

POSC 4340

Women and Mass Politics: Behaviour and Participation

Winter 2015 Course Syllabus
Class meeting time: Tuesdays and Thursdays, 10:30-11:45, in SN-4040
Instructor: Prof. Amanda Bittner
Email: abittner@mun.ca
Office: SN2040
Office Hours: Thursdays 12-2 pm, or by appointment

Course Description

For centuries women have been excluded from mainstream politics, and the legacy of this exclusion remains. To this day women are marginalized in our political system, missing from the highest administrative posts, and they continue to participate in lower numbers than men. This course explores women's political behaviour and participation, focusing primarily on the experiences of women in North America. We will look at women's efforts to secure political rights from the mid-19th century onward, as well as assessing women's attitudes towards politics, participation, and public policy.

Over the course of the semester we will address systemic and institutional barriers to participation, as well as looking at the effects of women's participation in politics, both in conventional institutional settings as well as non-conventional forms of activism. Women's behaviour is different from that of men, but it also varies across women. What are these differences? How does non-participation affect the translation of group and individual interests into policies? How big a problem is it if women don't vote, don't run for office, and don't legislate? We will explore these and other normative questions.

Required Readings

There is no required textbook for this course. However, there is a book that you may find useful as a secondary reference. It is not required, but it's a good book, it covers many of the topics that we do in the course, and it's available in the stacks at the library. If you want to purchase it, I would recommend checking online at Chapters or Amazon, it should be available for about \$40.

Krook, Mona Lena and Sarah Childs. 2010. *Women, Gender, and Politics: A Reader*. Oxford, UK; Oxford University Press.

We will be reading selected articles and chapters over the course of the term, as listed in the table below. The readings will be made available to the class by email – I will send you a link to a zip file in the first week of class for you to download and save.

Students are responsible for the material assigned each week. The assigned material will form the basis of class discussion.

Assignments and Grading:

Assignment	Date	Value
Critical Review Papers (3 x 1000 words)	Submit throughout course	30%
Research Paper (6000 words)	Initial paper due (via email) Sun March 15 th by midnight Final paper due Thurs April 2 nd by 4 pm (hard copy)	35%
Research Paper review	Due Thurs March 19 th by midnight (via email)	10%
Participation	Throughout	25%

Assignment Details:

This course is an advanced level class in which the focus is on reading, thinking critically, and communication, both written and oral. Therefore you will be assessed primarily on your ability and effort to do those three things.

Participation (25%)

The class will be conducted in a seminar format, and participation is crucial—students are expected to have come to class prepared, having done all of the readings and ready to discuss them. Throughout the course, I want you to do your own thinking. I want you to think about the readings, where there are strengths and weaknesses, and where you think the dialogue is missing something. Everything is contentious, nothing is set in stone. I don't expect anybody to agree with everything, and I'd like to encourage you to discuss your thoughts, in an environment where we are all open-minded and considerate of one another. Your participation in discussions throughout the course will be assessed through a participation grade of 25%. The focus is on quality, not quantity, but you will be expected to have done the prep for each class, and act as an active participant throughout the course. You will be assessed for the quality of your oral contributions to the seminar and evidence that you have read and understood the reading material.

Critical Review Papers (3 x 10% = 30%)

There are ten (10) weeks of readings in the class (after the first week). You must submit a minimum of 3 critical review papers, for whichever 3 weeks you like. Whatever works for your schedule is fine. I don't need to know in advance when you plan to submit them. Just come to class and hand one in. If you submit more than 3, the marks from your best 3 will count towards your final grade.

Papers must be 1000 words in length, single-spaced and typed in a 12-point font with a 1 inch margin on the left side of the page and a 2 inch margin on the right side of the page, to give me space to write comments in the right margin.

Review papers are NOT summaries of the readings. You are required to make links between readings, as well as providing a critical assessment of those readings. Every critical review paper **must** include an argument (thesis) that must be supported with reference to the week's readings. Structure is important, and you want to make sure that you include an introductory paragraph (which contains your thesis) as well as body paragraphs (supporting the thesis with reference to the readings) as well as a concluding paragraph. More information about expectations and requirements will be provided in class. This set of assignments is really about the process... I expect your writing to improve over the course of the term, and these assignments help to achieve that. I highly recommend handing them early on in the course, so you can get feedback early, to integrate into your subsequent assignments. This is a VERY difficult exercise. But it will make you a better writer. If you can do this, you can do anything. I always say this, but it's true.

Papers are due at the start of class for each Tuesday for which we have class. Late submissions will not be accepted and do not count as submissions... since you choose when you submit and when you don't, there really isn't any valid excuse for handing in something late.

Research Paper (35%)

Each of you is responsible for writing a longer paper on a topic with particular application to the material covered in the course. The topic is up to you, but you must discuss it with me before February 27th to get approval. An initial draft of your paper will be due on Sunday March

15, via email, by midnight. I will then send your paper to one other student to be peer-reviewed. All students will receive their peer-review comments by Thursday March 19th, also via email, by midnight, and will then have the opportunity to revise their papers in light of the comments received. Final drafts of the papers will be due in printed hard copy format by 4 pm in the main office in Political Science, SN-2028 (or you can submit it in class earlier that day).

Papers must be 6000 words, single-spaced and typed in a 12-point font. You are also required to cite a minimum of 20 sources in this paper, following the Mapping Politics styleguide (we will discuss this in class) as well as including a bibliography with your paper when you hand it in. You should treat this assignment as if you are submitting an article to an academic journal. The quality of the paper ought to be high, and how it looks matters. You should also include an abstract at the beginning of your paper.

The grade for this assignment will consider the quality of the initial draft, the final product, and the author's response to the peer review received. The final paper will therefore need to include a one-page (single-spaced) author's response to the peer review. This should include what the author did based on the suggestions received – what changes were made, what changes were not made, and why. How does the final draft differ from the first draft? It should be clear to the instructor how the review process improved (or didn't improve) the final draft of the paper.

Research Paper Review (10%)

This exercise will take place in the days following the submission of the initial draft of your research paper. You will submit your research paper by email on March 15th (by midnight), and you will then be assigned the paper of another student to review. Review of the work of others is a key component of academic life, and we will practice the art of written review. This process will mirror the process of academic peer review of journal articles, and we will discuss how this process works in class.

You are each required to review another student's initial draft of a research paper, and provide detailed commentary. Your commentary comes from the point of view of an "expert" in political science. When the time to peer-review comes around, we will already have had eight to nine classes, which comes out to about 40-45 articles or chapters that you will have already read about women in politics...so you really are sort of an expert by then.

The peer-review task is based largely on the following key activities:

- a. Reading the paper
- b. Thinking critically about the paper in the context of the other literature we have read in class
- c. Evaluating the paper based on a number of basic criteria for written research, including development of the argument, research conducted, clarity, structure, and style
- d. Providing detailed feedback for the author, including observations about parts of the paper that were well done or particularly interesting, as well as suggestions about how the paper might be improved for the final draft

The peer review that you submit should be approximately 2-3 pages in length (single-spaced, so about 1000-1500 words), and should focus primarily on substantive (conceptual) issues in the paper, but as a courtesy, can also incorporate smaller issues such as spelling and grammar. No need to ignore spelling problems that you happen to notice as a reviewer, some are hard to notice on your own as a writer, but this is NOT the main focus of this exercise. Spell-checkers exist in word processing software, and it's your primary job as a reviewer to think about the concepts in the paper, and provide feedback on this (more substantive level), not fix the paper's grammar and spelling.

You will email your review (in either Microsoft Word or pdf format, no other format is acceptable) to both the instructor and the author of the paper by midnight on Thursday March 19. This gives each author two weeks to revise their paper with the reviewer's comments in mind for final submission on the 2nd of April.

Brief course outline and reading schedule:

Date	Topic to be Covered	Visitors/Events
Jan 6 & 8	Introduction and Background	
Jan 13 & 15	The Struggle for Political Rights: Women's Movements I	Thursday: Noreen Golfman
Jan 20 & 22	The Struggle for Political Rights: Women's Movements II	
Jan 27 & 29	Institutional Effects on Participation	
Feb 3 & 5	Political Resources and Socio-Economic Status	
Feb 10 & 12	Women Candidates, the Media, and Voters	Tuesday: Sheilagh O'Leary
Feb 17 & 19	Reading Week: No Class	
Feb 24 & 26	The Gender Gap in Voting Behaviour: Attitudes and Opinions	Tuesday: Katie Clarke
Mar 3 & 5	The Gender Gap in Voting Behaviour: Voting and Participation	Friday 9-11: "Buying Sex"
Mar 10 & 12	Women in the Legislature	Thursday: Gerry Rogers
Mar 17 & 19	Grassroots Activism and Non-Conventional Forms of Participation	Thursday: Linda Ross
Mar 24 & 26	Women in Canada... Not Just White Women	
Mar 31 & Apr 2	Final week	

Assigned Readings and Plan for the Course:

Historical perspectives	
January 6 & 8	<p><i>Introduction, Background</i></p> <p>Vickers, Jill. 1997. A Framework for a Feminist Political Science. In <i>Reinventing Political Science: A Feminist Approach</i>. Winnipeg, MB: Fernwood Publishing.</p> <p>Paxton, Pamela & Melanie M. Hughes. 2007. Introduction to Women in Politics. In <i>Women, Politics, and Power: A Global Perspective</i>. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.</p> <p>Jennings, M. Kent. 2006. The Gender Gap in Attitudes and Beliefs about the Place of Women in American Political Life: A Longitudinal, Cross-Generational Analysis. <i>Politics and Gender</i> 2(2): 193-219.</p> <p>Short Video (to be shown in class): Women's Media Center. 2008. <i>Sexism Sells, But We're Not Buying It</i>.</p>
January 13 & 15	<p><i>The Struggle for Political Rights: Women's Movements (I)</i></p> <p>McGlen, Nancy E., Karen O'Connor, Laura van Assendelft, and Wendy Gunther-Canada. 2005. The Struggle for Political Rights. In <i>Women, Politics and American Society</i>. New York: Pearson Education Inc.</p> <p>Fuller, Margaret. 1843. The Great Lawsuit. Man versus Men. Woman versus Women. <i>The Dial</i> 4 (July Issue).</p> <p>Sharpe, Robert J. and Patricia I. McMahon. 2007. A Relic of Days More Barbarous Than Ours. In <i>The Persons Case: The Origins and Legacy of the Fight for Legal Personhood</i>. Toronto: Osgoode Society for Canadian Legal History.</p> <p>Dubois, Ellen. 1975. The Radicalism of the Woman Suffrage Movement: Notes Toward the Reconstruction of Nineteenth-Century Feminism. <i>Feminist Studies</i> 3(1/2): 63-71.</p> <p>Kulba, Tracy and Victoria Lamont. 2006. The Periodical Press and Western Woman's Suffrage Movements in Canada the United States: A Comparative Study. <i>Women's Studies International Forum</i> 29: 265-278.</p>
January 20 & 22	<p><i>The Struggle for Political Rights: Women's Movements (II)</i></p> <p>MacIvor, Heather. 1996. Sexual Politics and Feminist Responses. In <i>Women and Politics in Canada</i>. Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press.</p> <p><i>A Critical Dialogue on Gender in the Aggregate, Gender in the Individual, and a Theory of Politicized Context:</i></p> <p>Burns, Nancy. 2007. Gender in the Aggregate, Gender in the Individual, Gender and Political Action. <i>Politics and Gender</i> 3(1): 104-124.</p> <p>Junn, Jane. 2007. Square Pegs and Round Holes: Challenges of Fitting Individual-Level Analysis to a Theory of Politicized Context of Gender. <i>Politics and Gender</i> 3(1): 124-134.</p>

	<p>Materials from Herstory project, all available at: www.cwluherstory.com/CWLUArchive</p> <p>Booth, Heather, Evie Goldfield, and Sue Munaker. 1968. <i>Towards a Radical Movement</i>.</p> <p>Millett, Kate. 1968. <i>Sexual Politics</i>.</p> <p>National Organization for Women. 1966. <i>NOW Statement of Purpose</i>.</p> <p>Freeman, Jo. 1971. <i>The BITCH Manifesto</i>.</p>
Some Barriers to Women's Participation	
January 27 & 29	<p><i>Institutional Effects on Participation</i></p> <p>Bashevkin, Sylvia. 1985. The Higher the Fewer: Women's Participation in Major Party Organizations. In <i>Toeing the Lines: Women and Party Politics in English Canada</i>. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.</p> <p>Erickson, Lynda. 1993. Making Her Way In: Women, Parties, and Candidacies in Canada. In Joni Lovenduski and Pippa Norris, eds. <i>Gender and Party Politics</i>. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.</p> <p>Maclvor, Heather. 2003. Women and the Canadian Electoral System. In Manon Tremblay and Linda Trimble, eds. <i>Women and Electoral Politics in Canada</i>. Toronto: Oxford University Press.</p> <p>Sanbonmatsu, Kira. 2006. Do Parties Know that 'Women Win'? Party Leader Beliefs about Women's Electoral Chances. <i>Politics and Gender 2</i>: 431-450.</p>
February 3 & 5	<p><i>Political Resources & Socio-Economic Status</i></p> <p>Burns, Nancy, Kay Lehman Schlozman, Sidney Verba. 1997. The Public Consequences of Private Inequality: Family Life and Citizen Participation. <i>The American Political Science Review 91</i>(2): 373-389.</p> <p>Bourque, Susan C. and Jean Grossholtz. 1974. Politics as Unnatural Practice: Political Science Looks at Female Participation. <i>Politics and Society 4</i>:225-266.</p> <p>Elder, Laurel. 2004. Why Women Don't Run: Explaining Women's Underrepresentation in America's Political Institutions. <i>Women and Politics 26</i>(2): 27-56.</p> <p>Schlozman, Kay Lehman, Nancy Burns and Sidney Verba. 1994. Gender and the Pathways to Participation: The Role of Resources. <i>The Journal of Politics 56</i>(4): 963-990.</p> <p>Status of Women Canada. 2003. <i>Women and Men in Canada: A Statistical Glance, 2nd Edition</i>. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.</p> <p>Status of Women Canada. 2005. <i>Assessing Gender Equality: Trends in the Situation of Women and Men in Canada</i>. Ottawa.</p>
Public opinion and voting	
February 10 & 12	<p><i>Women Candidates, the Media, and Voters</i></p> <p>Gidengil, Elisabeth and Joanna Everitt. 2000. Filtering the Female: Television News Coverage of the 1993 Canadian Leaders' Debates. <i>Women and Politics 21</i>(4): 105-131.</p> <p>Goodyear-Grant, Elizabeth. Manuscript Under Review. Who Votes for Women Candidates and Why? Evidence from the 2004 Canadian Election Study. In Cameron D. Anderson and Laura B. Stephenson, eds. <i>Perspectives on the Canadian Voter: Puzzles of Influence and Choice</i>. UBC Press.</p> <p>McDermott, Monika. 1997. Voting Cues in Low-Information Elections: Candidate Gender as a Social Information Variable in Contemporary United States Elections. <i>American Journal of Political Science 41</i>(1): 270-283.</p> <p>Plutzer, Eric and John F. Zipp. 1996. Identity Politics, Partisanship, and Voting for Women Candidates. <i>The Public Opinion Quarterly 60</i>(1): 30-57.</p>
February 17 & 19	Reading Week this week: No Class
February 24 & 26	<p><i>The Gender Gap in Voting Behaviour: Attitudes and Opinions</i></p> <p>Gidengil, Elisabeth, Andre Blais, Richard Nadeau, and Neil Nevitte. 2003. Women to the Left? Gender Differences in Political Beliefs and Policy Preferences. In Manon Tremblay and Linda Trimble, eds. <i>Women and Electoral Politics in Canada</i>. Toronto: Oxford University Press.</p> <p>Conover, Pamela Johnston. 1988. Feminists and the Gender Gap. <i>Journal of Politics 50</i>(4): 195-1010.</p> <p>Bittner, Amanda. 2007. The Effects of Information and Social Cleavages: Explaining Issue Attitudes and Vote Choice in Canada. <i>Canadian Journal of Political Science 40</i>(4): 935-968.</p> <p>Wiris, Daniel. 1986. Reinterpreting the Gender Gap. <i>Public Opinion Quarterly 50</i>(3): 316-330.</p>
March 3 & 5	<p><i>The Gender Gap in Voting Behaviour: Voting and Participation</i></p> <p>Hooghe, Marc and Dietlind Stolle. 2004. Good Girls Go to the Polling Booth, Bad Boys Go Everywhere: Gender Differences in Anticipated Political Participation Among American Fourteen-Year-Olds. <i>Women and Politics 26</i>(3.4): 1-23.</p> <p>Verba, Sidney, Nancy Burns and Kay Lehman Schlozman. 1997. Knowing and Caring About Politics: Gender and Political Engagement. <i>Journal of Politics 59</i>(4): 1051-1072.</p>

	<p>Uhlener, Carole J. 1989. Rational Turnout: The Neglected Role of Groups. <i>American Journal of Political Science</i> 33(2): 390-422.</p> <p>Rosenstone, Steven J. and John Mark Hansen. 1993. Mobilization and Political Equality. In <i>Mobilization, Participation, and Democracy in America</i>. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.</p>
Do Women Legislators Make a Difference?	
March 10 & 12	<p><i>Women in the Legislature</i></p> <p>Lovenduski, Joni and Pippa Norris. 2003. Westminster Women: The Politics of Presence. <i>Political Studies</i> 51: 84-102.</p> <p>Tremblay, Manon. 1998. Do Female MPs Substantively Represent Women? A Study of Legislative Behaviour in Canada's 35th Parliament. <i>Canadian Journal of Political Science</i> 31 (3): 435-465.</p> <p>Lawless, Jennifer L. and Sean M. Therault. 2006. Women in the U.S. Congress: From Entry to Exit. In Lois Duke Whitaker, ed. <i>Women in Politics: Outsiders or Insiders? 4th ed.</i> New Jersey, Pearson Education Inc.</p> <p>Poggione, Sarah. 2006. Women State Legislators: Descriptive and Substantive Representation. In Lois Duke Whitaker, ed. <i>Women in Politics: Outsiders or Insiders? 4th ed.</i> New Jersey, Pearson Education Inc.</p>
Thinking Outside the White Conventional Box	
March 17 & 19	<p><i>Grassroots Activism and Non-Conventional Forms of Participation</i></p> <p>Muszynski, Alicja. 1999. Sexual Assault and the Canadian State: Participatory Democracy Struggles Within a Liberal Democracy. In Jill M. Bystydzienski and Joti Sekhon, eds. <i>Democratization and Women's Grassroots Movements</i>. Bloomington, Indiana University Press.</p> <p>Ammar, Nawal H. and Leila S. Lababidy. 1999. Women's Grassroots Movements and Democratization in Egypt. In Jill M. Bystydzienski and Joti Sekhon, eds. <i>Democratization and Women's Grassroots Movements</i>. Bloomington, Indiana University Press.</p> <p>Frager, Ruth. 1989. Politized Housewives in the Jewish Communist Movement of Toronto, 1923-1933. In Linda Kealey and Joan Sangster, eds. <i>Beyond the Vote: Canadian Women and Politics</i>. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.</p> <p>Kaplan, Temma. 2004. Prologue. In <i>Taking Back the Streets: Women, Youth, and Direct Democracy</i>. Berkeley: University of California Press.</p>
March 24 & 26	<p><i>Women in Canada...Not Just White Women</i></p> <p>Green, Joyce. 2001. Canaries in the Mines of Citizenship: Indian Women in Canada. <i>Canadian Journal of Political Science</i> 34(4): 715-738.</p> <p>Abu-Laban, Yasmeeen. 2002. Challenging the Gendered Vertical Mosaic: Immigrants, Ethnic Minorities, Gender, and Political Participation. In Joanna Everitt and Brenda O'Neill, eds. <i>Citizen Politics: Research and Theory in Canadian Political Behaviour</i>. Toronto: Oxford University Press.</p> <p>Agnew, Vijay. 1996. Immigrant Women and the State. In <i>Resisting Discrimination: Women from Asia, Africa, and the Caribbean and the Women's Movement in Canada</i>. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.</p>
March 31 & April 2	Final week, review, catch up if there are snow days.

Notes on Grading and Late Penalties

The final draft of the research essay is due Thursday April 2nd by 4 pm in the main office of the Political Science Department. The penalty for submitting this assignment late is 10% per day, including each weekend day. So, for example, if you submit your paper on the Monday after it is due, 30% will be automatically deducted.

Late papers are not acceptable for the short critical review papers. Because you get to choose when you submit them, deciding not to submit a paper is also your choice.

Finally, on the initial draft of your paper and the peer review exercise, late assignments are also not acceptable. This exercise involves working in a group/team environment, and by either a) not submitting an initial draft of your paper on time; or b) not submitting your peer review on time, you are seriously inconveniencing your colleagues. Students who do not submit their initial drafts on time forfeit the opportunity to either receive a peer review, or do one themselves. This is a kind of quid pro quo exercise, and given that it's done over email, there's no excuse for missing out. You can do it from home, you can do it from your bed if you like. If you become seriously ill or something in advance of this assignment, it is important that you take steps to notify the instructor (me) about your situation so we can work something out.

Finally, cheating, in addition to being unfortunate in any class, is especially unfortunate in a class where the main goal is to read, think, and discuss your ideas. It is simply not acceptable. Cheating on assignments includes (but is not limited to) allowing another student to copy from your own work and presenting someone else's work as your own. Information about procedures and penalties for academic dishonesty is outlined in the University Calendar and is available through the Department of Political Science. If you have questions or are confused in any way about what might constitute "cheating," please come and chat with me about it. I'm happy to talk about citing sources, how to do quotes, how to paraphrase, or anything else that is related.

Department of Political Science

Policy on Plagiarism

Plagiarism means offering the words or ideas of another person as one's own. The material copied or paraphrased may consist of a few phrases or sentences, or an entire passage or paper. Whatever its form and extent, plagiarism constitutes two kinds of failure: 1) Failure to perform the basic tasks expected in any paper -- original mental effort and expression; 2) Potentially, the moral failure of academic dishonesty. Plagiarism may be deliberate (as in the submission of a paper written in whole or part by another student, purchased from an essay bank, or cut and pasted from web sites) or the result of carelessness through failure to provide proper documentation.

All directly copied or quoted material must be enclosed in quotation marks and the source must be clearly identified in a citation. The source of any paraphrased material or ideas must also be properly documented. Failure to do so is plagiarism.

The procedure for handling cases of suspected plagiarism at Memorial University is set out in the University Calendar. All cases of suspected plagiarism must be reported to the Department Head in accordance with Section 4.11 of the University Calendar General Regulations. Depending on the circumstances and the degree of plagiarism involved, the Department of Political Science normally handles first offenders in accordance with the Procedures for Informal Resolution (Section 4.11.5). The penalty in such cases is normally a grade of 0 for the work concerned. The Department maintains a list of students who have been found guilty of plagiarism, and in the case of a second offence or in particularly serious cases of plagiarism, the Procedures for Formal Resolution (Section 4.11.6) will be followed. The penalty in these cases may be probation, suspension or expulsion in addition to the grade of 0 for the work concerned.

If in any doubt about what plagiarism consists of, consult with your instructor or refer to any standard work on writing essays and research papers. The Faculty of Arts Writing Centre (SN2053) can also provide relevant information. The notes on proper documentation below may be of assistance.

Notes on Proper Documentation

A good political science paper contains a logical argument built on solid evidence. While the evidence may be that of first-hand observation and study, evidence for most student papers will come from books, journals, newspapers, and government documents. Documentation in the form of in-text references (with page numbers) must be provided for all facts, ideas, or interpretations which are not considered to be common knowledge. An acceptable rule of thumb for determining whether an item is one of common knowledge would be if the information is readily available in a number of different sources. An example may help.

It is common knowledge that Martin Luther King, Jr. was a black civil rights activist who was jailed in Alabama for leading a march against segregation in the early 1960s. No footnote would be required for such a fact.

A footnote would, however, be required for a statement such as: Martin Luther King, Jr. expressed disappointment that southern religious leaders urged people to comply with desegregation not because it was morally right but because it was the law.

In the latter case, the reader might want to check that Rev. King actually did express those views. A good guideline to follow is to ask yourself where your understanding of the thoughts, beliefs, or ideas of an individual or a group came from. If you don't know, are you sure that your understanding is accurate? If it isn't, then don't use it. If you do know, then state the source.

A common misperception is that citations only have to be given for direct quotations. This is not correct: citations must be provided in all cases where an idea, belief, action, or thought is attributed to an individual or group.

A citation would be required for the following quotation from page 14 of the province's Strategic Economic Plan. "The private sector must be the engine of growth. While it is the role of government to create an economic and social environment that promotes competitiveness, it is the enterprising spirit of the private sector that will stimulate lasting economic growth."

A citation would also be required for the following statement. The Strategic Economic Plan argues that the private sector must be the basis of economic growth in the province.

Similarly, a citation must be provided whenever you "borrow" a particular idea, interpretation, or argument from a known source.