarizing the findings.  **Power sharing in different contexts: Favorable and unfavorable conditions**  A lecture answering the following questions: When does power sharing succeed and when does it fail? What are the qualities of power sharing that make it more or less likely to succeed? Is power sharing the solution or the problem? For how long can power sharing agreements work? How to establish a power sharing agreement including how to get groups to sit on the table and how to support negotiations as an external mediator?  *Readings on favorable conditions of power sharing:*   * Bogaards, Matthijs. 1998. “The Favourable Factors for Consociational Democracy: A Review.” *Eur J Polit Res* 33 (4): 475–96. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006887312649. * Lijphart, Arend. 2000. “Definitions, Evidence, and Policy: A Response to Matthijs Bogaards' Critique.” *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 12 (4): 425–31. https://doi.org/10.1177/0951692800012004003. * Lijphart, Arend. 2002. “The Wave of Power‐Sharing Democracy.” In *the Architecture of Democracy: Constitutional Design, Conflict Management, and Democracy*, edited by Andrew Reynolds, 37–54. Oxford: Oxford University Press. * McGarry, John. 2019. “Classical Consociational Theory and Recent Consociational Performance.” *Swiss Polit Sci Rev* 109 (2): 148. https://doi.org/10.1111/spsr.12378.   *Readings on conflict resolution:*   * Zartman, I. William. 2000. “Ripeness: The Hurting Stalemate and Beyond.” In *International Conflict Resolution After the Cold War*, edited by Paul Stern and Daniel Druckman, 225–50. Washington, DC: National Academy Press. * Kydd, Andrew H. 2010. “Rationalist Approaches to Conflict Prevention and Resolution.” *Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci.* 13 (1): 101–21. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.032108.135916. * Walter, Barbara F. 2009. “Bargaining Failures and Civil War.” *Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci.* 12 (1): 243–61. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.10.101405.135301. |
| Session 13  21.01.2020 | **Collating and summarizing the findings (1)**  Group exchange by students on collated and summarized data and challenges faced. Discussion on how to overcome challenges based on other groups’ experience.  **Empirical assessment of power sharing**  A lecture answering the following questions: What are the different measurement options of power sharing? What are the positive or negative outcomes of power sharing?  *Readings on power sharing empirics:*   * Graham, Benjamin A. T., Michael Miller, and Kaare W. Strom. 2017. “Safeguarding Democracy: Powersharing and Democratic Survival.” *American Political Science Review* 111 (4): 686–704. * Hartzell, Caroline, and Matthew Hoddie. 2015. “The Art of the Possible: Power Sharing and Post—Civil War Democracy.” *World Pol.* 67 (01): 37–71. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0043887114000306. * Linder, Wolf, and Andrea Bachtiger. 2005. “What Drives Democratisation in Asia and Africa?” *Eur J Political Res* 44 (6): 861–80. * Norris, Pippa. 2008. *Driving Democracy: Do Power-Sharing Institutions Work?* Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press (Chapter 9: What Works? Lessons for Public Policy). |
| Session 14  28.01.2020 | **Collating and summarizing the findings (2)**  Addressing any last minute questions from the groups on collating and summarizing the results.  **Power sharing policy proposals and latest developments**  A lecture answering the following questions: How to translate power sharing theory into practice? How to constitutionally engineer power sharing? What are the latest developments in the study of power sharing?  *Readings on power sharing policy proposals:*   * Reilly, Benjamin. 2012. “Institutional Designs for Diverse Democracies: Consociationalism, Centripetalism and Communalism Compared.” *Eur Polit Sci* 11 (2): 259–70. https://doi.org/10.1057/eps.2011.36. * Lijphart, Arend. 2004. “Constitutional Design for Divided Societies.” *Journal of Democracy* 15 (2): 96–109. https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.2004.0029. * Horowitz, Donald L. 2002. “Constitutional Design: Proposals Versus Processes.” In *the Architecture of Democracy: Constitutional Design, Conflict Management, and Democracy*, edited by Andrew Reynolds, 15–36. Oxford: Oxford University Press. * Reilly, Ben. 2002. “Electoral Systems for Divided Societies.” *Journal of Democracy* 13 (2): 156–70.   *Readings on latest developments:*   * Agarin, Timofey, and Allison McCulloch. 2019. “How Power-Sharing Includes and Excludes Non-Dominant Communities: Introduction to the Special Issue.” *International Political Science Review*, 019251211987307. * Bogaards, Matthijs. 2019. “Consociationalism and Centripetalism: Friends or Foes?” *Swiss Polit Sci Rev* 28 (1): 129. https://doi.org/10.1111/spsr.12371 * McCulloch, Allison. 2019. “Power-Sharing: A Gender Intervention.” *International Political Science Review* 9 (1): 019251211986102. |
| Session 15  04.02.2020 | **The findings of regional scoping reviews (1)**  The Africa-America and Asia Groups will present the findings of their scoping review.    **Course evaluation** |
| Session 16  11.02.2020 | **The findings of regional scoping reviews (2)**  The Europe Group will present the findings of their scoping review. Addressing any final questions. Celebrating the final milestone! |
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