

Supplementary Material

Supplement A: Data Collection and Ethics

The course evaluation data used in this project was collected in accordance with the American Political Science Association's standards for professional ethics and principles for human subjects research. Data collection and handling protocols were approved by the Institutional Review Board at the authors' university. This section briefly describes these procedures.

At the conclusion of the semester, students are invited to complete standard course evaluation surveys. These surveys are implemented by the university and students are informed that their participation is completely voluntary. Anonymized survey results are automatically released to instructors approximately two weeks after final grades are submitted, when respondents are no longer in a direct-dependency relationship with the course instructor. Other vulnerable populations (e.g. prisoners or decisionally impaired individuals) were unlikely to be included as respondents, as they were unlikely to be students in the course. Respondents are all aged 18 years or older.

To further guard against the possibility of inductive disclosure, instructors do not receive observation-level responses. Instead, responses are aggregated into summary measures (for example, the percentage of students responding that they "agree" or "disagree" that they "learned a great deal from this course"). We also added a series of free-response items to these evaluations, and this textual data was released to us with responses in random order. Products of the course presented in the Supplementary Information (e.g. poster) are likewise completely anonymized and are used with written permission from the students who created them.

Supplement B: Abbreviated Course Syllabus

1. What is this class about? How will it help you in the future?

While I may be wrong, most of you will not become academic political scientists. Even fewer (likely none of you) will become academic political theorists. However, there is real value to the study of political theory: learning about social contract theory, classical virtue ethics, or medieval understandings of religion and politics can be engaging, enriching intellectual work. Such learning plays an important role in the degree program of political science and in the broader task of liberal education.

However, the topics and goals of this class are different. Of course, you will learn things which enrich your understanding of political science and broaden your liberal education. You will (and must) improve your philosophical reasoning skills in much the same way you would while studying arguments about the State of Nature. But rather than focus on topics which are, in some sense, far away in time and space, this course will focus on what is nearby.

This class aims to improve your understanding and use of everyday political theory. What makes the course ‘everyday’ political theory is that it will help you **analyze and evaluate the stuff of your everyday life**: Your favorite coffee shop. Your living situation. Your Instagram feed and your favorite subreddit. The job that you love (or hate). The congregation down the street. The library. The classroom. The quiet trail. *What do all these things have in common?* They are all potential arenas for *politics: shared meaning and action*.

I will lead you to **acquire analytic skills to explore relationships between citizenship, cooperation, and value**. For every area we discuss in class, it will involve an ‘us’ (the citizenship part), some goal we want to achieve or problem to solve (the value part), and a strategy for bringing about the value or solving the problem (the cooperation part). This course takes a micro-perspective: we will focus on areas of life you are likely to directly experience.

For example, I assume all of you will have a job at some point. To that end, there are several readings about the workplace as a space for freedom (or domination) and the overall political theory of the corporation. Additionally, I assume you’ll live in a community sometime (a reasonable assumption). So, there are readings about street-level agents of the state and about the political theory of being a good (or bad) neighbor. We’ll apply the perspectives we learned on citizenship, value, and problem-solving to the readings on these different areas of life (the workplace, the neighborhood).

In the process, you’ll gain critical skills in **seeing like a citizen**: you’ll learn to see the order behind things, imagine how they could be different, and evaluate what could be better. In other words, you’ll learn what it means to ask: “What should we do together, and how?” You’ll learn political theory which applies to your everyday life, and you can apply it every day...

In fact, **you’ll apply what you learned in class to areas of your own life here in Chapel Hill**. In the end, you will acquire skills of membership, cooperation, and analysis which will bolster your agency and insight wherever you go.

In Sum, by the end of this course you will be able to:

- Understand differing views on citizenship, value (e.g. equality), and on cooperation.
- Analyze differing approaches to goods provision
- Join normative analyses with descriptive, social scientific work
- Explain the meaning and significance of the question “what should we do together?”
- ‘See like a citizen’ in your everyday life

2. Strategy for Success

Following these two simple rules will help you go a long way to success in this course:

- Attend class (and)
- Do the reading

Some pointers on each of those...

When you attend class:

- Take notes: don’t just copy the slides. I will make the slides available to you (if there are any). Instead, note information I give verbally or how I emphasize something. Too, people will ask questions in class (so will you!) and those questions won’t be in the slides.
- Ask questions: when you don’t understand, when I go too fast, when you disagree, etc.

When you read for class, keep these questions in mind:

- If you needed to explain the author’s main argument to someone who had never heard it before, what would you need to communicate?
- What claims about human beings does the author make? About society? About right and wrong? Good and evil?
- Who might the author’s audience be?
- What does the author emphasize? Order and stability? Justice? Well-being and flourishing?

There are many other questions you might ask. This list isn’t meant to be exhaustive--but it is a good place to start.

3. Schedule & Readings

Course Readings (and Costs)

Course Readings come from a variety of sources and disciplines. *All readings are available on Sakai.* This is partly for convenience, partly out of necessity, and partly due to budget constraints. Part of this class is an end-of-the-semester poster presentation. Printing a poster costs money. I will provide more information later, but you should expect to purchase a printed poster this semester (the cost will be divided among your group--again, more info later).

Schedule

POLI 276 Schedule

Week 1 Citizenship/Membership

January 10--

- How to Read in College—Only 358-367 “Appendix” of Concepcion’s “Reading Philosophy with Background Knowledge and Metacognition”
- Constant, The Liberty of the Ancients Compared with that of the Moderns

January 12--

- Pocock, “The Ideal of Citizenship Since Classical Times” *Queen's Quarterly* Spring 1992; 99, 1.

January 14--

- SEP Civic Education or PDF of Crittenden, Jack and Peter Levine, "Civic Education", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall 2018 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.)

Optional Reading:

- Dalton, Citizenship Norms and the Expansion of Political Participation, *POLITICAL STUDIES*: 2008 VOL 56, 76–98
- Friere, excerpt, Pedagogy of the Oppressed
- Vallier, Social and Political Trust: Concepts, Causes, and Consequences

Journal Entry 1: write about 2 places where you spend time (work, home, ‘third place,’ religion, etc). In your reflection, be sure to discuss what you think it means to be a good member of that place. Is it more liberal? More republican? What concepts from the reading can you apply?

Week 2 Institutions and Cooperation

January 17--

- Hirschman, A.O. (1970). *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty*. Harvard UP.
 - 21-9 “Exit”,
 - 30-43 “Voice”,
 - 98-105 “Loyalty and the Difficult Exit from “Public Goods” (and Evils)”

January 19--

- Hardin, G. “Tragedy of the Commons.” *Science* 162, 1243 (1968).
- Ostrom, E. (2010) Beyond Markets and States. *The American Economic Review*, Vol. 100, No. 3, pp. 641-672

January 21--

(again, but skim) Ostrom, Beyond Markets and States

Optional Reading:

- Ostrom, Design Principles of Robust Property-Rights Institutions: What Have We Learned
- Ostrom Governing the Commons Chapter 1
- Bicchieri, C. (2016). *Norms in the Wild*. Oxford UP. (Selected Chapters)

Journal Entry 2: Pick some place you have spent much of your time recently. What goods do you enjoy there? How could they be different? How could they be provided differently? What rules structure that environment? etc

Week 3 Cooperation and Deliberative Democracy

January 24--

- Levine, P. (2019) “What Should We Do? The Bloomington School and the Citizen’s Core Question.” in *Ostrom’s Tensions*. Ed. Herzberg et al. Mercatus Center at George Mason.

January 26--

- Gutmann & Thompson. (2004). “What Deliberative Democracy Means” in *Why Deliberative Democracy*. Princeton UP. Pages 1-36 only.

January 28--

- Bagg, S. (2018). “Can deliberation neutralize power?” *European Journal of Political Theory*, Vol. 17(3) 257–279

Optional Reading:

- Thompson, Deliberative Democratic Theory and Empirical Political Science, ARPS
- Diamond and Fishkin, Great News for Democracy, NYT 2019
- Eitan D. Hersh, The Problem With Participatory Democracy Is the Participants

Journal Entry 3: Using what you have learned about citizenship, cooperation, and deliberation, discuss your hopes and concerns for the group work that’s coming in this class; apply what you’ve learned so far to the reality of group work.

Week 4--Midterm 1 and Group Project Launch

January 31--(no reading)

- Begin Group Selection [Initial groups of 3-5, lead to discussions of potential target institutions.]

February 2--(no reading)

- Complete Group Selection [Any shifting occurs. Settle groups of 3-5 and choose paper topics. Team Bonding!]
- Review and Advice on Papers

February 4-- [Midterm 1 online; no class meeting]

Journal Entry 4: Prewrite on your individual paper. What topic and lens have you chosen? What approach will you take? What readings will you incorporate? What do you hope to learn from your analysis?

Week 5-- Freedom

Text: Krause, S. (2015). *Freedom Beyond Sovereignty: Reconstructing Liberal Individualism*. University of Chicago Press.

February 7--

- Krause, Vitalities of Non-Sovereign Agency

February 9--

- Krause, What is Freedom?

February 11--

- Krause, Plural Freedom

Optional Reading:

- Young - Five Faces of Oppression
- Wolf, Happiness and Meaning, *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, Vol. 158, No. 1 (MARCH 2014), pp. 18-24
- Cone, James. (1989 [1969]). *Black Theology and Black Power*. Orbis.
 - Preface to the 1989 Edition, *Black Theology and Black Power*
 - Cone, Introduction
 - Cone, Chapter 1

Journal Entry 5: Either (a) Pick two forms of freedom, compare and contrast. Where have you experienced these forms? Where have you lacked such freedom? Or (b) Continue your preparations for the Individual Paper. Write out your outline and/or your opening paragraph.

Week 6-- Equal Opportunity(?)

Text: Fishkin, J. (2014). *Bottlenecks: A new theory of equal opportunity*. Oxford UP.

February 14--

- Fishkin, Introduction

February 16--

- Fishkin, "Opportunity Pluralism," 1-23

February 18--

- Fishkin, "Opportunity Pluralism," 23-49

Due: Individual Paper submit via Dropbox by 12PM (Group Project, Part 1)

Optional Reading:

- Fishkin, "Opportunity Pluralism," 49-58
- Anderson, E. "What's the Point of Equality?" *Ethics*, Vol. 109, No. 2 (Jan., 1999), pp. 287-337
- Sen, Equality of What? *Tanner Lectures*

Week 7--What are we doing here? A Crash Course in Thinking about Justice

Text: Schmidtz, D. (2006). *Elements of Justice*. Cambridge UP.

February 21--

- Schmidtz, Chapters 1-3

February 23--

- Schmidtz, Chapters 4-5

February 25--Review and Introduction to Unit 2 of Course [No Reading]

Feedback Due from Instructor on Individual Papers via Dropbox

Week 8--Corporations

February 28--

- Singer, "Classical Theories of the Corporation" in Singer, A. (2018). *The Form of the Firm: A Normative Political Theory of the Corporation*. Oxford UP.
- Friedman, Corporate responsibility

March 2--

Singer, "Ronald Coase and the Difference between Markets and Firms"

March 4--

- Ciepley, D. "Beyond Public and Private: Toward a Political Theory of the Corporation." *American Political Science Review* Vol. 107, No. 1 February 2013.

Optional Reading:

- Hayek, “Principles of a Liberal Social Order,” in *Studies in Philosophy, Politics and Society*. Politico, 31. No. 4. (December 1966). pp. 601-618.
- Berry, W. Two Economies. in *Art of the Commonplace*.

No Journal Entry: PREP FOR MEETING ON MARCH 7

Week 9—Corporations and Markets Continued & Midterm 2

March 7–

- Built-in Group Meetings [No Reading]

March 9–

- Anderson, Chapter 2 in Anderson, E. (2017). *Private government: How employers rule our lives (and why we don't talk about it)*. Princeton UP.

Optional Reading:

- Tyler Cowen, Response to Anderson in *Private Government*.
- Spinner-Halev, J. (2017). “Liberalism, Markets, and Responsibility.” *The Journal of Politics*, volume 79, number 4.

March 11–

Online Midterm 2 /// No Readings-No Class Gathering

Week 10

SPRING BREAK

March 14--No Class

March 16--No Class

March 18--No Class

Week 11--Neighbors

Text: Rosenblum, N. L. (2016). *Good neighbors: The democracy of everyday life in America*. Princeton UP.

March 21–

- Rosenblum, Introduction (Good Neighbor Nation)

March 23–

- Rosenblum, Chapter 3 (Reciprocity Among Decent Folk)

March 25–

- Rosenblum Chapter 4, Taking Offense, Speaking Out

Due: Group Papers submit via Dropbox.

No Journal Entry: Chill out/rest.

Week 12--Identity, Norms, and Citizenship Revisited

Text: Allen, D. S. (2004). *Talking to strangers: Anxieties of citizenship since Brown v. Board of Education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

March 28–

- Allen, Prologue and Chapter 1

March 30–

- Allen, Chapter 2

April 1–

- Allen, Epilogue

Feedback on Group Papers Due from Instructor via Dropbox

Optional Reading:

- Bretherton, L. “Exorcizing Democracy.” *Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics*, Volume 38, Number 1, Spring/Summer 2018, pp. 3-24

No Journal Entry: Work on Presentation and Brief

Week 13--The State and the City

April 4–

- Bickford, S. (2000). “Constructing Inequality: City Spaces and the Architecture of Citizenship.” *Political Theory* Vol 28 (3), 355-376.

April 6–

- Zacka, Chapter 1 “Discretion” in Zacka, B. (2017). *When the state meets the street: Public service and moral agency*. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

April 8–

- Zacka, “Pathologies” Part 1 66-85

Optional Reading:

- Scott, J. (1998). *Seeing Like a State*. Yale UP. Chapter 2 only.

No Journal Entry: Work on Presentation and Brief

Week 14--State and the City Continued, Group Project Prep

April 11–

- Zacka, “Pathologies” Part 2 85-110
- Activity: Lottery for practice presentation slots

April 13–

- Workshop day on Presentations and Briefs

April 15–

- **NO CLASS**

Week 15--Preparing for the Workshop/Conference---practice presentations*

April 18–

Groups 1-3 Presentation/Poster Due

[Or groups 1-4, or 1-5; depends on # of groups]

April 20–

Groups 4-6 Presentation/Poster Due

April 22–

Groups 7-9 Presentation/Poster Due

DUE: All Group Project Briefs Due via Dropbox

*Group presentation numbers dependent on number of groups formed at the start of semester.

Week 16

April 25–

Course Review

No Reading, No Assignment

TUESDAY April 26–Poster Presentations/Attendance Required/Public Lecture from Peter Levine (Tufts). 5PM-8PM

April 27–

Debrief and Reflection, Review for Exam

Journal Entry 6: Submit Question for Final Exam Part 2

May 5 at 8AM

Final Exam Parts 1 and 2

4. Explanation of Assignments and Assessments

Summary of Assignments and Assessments:

Participation 5%

Journal Entries 10%

Group Project 60%

- Individual Paper 20%
- Group Paper 20%
- Poster Presentation and Brief 20%

Exams 25%

- 2 Midterms 5% Each
- Final 15%

Total: 100%

Note: Peer evaluation is built-in to the group project. See below.

Explanation of Assignments and Assessments

Participation (5%)

First, there is no attendance policy for this course. If you need to miss, please let me know that you won't be coming to class. Second, it is *impossible for you to participate if you are absent*. So, while there is no attendance policy, if you're never in class, you're pretty much guaranteed to get a 0 in this category. If you participate well when you are in class, and you are in class *the vast majority of the time*, then missing a day here and there isn't a problem. If you hardly participate when you are in class and you miss class often, your participation grade will be poor.

That said, I have a very inclusive view of participation: asking questions, taking part in discussion, and active listening through note-taking are all participation. Quality is *as important* as quantity. Yes, it is good to participate often—but it is equally important to work hard at connecting different elements of the course to ask how they connect, provide substantive objections to readings, and so on. Last, I often call on people in class to see what they think. It is okay if you're just listening. 'Cold-calling' is often thought of as a way to 'test' the students for understanding. Instead, I am trying to find out what you are thinking or what questions you have. Your responsiveness to these interactions is also part of participation.

A reasonable warning: this class is at 9:05AM. I am, let's say, a *high energy teacher*. Get ready to participate. It won't be a class for you to just show up and listen. I'm very excited about it.

Journal Entries (10%)

Journal entries give you a chance to write and reflect on a topic related to the reading, discussion, and lectures for that week. They also give me a chance to evaluate the degree to which you understand the material (and determine what to return to and explain again!). While it

is not technically a completion grade assignment, students who demonstrate that they have read/attended and are engaging the material will receive full or close-to-full credit. DO NOT SKIP THESE. They really help your understanding, your grade, and my instruction throughout the semester. Alternatively, if you don't complete the journal entries, your grade will suffer and your understanding will be lackluster.

All journal entry assignments open after class time on Fridays and are due before 12PM the following Tuesday.

Exams: Midterms (10%) and Final Parts 1 and 2 (15%) (Total 25%)

These are traditional examinations, plus one odd/important part of the final which needs explanation. The two midterm exams cover the material discussed up to that point and will include some multiple choice and short answer questions. These are each worth 5% and are designed to evaluate your foundational understanding of the reading and topics.

The Final exam will be similar and *will be cumulative* (i.e. it will cover the entire course). Part 1 of the final is a traditional exam and will be completed in the first 1.5 hours of the final exam period (it will be a length which fits 1.5 hours). Part 2 of the final exam is a 'reverse' final or open discussion. Students will submit questions in advance which will then be discussed by the instructor (me) and students (you). The bulk of the evaluation for the final exam will come from part 1, but your question submission will play a small role in the final as well. Your question submission counts as a journal entry which is completed before the final.

Group Project Assignments (read closely!) (Total 60%)

Overview. The group project is the most important part of your work in this course. The goal is to bring together your own individual understanding of a topic, problem, or institution with the work of your peers *which directly relates to life in Chapel Hill.*¹ Together, you'll create a final poster presentation which you'll share at a mini-conference hosted by the Philosophy, Politics, and Economics Program. The overall project has three parts: an individual paper (written by you), a group paper (written as part of a group), and a group poster presentation & project brief toward the end of the class (again, created as part of a group).

Early in the semester (January 31 & February 2), you'll self-select into groups of 3-5 members. Each group will choose an organization or institution which you each have some contact with to focus your work. Each member of the group will write their first paper by themselves. All of the papers will be on the same topic, but will focus on different elements or modes of analysis, drawing on the content of the course. For example, if your group chooses a local coffee shop for analysis, a group of three might write papers on citizenship/membership, institutional design, and freedom as they relate to the coffee shop. Then, after receiving extensive comments from me, the group members would contact the coffee shop to see if there is a pressing goal or problem they hope to solve. Then, your group paper would bring together your

¹ Possibly to the surrounding area as well, depending on how the project progresses.

existing research from the individual papers to address the problem or goal identified by the organization (the coffee shop). After receiving feedback from me on the group paper, you'll work on your poster presentation and invite the coffee shop owner to attend our miniconference. There are other ways this project can go, of course. But, the three elements will remain the same: a paper you write individually, a group paper, and a poster presentation.

Individual Paper (20%) [Group Project Part 1] Due Date: February 18th

After self-selecting into groups of 3-5, you'll choose a shared topic for the semester. Then, you'll choose a lens (citizenship/membership, institutional design, equality, freedom, etc). From there, you each individually write papers. These papers are *not graded as a group* but are instead *graded individually.* Each paper must be between 1000-1300 words. Clear, concise writing is expected. (Further info on this later.)

After receiving feedback from me, you'll contact the relevant group/person/institution, introduce yourselves, and see whether you're able to help in some way. (I will likely contact this group first to 'test the waters.')

This part is not graded and can go a variety of ways (they may not respond, they may be put off, they may be very excited, etc). From there, you'll move toward the Group Paper.

Group Paper (20%) [Group Project Part 2] Due Date: March 25th

After completing an initial meeting with the relevant folks, you'll write a group paper which synthesizes your research from the individual paper, incorporates my feedback, and connects to the problem or goal the outside institution indicated. This paper should be approximately (1000 words) x (# of authors). For example, if your group has 4 members, the group paper should be around 4000 words. We'll discuss this much more as it approaches. You will receive feedback from me on these projects before moving on to the Poster Presentation and Brief. ***DO NOT JUST COPY AND PASTE YOUR PAPERS TOGETHER.*** Create a plan together and work toward a synthesis of your work. (I will provide more instruction on this as we progress.)

Beginning with the group paper, students will also be required to meet with me or with one of two graduate student consultants. Myself and the other graduate student consultants will provide feedback, literature suggestions, and a 'sounding board' throughout the project development process. This will continue, as needed, through the mini-conference in April.

Poster Presentation and Brief (20%) [Group Project Part 3] Poster Due Date: April 18-22² & Brief Due Date: April 22 & Mini-Conference Presentation: April 26

The final stage of the project is to write a white paper-like brief of 4-6 pages (plus citation page) and produce a poster presentation to share with the public at the mini-conference. Your brief will summarize the findings of your group paper into actionable information. The

² Exact date depends on which group you are in. Dates selected by lottery.

poster presentation will serve as a way to illustrate your work and communicate the findings to the public. Given the nature of this part of the project, your goal will be to alter and clarify your previous work into a short form and prepare to communicate it to other students and attendees of the mini-conference. You will be graded on the clarity and concision of the brief and on your overall poster presentation (roughly, half and half). *10% of the grade for this part is completion: you just have to show up to the mini-conference and present!*

Beyond this course, the brief and/or group paper could be adapted for an application to the [Bryan Fellowship](#). For examples of successful Bryan projects, see [here](#). Other programs on campus may be interested as well (e.g. [Parr Center for Ethics/ParrHeels](#), [Shuford Program in Entrepreneurship](#), and [Innovate Carolina](#)).

Summary of Group Project Schedule

- January 31 and February 2: Form groups and select topic
- February 18: Individual Paper Due (20%)
- February 25:
 - Receive Feedback on Individual Papers and
 - Contact Organization ASAP
- March 25: Group Paper Due (20%)
- April 1: Receive Feedback on Group Paper
- Poster Presentation and Brief (20%)
 - April 18-22: Poster Presentations Due/Practice Presentations
 - April 22: Brief Due
 - April 26: Mini-Conference with Philosophy, Politics, and Economics

Peer Evaluations and Group Work Explanation

Many students are wary of group work. We've all been burnt (or been the burner!) in group work where 5 students are supposed to do a project...and only 1 or 2 actually do everything. First, let me reassure you: peer evaluation will be part of your grade for each of the group-graded portions. This means that in addition to my grading, you will also grade and be graded by your fellow group members. More info on this later, but for now know: part of your grade will be determined by people who depend upon you *for their grade*. ***So, you have serious incentives to do good work.***

Second, there are several reasons why group work is important. Much of life involves considerable group work (as we'll see through some of our readings). Whether at home, at work, in the neighborhood, or in our social lives, cooperating with others is often required. Further, we can achieve more together than alone. That isn't just a truism--it is supported by a variety of research! Last, ***strategizing for cooperation in groups is a learning outcome of the course itself.*** And, each phase of the project will require different skills and knowledge--meaning that you'll excel when you learn how to work together.

Supplement C: Group Project Part 1

Individual Paper (20%) [Group Project Part 1]

Due Date: before class on February 18th via Sakai Dropbox

In class on Monday Jan 31 and Wednesday Feb 2, we'll choose groups. I will record the group membership. After self-selecting into groups of 3-5, you'll choose a shared topic for the semester. Then, you'll choose a lens (citizenship/membership, collective action, deliberation, equality, freedom, etc). From there, you each individually write papers. These papers are *not graded as a group* but are instead *graded individually.* Each paper must be between 1000-1500 words. Clear, concise writing is expected.

Choosing a Perspective: Now that you have a group formed and an issue or organization selected, each member of the group needs to write about the same issue or organization *from different perspectives* drawn from the reading in the class. This does not mean each paper can draw *only* from that perspective, but it should draw primarily from one. You may choose any perspective from weeks 1-5. This means you may choose to write from a perspective we have not covered. The perspectives are:

- Citizenship/Membership
- Collective Action/Cooperation
- Deliberation
- Liberty
- Equal Opportunity/Equality

As of today (January 31) we have not yet covered Liberty and Equal Opportunity/Equality entirely (Constant and a few others mention liberty). **Important:** Again, each member of your group will choose a *different* perspective. My only stipulation is that someone *must* choose the Collective Action/Cooperation perspective. Once you settle who is writing from what perspective, you can each individually write your papers.

First Task: *You Must* submit your group and individual paper topics to me before class begins on Monday February 7th. You may do so earlier. **You must also give your group a name.**

Second Task: your papers are due via Sakai dropbox on before class on February 18th. Papers must be 1000-1300 words. Format with 1" margins, double spaced lines, and a typical font. You must cite sources, but you may choose the style (just be consistent).

Below, you'll find a bunch of helpful advice on researching and writing the paper. And, you'll gain some insight on my grading process. Remember: tests help me gauge your basic understanding of a bunch of things. Papers are designed to help you gain a deeper understanding of a smaller proportion of the course material. Dive in!

A. How to research for the Paper? B. Write the Paper? C. How will I grade it?

A. How to Research for the Paper, in No Particular Order:

- Most important: something is *already* the case at your organization or with your chosen issue. You should spend time thinking, observing, researching what that actually is.
 - Go to the location/organization of your paper or otherwise learn about it. This will really help you understand how to connect things (more below).
 - Ask relevant questions for your topic. For example “What is the operant form of citizenship/membership here?” “What kind of goods are they producing, and what is their approach—more state-like? Market-like? Community?” “How are important decisions made? Does deliberation play a role? Could it?”
- Look at the perspective you have, review your notes. Potentially reread the required reading.
- See if the suggested reading for that perspective is useful/relevant. The suggested reading assigned during the week when we talked about your perspective is the place to look. See me for further suggestions.
- Think about the nuances/distinctions within your topic. What are the advantages? Disadvantages?
- Important: In the paper itself, and in the research phase, you’ll need to note both normative /philosophical and descriptive elements.
 - Descriptive: What is the issue or organization? What are its relevant features? Why does it exist?
 - Normative/Philosophical: From the perspective you take, what is good about this issue/organization? What could be better? Why might you want it to be different? Since there are always alternatives, what are the different possibilities? Why prefer one to another? How might you decide (e.g. should deliberation play a role)?

B. Writing the Paper:

Once you have done the research part, writing the paper becomes clearer. Any good paper will include both some descriptive elements (you’ll talk about the issue or organization to provide context) and normative or philosophical elements (you’ll assess the alternatives and advance some view about what makes them good or bad options).

At this point, *it is okay to take a definite position **or** to extensively weigh the alternatives.* In other words, your paper can be an argument for a particular approach to the issue/how to improve an organization (or set up an alternative), *or* it can focus on spelling out all the relevant

details so you can make a more informed argument later (at the group paper phase). So, there are two kinds of papers:

- Type 1: Argue for a Thesis
- Type 2: Assess the Alternatives *without* Making a Determination

Type 1: Argue for a Thesis

In this approach, you should still evaluate alternatives relevant to the organization/issue, but you argue for *why a particular approach is the right one*. Naturally, this involves a lot of the same work as Type 2, but it includes the need for a conclusive judgment. Of course, my comments on the paper may lead you to revise your thesis (or not!)--or you may find that your peers persuade you to think about the issue differently in the group paper phase.

Type 2: Assess the Alternatives without Making a Determination

In this approach, you should complete the same work as in Type 1, but you do not need to make a judgment about which approach to take. Instead, your job is to demonstrate a deep familiarity with the problems/trade-offs/advantages/etc involved and conclude by summing up the different paths you could take. This is basically a deliberative exercise in writing—you spell out the different views from your perspective and organize them so that when you reach the group paper phase, you have a lot of information to work with.

What might a paper look like?

Great question. Let's say I am writing a paper on my workplace, the Department of Political Science at UNC Chapel Hill. And, let's say I am writing about it from the perspective of citizenship. What might I write about? Let's say I've decided to write a Type 2 paper—one where I don't make a final decision. There are probably other ways of writing these papers, but here's a very rough structure:

- Part 1: Provide an analysis of *how things are* using course material and your own research. You might also discuss the good and bad of the current situation.
- Part 2: Use concepts/research to discuss *how things could be different*. Importantly, don't be overly optimistic (that is—don't imagine that there are no downsides to a different state of affairs).
- Part 3: Conclude by either offering a judgment (Type 1) or by summing up the alternatives (Type 2).

Hypothetical Outline on Citizenship/Membership in the POLI SCI Department at UNC-Chapel Hill.

Part 1: *How Things Are*

- Introduce the context (the department)

- Work through several of Bretherton's 5 Dimensions, focusing in on one in particular—the 4th dimension, the performance of a vision of politics in our department. That is, what does a good member of our department do?
 - The regular professional activities: write, teach, research, present work
 - The informal stuff: eat lunch together, talk about interesting things, offer to help each other on their projects, spend time together socially outside work
- Draw some analogies to the Political Animal and Legal Person view
 - Legal/formal rights/obligations of doing x, y, and z
 - Membership responsibilities of engaging in certain behaviors
- Identifying a Key Problem: COVID has disrupted our department. How can we improve? Should we be the same as before or seek different possibilities of membership?

Part 2: *How Things Could Be Different*

- Drawing from the political animal view
 - We could engage in more collective decisions/common activity.
 - Planned, shared lunches at restaurants or campus dining, rather than accidental meet-ups
 - More gatherings in person or zoom to discuss the common goals or values of our department—develop a common set of aims
 - More social time together after hours
 - Downsides:
 - Higher cost of coordinating everyone
 - Potential conflicts between personal values and department values
 - Unequal resources/free time across department members due to obligations at home or other interests (oikos-polis problem)
- Drawing from the legal person view
 - Recommit or alter the formal, legal, or contractual responsibilities of the department members to direct their actions toward greater personal independence
 - Redirect funds from social activities to research budgets, travel, etc. leading to greater intellectual independence.
 - Spend significant time revising or reinforcing various forms of appeal and redress in the department (focus on the legal, contractual elements)
 - Downsides
 - Could lead to the same social outcomes, or could lead to a socially fractured department
 - Could exacerbate existing social inequalities by eliminating common activities which are funded by department instead of by personal funds

Part 3: *Preliminary Assessment*

Conclude the paper by summing up the differences in the alternatives. Suggest that it may be possible to combine some elements of both or introduce other approaches as needed. Suggest that further work/research is needed in the group phase.

Some Notes:

- Naturally, this would look different if I had written from the Collective Action perspective or from Deliberation, or Liberty, etc.
- Also, topics need not be directly about an organization. The topic could be focused on campus littering, mask usage, or bathroom graffiti. Those things would be different, of course—but still possible to use the perspectives we’ve learned to analyze them.

C. How am I going to grade this?

My paper rubric looks like this, with each category being graded out of 20 (adding up to 100).

Knowledge of Course Material	Writing/Clarity	Evidence	Well Developed/ Persuasive	Creativity

- Knowledge of Course Material: have you demonstrated a thorough understanding of your perspective? Do you know much more about it than someone in class who didn’t write on that topic?
- Writing/Clarity: Are the arguments clearly expressed? Is it readable? How hard is it to follow along? Are there basic errors in the writing or is it well-executed?
- Evidence: What sources does the paper cite? Does the paper engage the descriptive part of the paper well?
- Well Developed/Persuasive: Does the paper evaluate alternatives in detail? Does the argument/analysis connect well with the evidence offered? Would a reasonable person who disagrees with the opinion of the paper be forced to admit “it has a point”?

- Creativity: how well do you imagine possibilities, come up with interesting comparative examples, interestingly organize the material so that it is better, or otherwise do something more than just go through the motions?

Last, since it is very important to the future of the group project, I'll provide speedy and thorough feedback. The (ambitious) timeline is that I will return your papers with comments *one week* after I receive them. That's very fast.

Once you get your comments back, you'll look at them to see how to improve in the group paper. Then it will be time to identify and move toward contacting the relevant person for your group. More on that later.

Supplement D: Group Project Part 2

Group Paper (20%) [Group Project Part 2]

Due Date: before class on March 25th via Sakai Dropbox

Basic Info

- Length: This paper should be approximately (1000 words) x (# of authors). For example, if your group has 4 members, the group paper should be around 4000 words. There is no penalty for writing *more* than this approximation. However, papers under the word count are unlikely to be good. Reference page does not count.
- Formatting: All names of the group members should be visible on the first page of the document. All papers should include a reference page. References do not count toward the word minimum.
- Submit: One copy via dropbox through one member of your group. No need for all of you to submit the paper. **Please submit a word document, NOT a pdf.**
- You will receive a grade for this group paper
 - Based on the overall quality of the paper as outlined in C below.
 - Based on the peer evaluation rules you adopted.

Content and Goals of the Paper

All papers must (1) identify some issue and explain why it matters, (2) provide an answer to “what should we do?” as it relates to that issue, and (3) summarize the advantages and highlight some potential drawbacks of your answer to “what should we do?” This does not *necessarily* mean your paper will have 3 sections (though it could—see below).

Important Notes:

- This paper requires knowledge of the issue *and* substantial application of the perspectives you have learned in class across (1), (2), and (3) above. This means you need to apply knowledge of your topic and perspectives to successfully achieve (1), (2), and (3).
- The temptation will be to write a paper about ‘what should be done’ rather than ‘what should we do?’ The paper cannot merely amount to a policy recommendation. Even if a new policy is what you think *should* happen, then you should answer the question of “what should we do *to get this policy in place?*” The question always comes back.
- Last, resist the urge to *definitively solve* the issue. Even if there is a clear solution (which is unlikely), there are *many intermediate steps* that must be taken in order to get there. The answer to “what should we do?” will inevitably include those intermediate steps. You need to balance the desire to do great things with the practical realities of what it means to try to move things in a good direction.

In sum: apply knowledge of the topic and your perspectives to seek answers to the question “what should we do?” as it relates to some important issue. Aim to move things in the right direction; resist the pull of offering solutions which gloss over the reality of intermediate steps.

Below you will find further explanation, a sample outline of a paper, and a review of my rubric/grading process.

A. More Detail on the Important Notes

In the broadest sense, every paper will answer ‘what should we do?’ Recalling Levine, to ask ‘what should we do?’ means moving beyond the idea of what should be done; you need to move beyond arguments about what should happen regarding some issue in a grand, ideal sense. Saying that some other group should pass a law about X does not tell me what *you* should do. Your focus should be on *yourselves* as citizens, members, or people reasonably situated to care about the topic and do something. Part of the point of the interviews is to consider extending ‘we’ beyond the students of your group. For example, perhaps the person you talk with sees you as an ally/co-citizen in addressing a given problem. Perhaps something important is already going on regarding your issue that you think shapes the answer to ‘what should we do?’

Of course, answering the question of ‘what should we do?’ entails normative, philosophical argument. You’ll need to answer questions like ‘why does this matter?’ and address contextual, descriptive points along the way. Generally speaking, you want to identify an issue, provide reasons for why it matters, and then move toward what we should do about it.

The ‘we’ can be your group. Or, it can be what students who care about this issue should do. [If there is a sensible ‘we’ beyond those points, you’ll need to show why it makes sense.] Maybe your interview leads you to see yourselves as part of a broader group (e.g. those who work with the Food Pantry). Perhaps part of what you think you should do is get more students to care about something in particular.

Your perspectives can play a variety of roles in this process. Of course, they can help identify reasons why some issue matters (e.g. it has negative impacts on opportunity, freedom, etc). Your perspectives can also help you see what you should do in light of the issue—perhaps your view of citizenship informs why you should do something about gentrification. This will nearly always be a combination of collective action and other perspectives (e.g. we should exit from some institution to pressure it to do better; we should voice our opinion—and deliberate publicly about what should be done to improve outcomes).

Importantly, the answer to ‘what should we do?’ will likely not include an outright *solution*. Remember: we’re not trying to leap to the ideal here, we’re following processes that attempt to move things in the right direction.

B. Sample Outline

By way of illustration, below is an outline I've (not completely) made up. The topic concerns racial reconciliation among religious institutions in Chapel Hill. I gesture at some potential citations throughout in parentheses. I've told you what a good paper will do above. Below, I show you what a good outline might look like.

1. Intro: Overview of argument, framed as a question of what we should do about the fact of racially segregated congregations in the midst of a time of racial reckoning in the United States?
2. The state of things and why it matters
 - a. Context on racial segregation of congregations in the US, specifically in the South and in Chapel Hill (where information is available).
 - b. Identify Congregation A as home congregation, B and C as congregations which we sometimes gather with for Sunday, but with whom we have not developed further relationships. The initial 'we' is concerned members of congregation A. This connects us to the question in a real way, grounding the normative and practical matters of what we should do.
 - c. Why it matters
 - i. [(relevant) Theological commitments (religious text which exhorts racial reconciliation)]
 - ii. Separation can increase the possibility for misunderstanding which in turn leads to agency-undercutting oppressive attitudes based on group membership (Krause). Separation also undercuts agency related to collective world-making—we could do more together (Krause).
 - iii. Because of discrepancies in community connections and constituency, membership in one congregation provides different (and more) opportunities than membership in another (Fishkin).
 - iv. However, different congregations may actually afford the oppressed group a space within which they can bolster their own agency—a counterpublic (Krause). A simple merger would likely undercut this possibility.
 - v. Further, one congregation does not necessarily know what the other thinks or wants. It is possible there is wrongdoing or hurt which we do not know about and could re-enact if clumsy or ignorant.
3. What should we do?

- a. We, the interested members of congregation A should set up some time to connect with members of congregation B and C beyond the occasional gatherings we sometimes do. One idea is a picnic with yard-games and a joint cookout. This type of gathering serves several goals.
 - i. First, it can create a space for coming to know, respect, and love one another better. This has theological advantages as well as non-instrumental political theory advantages: our increased unity would be a good in itself in light of a broadly polarized culture filled with racial tension—it provides an avenue for a less fractured civic body, reformulating membership in the process by normalizing relationship between the congregations (Bretherton).
 - ii. Second, in light of concerns of undercutting counterpublic agency (Krause), we should gather in a way that does not infringe upon their agency-enabling arenas. This will entail deliberation on the topic of where we should meet and how (Gutmann & Thompson). This makes our proposal for a picnic preliminary and open to revision as a result of deliberation.
 - iii. Third, when we meet, we should aim to have fun together. Why? This initial goal provides us a way to build trust, reciprocal expectations, and work out basic norms of collective action—the nuts and bolts of working together (Ostrom). This also serves the end of building better relationships and understanding to improve further deliberation (Gutmann & Thompson).
- b. In order to pluralize opportunity (Fishkin) on this front, we should also create smaller, less planned instances of connection. Rather than relying on multiple large gatherings, we should also use congregational funds to pay for small groups to eat meals together. This removes an instrumental good bottleneck to connection between the congregations, allowing people to connect who would otherwise not have the time or financial means.

4. Challenges and Conclusion

- a. This task faces many challenges beyond those already mentioned.
 - i. First, this constitutes a set of first steps in a much longer work. It will likely seem slow or ineffective to some. To this end, it will be important to create small ‘wins’ along the way—and design tasks to draw in participation through normative language (we believe we ought to do this) and creating small incentives to contribute (increasing MPCR) (Ostrom). Additionally, some should only serve

on the team pursuing these goals for limited, 6 month terms. They can always continue to serve past this time, but after 6 months, those who are insufficiently committed can exit (Ostrom, Hirschman).

- ii. Second, planning and coordinating events between groups constitutes collective action. We must balance the desire to include more people against the costs of including more people. On one hand, the more the better—more people would demonstrate a real desire from one group to the other and would mean more volunteers. On the other, more people means higher coordination costs/transaction costs, leading to the need for centralized leadership. We must be careful to approach these matters in ways that acknowledge the possibility of creating domineering leadership. Selecting trustworthy leaders is important.

b. Conclusion

- i. In light of our normative reasons to pursue racial reconciliation between our congregations, we should [summarize 3, taking into account 4].
- ii. Of course, this by no means completes the work or solves the question of racial reconciliation in Chapel Hill, let alone beyond our town. However, this is a step in the right direction.

C. How am I going to grade this?

My paper rubric looks like this, with each category being graded out of 20 (adding up to 100).

Knowledge of Course Material	Writing/Clarity	Evidence	Well Developed/ Persuasive	Creativity

- Knowledge of Course Material: have you demonstrated a thorough understanding of your perspective? Do you know much more about it than someone in class who didn't write on

that topic? *Do your perspectives play a significant role identifying aspects of the problem and what we should do about it?*

- Writing/Clarity: Are the arguments clearly expressed? Is it readable? How hard is it to follow along? Are there basic errors in the writing or is it well-executed?
- Evidence: What sources does the paper cite? Does the paper engage the descriptive part of the paper well?
- Well Developed/Persuasive: Does the paper evaluate alternatives in detail? Does the argument/analysis connect well with the evidence offered? Would a reasonable person who disagrees with the opinion of the paper be forced to admit “it has a point”? *Does the paper convincingly offer an answer to “what should we do?” that does not reduce to a policy recommendation? Does it discuss the strengths and weaknesses of that approach?*
- Creativity: how well do you imagine possibilities, come up with interesting comparative examples, interestingly organize the material so that it is better, or otherwise do something more than just go through the motions?

I will return comments on the group paper within 1 week of receiving it.

Supplement E: Group Project Part 3

Overview of Graded Components of Part 3:

- ***Instead of a Brief***, there will be a graded check-in *worth half* (50%) of Part 3 where you'll have to meet with me to show a rough draft of the poster using one of the templates I provide through Sakai (more below). This will happen in class on **Monday the 11th**. I realize this is very soon—but we'll spend time in class working on it on Wednesday the 6th and Friday the 8th.
 - This will be graded like a journal entry: if you put in effort, you'll receive full marks. If you show up unprepared, you'll see deductions. Not looking for perfection, looking for progress.
- The other half of Part 3 of the group project will be the poster presentation.
 - 10% of the poster grade is just showing up with a poster and presenting it.
 - The remaining 40% of the poster grade is based on the following criteria which should look very familiar. These are a mix of what is actually on the board and how you respond to questions and interact with folks as they come by your poster:
 - Knowledge of Course Material
 - Writing/Clarity
 - Evidence
 - Well Developed/Persuasive
 - Creativity
- In sum:
 - There is no longer a brief. You only have to create the poster.
 - 50% of Part 3 is a check-in with me on Monday the 11th that includes a drafted poster template. I will give feedback.
 - 10% of Part 3 is just showing up with your poster and presenting.
 - 40% is my grade of the poster itself and your presentation skills.
 - Peer review element is determined by your group rules.

What to Expect on April 26th/What to Do

- Arrive, dressed to present with your poster, at 445PM to the lobby outside Hanes Art Center 121 on April 26th.
- The poster session is from 5PM-550PM.
- The public lecture, which you must attend, will take place from 6PM to 730PM with pizza to follow. (The final exam will include material from the lecture.)
- Once you've had your fill of pizza, your group's poster will go with one member of your group and the poster stand will go back into its box and be returned to the UNC PPE staff (or to me).

The Poster/Expectations

Overall Cost:

- **You should expect to pay around \$60-\$70 for the poster** from the print shop.
- Please plan to split the cost of the poster equally. This means no one should expect to pay more than \$18. I realize this is an expenditure, but should be manageable given that I have assigned no textbooks or other required materials for the class.

Creating the Poster

- I have created 3 templates for you to work from. This should ensure a good starting place for each group and will make it easier to match the specifications needed for printing.
 - The template dimensions should already be 31" X 39" in the Powerpoint template.
 - Add images and text appropriate to your topic. More directions on how to create a good poster below.
- Templates can be found in the resources folder for the group project under 'Poster Templates'

Technical Information

- Posters must be formatted at 31" X 39" in Full Color Photo Paper with a Satin Finish. You *must* have the poster mounted on a Foam Core Board. (see below)
 - This means the print order is 31 inches wide and 39 inches tall and rigid because it is mounted on the Foam Core Board.
- You *must* use one of the 3 templates I uploaded to the Sakai resources folder. Of course, you need to edit it, adding your own information, useful/illustrative pictures, and any other information where necessary. DO NOT alter the slide dimensions from 31" X 39"

What to cover in the Poster

All posters will include at least three main sections, which match the main sections of your group paper:

- Why Does It Matter
- What Should We Do?
- Challenges and Tradeoffs

General Advice on the Poster:

- Read the comments on your group paper for further ideas.
- Think of the poster as an extended outline for a talk
- Use technical language sparingly
- Make the topic obvious and make a persuasive argument for why it matters
- Answer the civic question 'what should we do' alongside any related policy suggestions
 - DO NOT merely give policy recommendations
- Note important challenges and tradeoffs

General Advice on the Talk/Presentation

- Be sure to include the perspectives/prepare your brief talk based on who knows most about what.
- Have a 'short' version and a 'long' version prepared. This way you can give a brief overview of the argument, then be able to dive into greater detail about specific points if needed.

Supplement F: Example Student Poster

No Student Hungry: Campus Food Pantry [Student Names Removed]

Why It Matters

- 20% of students experience food insecurity on campus.¹
- Meal plans are expensive!
- There are food deserts in the university's most populous areas.
- Hunger creates citizenship inequality for food-insecure students.²



Non-perishable items that can be selected within the food pantry.⁴

What Should We Do

- Ask faculty to put information about the food pantry's services in their syllabi.
- Create an anti-stigma social media campaign to allow for more conversation around the issue.⁵
- The social media campaign could bring more awareness to pantry's services.

Challenges and Tradeoffs

- It is time consuming to get institutions to implement changes that a small group proposes.
- Social media posts may be ignored.
- The social media campaign could interfere with food pantry operations.

MEAL PLAN	Unlimited	Block 200	Block 160	Block 120	"Block 100+ 200 Flex"
"# of Swipes Per Semester"	Unlimited	200	160	120	100
"Avg. Meals Per Week"	Unlimited	12	9	7	6
"Avg. Cost Per Meal"	\$6.93	\$10.97	\$12.10	\$12.90	\$13.46
"Cost Per Semester"	\$2,502	\$2,194	\$1,936	\$1,548	\$1,545

This table from the CDS website illustrates that even the most cost-effective meal plan options can be expensive.³

References

1. Home. (2022). The Food Pantry. [URL REMOVED]
2. Pocock, J. G. A. (1992). The Ideal of Citizenship Since Classical Times. *The Queen's Quarterly*, 99(1), 33–55.
3. *Eat Like a* [Removed]. (2021). [Removed] Dining Services. [URL Removed]
4. *Hungry Students: [Removed] struggles with food insecurity*. (2018). Media Hub [Removed]. [URL Removed]
5. Krause, S. (2015). *Freedom Beyond Sovereignty: Reconstructing Liberal Individualism*.
6. Gutmann, A., & Thompson, D. (2004). *Why Deliberative Democracy*. Princeton University Press.

Further Ideas for Change

- Opening a second food pantry closer to South campus.
- The Food Pantry could collaborate with organizations such as the [Removed] to host an open forum to highlight and discuss issues facing students on campus.

Supplement G: Course Evaluation Comparison

The majority of our course evaluation items (including all those presented in the main text) were custom-written for this particular course. As a consequence, we are unable to compare these scores across courses to evaluate whether, for example, the course presented in this paper results in more students rethinking their approach to community involvement relative to other courses. We can, however, present comparisons for the nine Likert-scale items common to all course evaluations across the university. Table 1 displays these items and their means within this course and across all courses taught by the Department of Political Science in Spring 2022. All items are asked on a five-point scale.

Table 1: Course Evaluation Comparison

Item	UCER Course Average	Spring 2022 Department Average
Overall, I learned a great deal from this course.	4.61	4.55
The instructor treated all students with respect.	4.96	4.80
The instructor encouraged all students to participate in this class.	4.89	4.59
The instructor saw cultural and personal differences as assets.	4.89	4.63
I could really be myself in this course.	4.46	4.40
In this course, I had multiple opportunities to express my viewpoints and questions.	4.79	4.60
The course challenged me to think deeply about the subject matter.	4.75	4.62
The design of this course (e.g. its format, selected materials, assignments, exercises, quizzes, etc.) helped me better understand the subject matter.	4.64	4.43
Overall, this course was excellent.	4.57	4.49