

Foundation Scholarship Examinations 2022-23

**Examination Papers set by Trinity College Dublin's Political
Science Department**

Guidance for Students

Introduction

The Foundation Scholarship examinations provided by the Political Science department have changed in 2020-21 due to the curriculum changes resulting from the Trinity Education Project (TEP). These changes resulted in political science offering five examinations, in place of the two examinations that were offered in 2016-17 through 2019-20. These differences have been retained this year.

The number and combination of papers that you should take depends on your programme plus the pathway that you are taking. There are mandatory papers for different programmes and pathways plus optional choices. The details can be found in the following table.

| Paper description | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Paper 1: Political Science General Paper 1 | | | | | | | |
| Paper 2: Political Science General Paper 2 | | | | | | | |
| Paper 3: Political Science History of Political Thought Paper | | | | | | | |
| Paper 4: Political Science Comparative Politics Paper | | | | | | | |
| Paper 5: Political Science International Relations Paper | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Credit Profile in Political Science in Senior Fresh | No. of SF credits taken in Political Science by end of Semester 1 | Number of papers taken in Political Science | Papers to be taken (M= mandatory, O= optional) | | | | |
| | | | Paper 1 | Paper 2 | Paper 3 | Paper 4 | Paper 5 |
| 40 SF credits (20 by end Sem 1) | 20 | 3 | M | | O | O | O |
| JF credits only | n/a | 1 | | M | | | |
| 40 SF credits (20 by end Sem 1) | 20 | 2 | M | | O | O | O |
| 20 SF credits (10 by end Sem 1) | 10 | 2 | M | | O | O | O |
| 20 SF credits (10 by end Sem 1) | 10 | 1 | M | | | | |

Please note that the Political Science Department **cannot** provide you with any guidance on what examinations you should take beyond the information provided in this table.

Each examination is timed at two hours fifteen minutes. Please note that no special tutorials will be provided by academic staff relating to any of these examinations. Sample questions for each examination can be found below. Some “Frequently Asked Questions” are also answered on the Political Science Department’s website.

We wish all students good luck with the Foundation Scholarship examinations.

POLITICAL SCIENCE 1

The examination “**Political Science 1**” requires students to write an essay on a topic related to one of the broad areas of political science covered in Senior Fresh (SF) modules—international relations, comparative politics, or history of political thought—but addressing materials that are outside the Michaelmas Term SF module syllabi. The topics can be found below, along with an additional reading list covering each topic. Students will therefore focus on one of these topics in advance and write one essay on that topic in a two-and-a-quarter-hour examination. The exam will contain only one essay question for each of the three topics for which reading lists have been provided. Students may, at their discretion, prepare more than one topic in advance, but they will answer only one essay question in the examination. To repeat: students must answer one question for this examination—the international relations question, the comparative politics question, or the history of political thought question—and not more than one.

When writing essays for “Political Science 1”, students are expected to know relevant materials and concepts from the related SF modules, but they must demonstrate engagement with, and mastery of, the materials contained on these additional reading lists. Similarly, students may choose to do additional reading, beyond the materials contained in the provided reading lists, on these political science topics, but, again, students are expected primarily and above all to demonstrate engagement with and mastery of the materials contained on these reading lists. There is no requirement to do any additional outside readings and indeed these reading lists are already extensive and demanding. Indeed, given that these reading lists are extensive, students may wish to select and prioritize their readings from among the readings set out. If a student wishes to refer to additional readings outside these reading lists (or materials contained on module syllabuses), the student is recommended to provide a reference, indicating author, title, and year of publication if possible.

Reading lists for these topics this year are contained in this document, as well as sample questions. Students, however, are advised to prepare broadly for a variety of possible questions addressing this material.

Readings for these topics will be made available online—through the library, through the Blackboard pages of the relevant modules, or through other means.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Eleonora La Spada

Political Science 1

International Relations

Topic: Inter-state War and Civil War in IR

Since the end of the Cold War, civil war have become a more prominent interest in international politics. The demarcations between “interstate war” and “civil war” have become increasingly blurred.

A large share of literature on political violence and conflict studies has previously tended to separately study interstate conflict and civil war, treating the two as independent – if not mutually exclusive – phenomena. During the last decades a large body of literature has relaxed this assumption (e.g., Gelditsch et al. 2008). Several scholars have argued that International Relations theories have enriched research in civil war studies in several ways.

This question will deal with a rigorous discussion - and evaluation - about a theoretical dialogue and integration between the these two fields of research.

Readings:

Arreguín-Toft, I. (2012). Contemporary asymmetric conflict theory in historical perspective. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 24(4), 635-657.

Butler, C., & Gates, S. (2009). Asymmetry, parity, and (civil) war: Can international theories of power help us understand civil war?. *International Interactions*, 35(3), 330-340.

Cederman, L. E., Wimmer, A., & Min, B. (2010). Why do ethnic groups rebel? New data and analysis. *World politics*, 62(1), 87-119.

Chadefaux, T. (2011). Bargaining over power: when do shifts in power lead to war?. *International Theory*, 3(2), 228-253.

Clayton, Govinda (2013) Relative Rebel Strength and the Onset and Outcome of Civil War Mediation. *Journal of Peace Research*, 50(5), 609-622.

Clayton, G., & Sticher, V. (2021). The logic of ceasefires in civil war. *International Studies Quarterly*, 65(3), 633-646.

Collier, P., & Hoeffler, A. (2004). Greed and grievance in civil war. *Oxford economic papers*, 56(4), 563-595.

Cunningham, K. G. (2013). Actor fragmentation and civil war bargaining: How internal divisions generate civil conflict. *American Journal of Political Science*, 57(3), 659-672.

Fearon, J. D., & Laitin, D. D. (2003). Ethnicity, insurgency, and civil war. *American political science review*, 97(1), 75-90.

Findley, M. G. (2013). Bargaining and the interdependent stages of civil war resolution. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 57(5), 905-932.

Gade, E. K., Gabbay, M., Hafez, M. M., & Kelly, Z. (2019). Networks of Cooperation: Rebel Alliances in Fragmented Civil Wars. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 63(9), 2071–2097.

Gleditsch, K. S., Salehyan, I., & Schultz, K. (2008). Fighting at home, fighting abroad: How civil wars lead to international disputes. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 52(4), 479-506.

Howard, L. M., & Stark, A. (2017). How civil wars end: The international system, norms, and the role of external actors. *International Security*, 42(3), 127-171.

Ivan, A. T. (2001). How the weak win wars: A theory of asymmetric conflict. *International Security*, 26(1), 93-128.

Lake, D. A. (2003). International relations theory and internal conflict: insights from the interstices. *International Studies Review*, 5(4), 81-89.

Mason, T. D. (2009). International relations theory and how Civil Wars end. *International Interactions*, 35(3), 341-351.

Mason, T. D., & Fett, P. J. (1996). How civil wars end: A rational choice approach. *Journal of conflict resolution*, 40(4), 546-568.

Morrow, J. D. (2000). Alliances: Why write them down?. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 3(1), 63-83.

Posen, B. R. (1993). The security dilemma and ethnic conflict. *Survival*, 35(1), 27-47.

Powell, R. (2006). War as a commitment problem. *International organization*, 60(1), 169-203.

Reiter, D. (2003). Exploring the bargaining model of war. *Perspectives on Politics*, 1(1), 27-43.

Shirkey, Z. C. (2017). Military Intervention in Interstate and Civil Wars: A Unified Interpretation, in “Oxford Encyclopedia of Empirical International Relations Theory”, edited by William R. Thompson, *Oxford University Press*.

Walter, B. F. (2009). Bargaining failures and civil war. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 12(1), 243-261.

Werner, S., & Yuen, A. (2005). Making and keeping peace. *International Organization*, 59(2), 261-292.

Sample Question:

- Civil wars have become a subject of major interest for IR scholars. Explore and evaluate how international relations theories developed in the context of interstate relations can give -or have given - significant insight to explain civil war onset, dynamics, and/or termination.

HISTORY OF POLITICAL THOUGHT

Peter Stone

Topic: The Political Theory of Joseph Schumpeter

The Athenian democrats were much concerned with the relationship between political elites and ordinary citizens. This relationship continued to animate political scientists in the modern era, who were further concerned with the difference between democracy on the city-state level and democracy in large-scale nation-states. The modern debate on this topic produced, among other positions, the *theory of democratic elitism*, which stresses the inevitable centrality of political elites in any well-functioning political system, even a nominally democratic one. One of the foremost democratic elitists was Joseph Schumpeter (1883-1950), a political economist much concerned with the twin collapse of both democracy and capitalism in Europe during the Great Depression of the 1930s. He offered his analysis of the problem in his book *Capitalism, Socialism & Democracy*, first published in 1942. This question will deal with the political theory of Joseph Schumpeter, with a focus upon his democratic elitism.

Readings:

There is one primary reading for this question:

Schumpeter, Joseph A. (1943). *Capitalism, Socialism & Democracy*. London: Allen & Unwin, Part IV (Socialism and Democracy). This book is on reserve at the library, but an e-book edition is also available through the library.

The following secondary readings are also assigned:

“*Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy* after 75 Years.” (2017). *Critical Review* 29 (4). Symposium.

“Elite Theory.” (2022). *Topoi: An International Review of Philosophy* 41 (1). Symposium.

Böker, Marit and Elstub, Stephen. (2015). “The Possibility of Critical Mini-Publics: Realpolitik and Normative Cycles in Democratic Theory.” *Representation* 51 (1): 125-144.

Chapman, Emilee. (2019). “The Distinctive Value of Elections and the Case for Compulsory Voting.” *American Journal of Political Science* 63 (1): 101-112.

Elliott, John E. (1994). “Joseph A. Schumpeter and the Theory of Democracy.” *Review of Social Economy* 52 (4): 280–300.

Green, Jeffrey Edward. (2010). “Three Theses on Schumpeter: Response to Mackie.” *Political Theory* 38 (2): 268-275.

Ingham, Sean. (2016). “Popular Rule in Schumpeter’s Democracy.” *Political Studies* 64 (4): 1071-1087.

Koenig-Archibugi, Mathias. (2022). "Who Are the People? Defining the Demos in the Measurement of Democracy." *Political Studies* 70 (2): 402-424.

Mackie, Gerry. (2009). "Schumpeter's Leadership Democracy." *Political Theory* 37 (1): 128-153.

Mackie, Gerry (2010). "Reply to Green." *Political Theory* 38 (2): 276-281.

Mackie, Gerry. (2011). "The Values of Democratic Proceduralism." *Irish Political Studies* 26 (4): 439-453.

Sample Question:

- What is the difference between economic and political competition for Schumpeter?

COMPARATIVE POLITICS

Lisa Keenan

Topic: capturing public opinion

This year's scholarship general question for Comparative Politics A will focus on the topic of public opinion. Specifically, it is interested in thinking about how to measure public opinion through the use of various kinds of opinion polls.

Issues to consider include the following:

- How do we know what the public thinks?
- What are some considerations when carrying out a poll?
- How can we interpret the polls when respondents may refuse to answer?

Readings:

Achen, C. H. (1975). Mass political attitudes and the survey response. *American Political Science Review*, 69(4), 1218-1231.

Ad Hoc Committee on 2016 Election Polling. (2016). *An Evaluation of 2016 Election Polls in the U.S.* – Executive Summary only. Available online at: <https://www.aapor.org/Education-Resources/Reports/An-Evaluation-of-2016-Election-Polls-in-the-U-S.aspx>

Asher, H. (2017). *Polling and the public: What every citizen should know*. Cq Press. CQ Press [Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4]

Bishop, G. F., Oldendick, R. W., & Tuchfarber, A. (1984). What must my interest in politics be if I just told you "I don't know"? *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 48(2), 510-519.

Coughlan, M., Cronin, P., & Ryan, F. (2009). Survey research: Process and limitations. *International Journal of Therapy & Rehabilitation*, 16(1).

Dropp, K. (2016, November 3). How We Conducted Our 'Shy Trumper' Study. *Morning Consult*. Available at: <https://morningconsult.com/2016/11/03/shy-trump-social-desirability-undercover-voter-study/>

Enns, P. K., & Schuldt, J. P. (2016, November 7). Are There Really Hidden Trump Voters? *The New York Times*. Available at <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/07/opinion/are-there-really-hidden-trump-voters.html>

Peters, J. W. (2020, September 29). 'Hidden' Trump Voters Exist. But How Much Impact Will They Have? *The New York Times*. Available online at: <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/08/16/us/politics/trump-polls.html>

Glynn, C. J., Herbst, S., O’Keefe, G. J., Shapiro, R. Y., & Lindeman, M. (1999). *Public Opinion*. Westview Press. [Chapter 3].

Kennedy, C., Blumenthal, M., Clement, S., Clinton, J. D., Durand, C., Franklin, C., & Saad, L. (2018). An evaluation of the 2016 election polls in the United States. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 82(1), 1-33.

Kennedy, C., Mercer, M., Hatley, N. & Lau, A. (2022, September 21). Does public opinion polling about issues still work? *Pew Research*. Available online at: <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2022/09/21/does-public-opinion-polling-about-issues-still-work/>

Lusinchi, D. (2012). “President” Landon and the 1936 Literary Digest Poll. *Social Science History*, 36(1), 23-54.

Prokop, A. (2022, September 29). How the polls might be wrong (again) this year. *Vox*. Available online at: <https://www.vox.com/2022/9/23/23353634/polls-bias-democrats-midterms>

Sakshaug, J. W., Yan, T., & Tourangeau, R. (2010). Nonresponse error, measurement error, and mode of data collection: Tradeoffs in a multi-mode survey of sensitive and non-sensitive items. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 74(5), 907-933.

Silver, N. The Real Story of 2016. (2017, Jan 19). *FiveThirtyEight*. Available online at: <https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/the-real-story-of-2016/>

Smith, T. W. (1995). A Review: The Holocaust Denial Controversy. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 59(2), 269-295.

Squire, Peverill. 1988. “Why the 1936 Literary Digest Poll Failed.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 52:125-133.

The Guardian. (January 19, 2016). “General Election Opinion Poll Failure Down to not Reaching Tory Voters.” Available: <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2016/jan/19/general-election-opinion-poll-failure-down-to-not-reaching-tory-voters>

Sample question:

- Is it fair to say that political polling is in crisis?

POLITICAL SCIENCE 2

The examination “**Political Science 2**” can only be taken by students not enrolled in any SF political science module. It requires students to answer two general questions about the nature of politics. There will be a total of five questions on the exam. None of the questions will require knowledge of any SF political science module.

A reading list for this examination, as well as sample questions, can be found below. Students, however, are advised to prepare broadly for a variety of possible questions addressing this material.

Students must answer two questions out of the five offered. All questions deal with the general nature of politics, with a particular focus on the question of how best to approach the study of politics.

Readings:

The following readings make good introductions to the topic:

Almond, G.A. (1988). “Separate Tables: Schools and Sects in Political Science.” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 21 (4): 828–42.

Keohane, R.O. (2009). “Political Science as a Vocation.” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 42 (2): 359-63.

Mansbridge, J. (2014). “What Is Political Science for?” *Perspectives on Politics* 12 (1): 8-17.

Putnam, R.D. (2003). “The Public Role of Political Science.” *Perspectives on Politics* 1 (2): 249-55.

Smith, R.M. (2002). “Putting the Substance Back in Political Science.” *Chronicle of Higher Education* 48:30 (April 5): B10-B11.

After reading the introductory readings, students should proceed to the following:

Symposium. (2000). “The Public Value of Political Science Research.” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 33 (1).

Symposium. (2002). “Shaking Things Up? Thoughts about the Future of Political Science.” *P.S.: Political Science and Politics* 35 (2).

Almond, G. (1966). “Political Theory and Political Science.” *American Political Science Review* 60 (4): 869-79.

Bond, J.R. (2007). “The Scientification of the Study of Politics: Some Observations on the Behavioral Evolution in Political Science.” *Journal of Politics* 69 (4): 897-907.

Grant, R.W. (2002). "Political Theory, Political Science, and Politics." *Political Theory* 30 (4): 577–95.

Hanley, R.P. (2004). "Political Science and Political Understanding: Isaiah Berlin on the Nature of Political Inquiry." *American Political Science Review* 98 (2): 327-39.

Laitin, D.D. (2002). "Comparative Politics: The State of the Subdiscipline." in *Political Science: The State of the Discipline*, eds. Ira Katznelson and Helen Milner (New York: Norton). https://web.stanford.edu/group/laitin_research/cgi-bin/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/Cpapsa.pdf.

Shapiro, I. (2002). "Problems, Methods, and Theories in the Study of Politics, Or What's Wrong with Political Science and What to Do About It." *Political Theory* 30 (4): 596–619.

Truman, D.B. (1965). "Disillusion and Regeneration: The Quest for a Discipline." *American Political Science Review* 59 (4): 865–73.

Sample questions:

1. Harold Lasswell defined politics as "Who gets what, when, and how." Is this an adequate definition of politics?
2. Is political science really a science?

POLITICAL SCIENCE 3

The examination “**Political Science 3**” can only be taken by students enrolled in POU22011 (History of Political Thought A). It requires students to answer two questions relating to this module. There will be a total of five questions on the exam. There are no additional readings associated with this examination. A mastery of the materials taught in those lectures and contained on those syllabi (including of course any optional or additional reading suggestions) up to the end of the Michaelmas Term is sufficient preparation.

Students must answer two questions out of the five offered. All questions deal with material covered in POU22011 (History of Political Thought A).

Sample questions:

1. Why did Aristotle believe that some people were “slaves by nature?”
2. Examine the relationship between the Plato’s metaphysical theory of forms and his political elitism.

POLITICAL SCIENCE 4

The examination “**Political Science 4**” can only be taken by students enrolled in POU22031 (Comparative Politics A). It requires students to answer two questions relating to this module. There will be a total of five questions on the exam. There are no additional readings associated with this examination. A mastery of the materials taught in those lectures and contained on those syllabi (including of course any optional or additional reading suggestions) up to the end of the Michaelmas Term is sufficient preparation.

Students must answer two questions out of the five offered. All questions deal with material covered in POU22031 (Comparative Politics A).

Sample questions:

1. “Unelected judges have no right to overrule democratically elected politicians”. Discuss with reference to at least two countries.
2. Discuss the thesis that social class is no longer the dominant cleavage in European politics.

POLITICAL SCIENCE 5

The examination “**Political Science 5**” can only be taken by students enrolled in POU22021 (International Relations A). It requires students to answer two questions relating to this module. There will be a total of five questions on the exam. There are no additional readings associated with this examination. A mastery of the materials taught in those lectures and contained on those syllabi (including of course any optional or additional reading suggestions) up to the end of the Michaelmas Term is sufficient preparation.

Students must answer two questions out of the five offered. All questions deal with material covered in POU22021 (International Relations A).

Sample questions:

1. Is Keohane’s explanation of international cooperation the same as Axelrod’s explanation of cooperation between egoists? Answer drawing on readings and IR theory.
2. Under what circumstances do domestic lobby groups matter in international politics? Answer drawing on readings and IR theory.