

# Guide for evaluation of exams for STV2370 fall 2023

The evaluation of the exams shall relate to the following learning outcomes:

## Knowledge

You will:

- be familiar with central theories in comparative politics
- know empirical examples that both support and contradict these theories
- understand concepts related to theory development such as deterministic and probabilistic theories, assumptions, and scope conditions

## Skills

You will:

- be able to think critically about theoretical explanations
- recognize assumptions in theoretical explanations
- understand empirical consequences of theoretical explanations
- know how to apply theories to new contexts
- be more confident in thinking about how theories can be modified
- be able to communicate academic knowledge in writing and orally

The evaluation consists of a 3-hour written exam, which is graded on a letter scale descending from A (the best grade), to E (the lowest pass grade) and F (fail):

Grade	General qualitative description (Norwegian Association of Higher Education Institutions/UiO)	Description of grades for Bachelor's degree courses (political science)
<b>A Excellent</b>	Excellent performance, clearly outstanding. The candidate demonstrates excellent judgement and a high degree of independent thinking.	The candidate demonstrates an excellent mastery of the course curriculum. When discussing subject-related issues, the candidate applies concepts, theories and empirical knowledge with a very high degree of certainty and in a manner that shows independent thinking and reflection. Correct use of sources and references.
<b>B Very good</b>	Very good performance. The candidate demonstrates very good judgement and degree of independent thinking.	The candidate demonstrates very good mastery of the course curriculum. When discussing subject-related issues, the candidate applies concepts, theories and empirical knowledge

<b>Grade</b>	<b>General qualitative description (Norwegian Association of Higher Education Institutions/UiO)</b>	<b>Description of grades for Bachelor's degree courses (political science)</b>
		with a high degree of certainty and in a manner that shows independent thinking and reflection. Correct use of sources and references.
<b>C Good</b>	Good performance in most areas. The candidate demonstrates good judgement and independent thinking with respect to the most important considerations.	The candidate demonstrates good mastery of the course curriculum. When discussing subject-related issues, the candidate applies concepts, theories and empirical knowledge with certainty and in a manner that shows independent thinking. Correct use of sources and references in general.
<b>D Satisfactory</b>	Satisfactory performance, but with significant shortcomings. The candidate demonstrates limited judgement and independent thinking.	The candidate demonstrates incomplete knowledge of the course curriculum. Concepts, theories and empirical knowledge are applied inconsistently, and there are some deficiencies in the use of sources and references.
<b>E Sufficient</b>	Performance that meets the minimum criteria, but no more. The candidate demonstrates very limited judgement and independent thinking.	The candidate clearly demonstrates incomplete knowledge of the course curriculum, and shows substantial weaknesses in the application of concepts, theories and empirical knowledge, as well as a poor understanding when discussing subject-related issues.
<b>F Fail</b>	Performance that does not meet the minimum academic criteria. The candidate demonstrates a lack of both judgement and independent thinking.	The candidate shows no mastery of even elementary parts of the course curriculum, and demonstrates wide gaps in knowledge or an erroneous representation and application of key concepts and theories.

This exam consists of two parts: the first part consists of three questions that all need to be answered (30 points in total), for the second part, the students can choose to answer one of two longer questions (30 points).

- |   |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A: 51-60 points      B: 41-50 points      C: 31-40 points</li> </ul> |
|---|

## EXAM QUESTIONS

### PART I: Answer *all* of these short questions (10 points each):

1. In their article from 2019, Magaloni et al argue that drug trafficking organizations are more likely to provide assistance to communities when they have monopoly over a turf, because they are more confident that they can reap the benefits from this “investment” later on. List three observable implications of this argument. How well do you think this argument works to explain the behavior of other non-state actors?

*Two points for each actual “observable” implication, for example:*

- *More evidence of assistance on the ground (e.g. schools built by DTOs) in places where there is evidence of a DTO having a monopoly (through expert opinions, surveys, fewer clashes between DTOs, or something else)*
- *More assistance in an area (e.g. schools built by DTOs) that has moved from being a contested area to an area with more monopoly (as evidenced through expert opinions, surveys or something else)*
- *In surveys or interviews, people say they receive more assistance from DTOs in places where there is evidence of a DTO having a monopoly (through expert opinions, surveys or something else)*

*One point where something is a not-so-observable implication, such as: DTOs give more assistance in places where they have a monopoly, and 1.5 points if at least one of the variables is observable.*

*The second part of the question invites a discussion of engagement with the discussion we had about other non-state actors in the lecture on public goods provision in weak states. Up to two points for bringing up other relevant non-state actors and two points for some reflection on how this argument works for them.*

2. In a study of protest participation, McGlendon (2014) found that people were more likely to turn up in protests if they were told that others would be informed about their participation. Identify at least two scope conditions for this argument and as a consequence of these scope conditions how well you think these findings will travel to other parts of the world.

*This is a point we discussed in lecture, so those who paid attention there or read the article well are likely to find it easy: In the article, the US sample responds well to being told that their names will be listed in a newsletter or that photos of those participating will be posted.*

*In lecture we talked about how this might not travel well to repressive regimes where there is a risk involved in being listed / identifiable if you protest. An obvious scope condition is therefore that it depends on the regime situation being such that it is not*

*dangerous to be identified, and as a consequence that this particular design will not travel well to repressive regimes.*

*Another possible scope condition is that there is social status related to participating in protests, this is not the case all over the world, and the argument therefore depends on others caring about protest.*

*Another one is that people might not personally care about protest and might not care about the social esteem of those who will see these interventions, and therefore*

*Another possible twist to the answer, which I talked about the last lecture, is that the particular findings related to publication of names may not travel everywhere, but if we take a step up the ladder of abstraction and think of this as an argument about incentivizing with social status, then it is likely to travel to most parts of the world.*

*Two points for each well-articulated scope conditions, two points for each good discussion of how it travels, and the last two points for particularly good reflections (either the last one I mentioned or some other thing that shows a high level of engagement with the reading or the lecture).*

3. Htun and Jensenius (2022) show that there has been a reduction in domestic violence in Mexico in the 2000s, and they argue that this is because of the “expressive power” of the new law on Violence Against Women. In the 4-cell framework proposed by Parsons (2007), what *type* of explanation is? Discuss an alternative explanation from another “cell” in the framework and how these two explanations may relate to each other.

*This is a pretty obvious example of an institutional explanation the way I have written it, but if anyone says that it is actually a cultural explanation because the mechanism is about changing norms that is also ok (up to two points).*

*An obvious alternative explanation is that there is a gradual change in culture based on media debars, international pressure, or increasing education (up to two points). This is in the cell for ideational explanation (2 points, 1 point for calling it cultural /normative explanations).*

*Up for four points for a sensible discussion about how the two explanations may be compatible, how one may be stronger than the other, how one may actually explain the other or something similar.*

## **PART II: Answer one of the following essay questions (30 points):**

1. Several public intellectuals have lamented that there is little protest in the USA, Norway, and elsewhere in response to the situation in Gaza. Draw on readings

from at least two of the lectures from this course to reflect on why we don't see stronger public reactions and discuss what interventions by politicians, political parties, or activists that may increase public expressions of concern for the situation.

*The point here is to demonstrate a good understanding of the course curriculum, and to apply the theories we have read about to a new empirical setting.*

*Here, it particularly makes sense to draw on the readings on protest, clientelism (how parties and politicians mobilize people) and partisanship (people might be following party line), but given our discussion related to how "some groups being invisible" in the lecture on gendered political economy, these readings are also relevant. It is also relevant to relate to Parsons (2007) in order to reflect on explanations from other "cells" of his framework than the ones that have come up in the readings.*

*Students have been told that they can refer to authors with name and year, but that if they don't remember it is also ok to simply refer to the "name" of the theory, explain what it is about, or refer to the relevant lecture. I have also said that it is ok to bring in other perspectives and theories that they know, though the main point is of course to demonstrate knowledge of (and ability to engage with) readings from the course.*

*Given the point distribution, this long answer should count for half of the overall grade.*

2. Earlier this month, BBC reported that in Nigeria (a federal democracy with politicians elected in single-member districts) the ruling party has won elections in two states "amid reports of low turnout, violence and rigging». Draw on readings from at least two of the lectures from this course to see whether you can make sense of this election outcome.

*The point here is to demonstrate a good understanding of the course curriculum, and to apply the theories we have read about to a new empirical setting.*

*Here, it particularly makes sense to relate to the readings from the lectures on voting (cleavage theory vs Duverger's law), clientelism, and partisanship, but it is also logical to draw on the discussions of the relevance of non-state actors for service delivery in many countries (could explain low turnout). It is also relevant to relate to Parsons (2007) in order to reflect on explanations from other "cells" of his framework than the ones that have come up in the readings.*

*Students have been told that they can refer to authors with name and year, but that if they don't remember it is also ok to simply refer to the "name" of the theory, explain what it is about, or refer to the relevant lecture. I have also said that it is ok to bring in other perspectives and theories that they know, though the main point is of course to demonstrate knowledge of (and ability to engage with) readings from the course.*

*Given the point distribution, this long answer should count for half of the overall grade.*

