

GV994-8-FY Professional Development Seminar 2019–2020

Lecturer and Module Supervisor:

Dominik Duell

Tel: 01206 872211

E-mail: dominik.duell@essex.ac.uk

Room: 5.423

Office Hours: Thursday, 14-16

Module Administrator:

Please contact the Department Professional Services Team.

Module available for Study Abroad students: No

Assessment

No formal assessment but weekly attendance and active participation during the Departmental Seminar (Tuesday 2-3.30pm) and our weekly seminar is a requirement for all first year Government PhD students.

Module Description

This seminar provides training and support for the research capacity and professional development of all doctoral candidates in the Department of Government. Sessions are compulsory for first-year students. Advanced students are welcome to audit the seminar, and may be particularly interested in refreshing their knowledge of certain topics as outlined in the schedule below. The seminar focuses on writing and presenting a research proposal for the thesis, as well as other significant aspects of socialization into the discipline of political science. We aim to help PhD candidates develop a wide range of professional skills, giving them the capacity to complete their PhD and compete for academic jobs.

Doctoral candidates in the Department carry out their research in a wide variety of areas on a diverse set of topics, using a wide range of different approaches from nomothetic-deductive formal modelling, to quantitative and qualitative comparative studies, to normative political philosophy. Healthy exposure to these different perspectives in the scholarly study of politics provides an opportunity to improve general knowledge and background, and even provide new ideas for specialised areas of research. This seminar is not aimed at any sub-field or methodological tradition in particular.

Inevitably, the primary focus here is the academic profession. We will therefore practise a number of specific skills such as drafting research proposals, presenting results, and publication strategies. However, many of the sessions are also highly relevant for the other kinds of professions in which PhD graduates often find employment. Whatever your target, we aim in this seminar to provide a constructively critical atmosphere in which to hone various skills.

Beyond attendance and active participation, we have an overriding aim which is to prepare first-year doctoral candidates for having their research proposals accepted by the Research Students Progress Committee in the summer term. The research proposal will be developed, presented and defended in various formats throughout the seminar:

1. In Weeks 16-17, each student must deliver a 10-minute presentation of their proposed doctoral research. The presentation should (1) identify the research question, (2) outline the type and sources of evidence to be used, and (3) begin to consider the implications of different possible findings.
2. In Weeks 20-21, there will be peer review sessions during which the module supervisors and your fellow students will comment on your draft proposals. Guidance on the content of these drafts will be provided in Week 4.
3. In Week 23, there will be no standard seminar session but instead a poster session – to which all PhD students and faculty will be invited – at which you will present a poster outlining your planned research.

Readings

In addition to any readings listed below, you will want to become familiar with the main sources of professional news. This include articles in *PS: Political Science & Politics* and information shared through the various email lists and social media accounts of the main professional organisations (e.g., APSA, PSA, EPSA, ISA, etc.)

A number of APSA sections also produce periodic newsletters of potential interest to you depending on your subfield.

Module Objectives

By the end of this module, then, participants should have:

1. summarised a research proposal for the thesis work and had it critically appraised;
2. developed presentational skills both in regard to research, professional meetings and job-seeking;
3. accumulated general 'know-how' about the political science profession.

Module Structure

Unless otherwise noted, the module consists of 2 events each week: the Department Research Seminar (typically Tuesday from 2pm) and a 60-90 min class. The latter is held in NTC.2.01 starting at 4pm each Thursday.

Schedule

Week	Topics/Speaker/Readings	Relevant for:	
		1 st - years	2 nd /3 rd years
2	<p>Introduction, goals, expectations, setting priorities, managing time, building a good academic CV</p> <p><i>Please note: No Tuesday Departmental Seminar this week.</i></p> <p>Pre-seminar reading: Principal Regulations for Research Degrees - University of Essex (https://tinyurl.com/y9wxjeq7)</p>	√	
3	<p><i>No GV994 seminar this week (note: Tuesday Department Research Seminar as normal)</i></p>		
4	<p>What a PhD and PhD proposal should look like</p> <p>Ahead of the seminar: Write a 200-300 word abstract crisply summarizing (1) the main question you want to answer in your doctoral research, (2) the method/argumentative strategy you will employ in order to answer the question, (3) your present hypothesis of the question's answer</p> <p><u>Recommended readings:</u></p> <p>Although a US PhD Prospectus (done in year 3) is very different from a UK PhD Proposal (done in year 1), some very good generic proposal writing advice is given at: http://pages.ucsd.edu/~proeder/Prospectus.pdf</p> <p>Jeffrey W. Knopf, "Doing a Literature Review," <i>PS: Political Science & Politics</i> 1 (January 2006): pp. 127-132.</p> <p>Iain McMenamin, "Process and Text: Teaching Students to Review the Literature," <i>PS: Political Science & Politics</i> 1 (January 2006): pp. 133-135.</p>	√	
5	<p>The Profession</p> <p>In advance please peruse relevant journal metrics including Google Scholar Journal list and ISI (5 year impact factor).</p>	√	√
6	<p>Conferences: Submitting, attending and presenting</p>	√	√
7	<p>Publishing / preparing papers for journal submission/ reviewing</p> <p><u>Recommended readings:</u> Lee Demetrius Walker (2018) "Rejection of a Manuscript and Career Resilience." <i>PS: Political Science & Politics</i>, First View https://doi.org/10.1017/S104909651800121X</p> <p>Miller, B., Pevehouse, J., Rogowski, R., Tingley, D., & Wilson, R. (2013). How to be a peer reviewer: A guide for recent and soon-to-</p>	√	√

	be PhDs. <i>PS: Political Science & Politics</i> , 46(1), 120-123.		
8	<i>No GV994 seminar this week (note: Tuesday Department Research Seminar as normal)</i>		
9	Promoting your research Seeking and applying for funding	√	√
10	Doing a PhD Viva Recommended readings: https://www.theguardian.com/higher-education-network/2015/jan/08/how-to-survive-a-phd-viva-17-top-tips http://www.sciencemag.org/careers/2002/09/phd-viva-thrive-or-survive	√	√
11	PhD life, and well-being Recommended readings: Evans, T. M., Bira, L., Gastelum, J. B., Weiss, L. T., & Vanderford, N. L. (2018). Evidence for a mental health crisis in graduate education. <i>Nature biotechnology</i> , 36(3), 282. Please review services via https://www1.essex.ac.uk/students/health-and-wellbeing/	√	√
16/17	Presentation of PhD proposals	√	
18	Gender and the Profession Recommended readings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dion, M. L., Sumner, J. L., & Mitchell, S. M. (2018). Gendered citation patterns across political science and social science methodology fields. <i>Political Analysis</i>, 26(3), 312-327. • Teele, D. L., & Thelen, K. (2017). Gender in the journals: Publication patterns in political science. <i>PS: Political Science & Politics</i>, 50(2), 433-447. • Mengel, F., Sauermann, J., & Zölitz, U. (2018). Gender bias in teaching evaluations. <i>Journal of the European Economic Association</i>. https://doi.org/10.1093/jeea/jvx057 	√	√
19/20	Mock job talks	√	√
21/22	Peer review of draft PhD proposal	√	
23	Poster presentations to Department (<i>date/location tbc</i>)	√	√

Note: Relations between GV994 and Supervisory Boards

Supervisors and Boards have the first and the final say about how PhD work is conducted. This seminar merely supplements the Supervisory Boards and does not supplant them. There will inevitably be a certain amount of overlap between the two. Generally, supervisors welcome all critical and informal discussion of research, but in the event of a significant contradiction the supervisor's opinion prevails.