



E366 Climbing ahead, falling behind: social mobility across time and space

Summer 2024

Oral presentation

Description

Your evaluation for this course centers on an intriguing case study of social mobility, which you will present to the class. You are tasked with conducting a comparative analysis, with the specific comparison left to your discretion. You might compare social mobility between two vastly different countries or investigate two similar cases to understand how specific differences affect social mobility. Alternatively, you could adopt a historical approach, comparing the same country over different periods. Another option is to explore how different research methodologies provide various perspectives on social mobility.

By adopting a comparative perspective, you will effectively use the world as a laboratory to test hypotheses about the causes of social mobility. This approach allows you to analyze how macroeconomic, institutional, and social differences contribute to variations in social mobility and to develop valuable insights into the factors that shape social mobility in diverse contexts.

Expectations and goals

Fundamentally, students must adopt a comparative perspective that helps them to better understand the nature of social mobility. In the process, they must exhibit an understanding of different measures of social mobility and of different theories explaining social mobility.

This understanding should be communicated effectively through an English-language oral presentation of **ten minutes**, leaving **five minutes** for questions from the audience. One week before their scheduled presentation, students should distribute a list of a **minimum of four** academic sources upon which their presentation is based.

Students who are less comfortable with oral presentations may also submit an **optional** written version of their research, **maximum two pages** in length, to the instructor, due alongside their oral presentation. In the attached marking rubric, this written work will be evaluated instead of the sections 'organization and clarity', and 'delivery'. Students who opt to submit written work must submit work of an academic quality, with full citations in their preferred style.

In sum, students must:

- Research social mobility in two different contexts
- Provide a list of a **minimum** of four academic sources **one week** before their scheduled presentation
- One **ten minute** presentation of their research, allowing five minutes for questions
- (Optional) A written summary of their presentation, max. two pages

Assessment criteria—marking rubric

	Understanding of Topic and Research	Comparative Analysis	Organization and Clarity	Delivery	Engagement and visual aids	Overall impact
1	Demonstrates a thorough understanding of social mobility's causes with clear explanations and insightful analysis (e.g., discussing both economic and social factors in depth). Uses a wide range of credible sources, including academic papers, data, and case studies, to support arguments (e.g., citing recent studies and using diverse examples).	Provides a detailed and insightful comparative analysis of social mobility's causes across different countries (e.g., comparing policies in Nordic countries with those in the US and explaining the impacts).	Presentation is well-structured with a clear introduction, body, and conclusion; transitions are smooth (e.g., logical flow with clear sections). Main points are very clear and well-articulated (e.g., using precise language and highlighting key points effectively).	Speaks clearly and confidently with excellent articulation and appropriate pacing (e.g., engaging tone, steady pace). Uses body language effectively to enhance the presentation, including eye contact and gestures (e.g., engaging gestures, frequent eye contact).	Actively engages the audience, encouraging questions and interaction (e.g., asking questions, responding to audience cues). Visual aids are well-designed, clear, and effectively enhance the presentation (e.g., informative slides, clear graphics)	Presentation is polished and well-prepared; presenter is professional and confident (e.g., rehearsed, professional demeanor). Presentation is highly original and creative, offering new insights or perspectives (e.g., unique approach, creative elements).
2	Shows a good understanding of the topic with accurate explanations and analysis (e.g., explaining key factors but with less detail). Uses several	Provides a clear comparative analysis with some insightful points (e.g., comparing two countries with some depth).	Presentation has a clear structure with minor issues in transitions (e.g., some transitions could be smoother). Main points are clear and understandable	Speaks clearly and confidently with good articulation and pacing (e.g., mostly clear, minor pacing issues). Uses body language well, with good eye contact and	Engages the audience and encourages some interaction (e.g., some questions, occasional interaction). Visual aids are clear and enhance the	Presentation is well-prepared; presenter is professional (e.g., prepared, mostly professional). Presentation is original and somewhat creative,

Assessment criteria—marking rubric

	Understanding of Topic and Research	Comparative Analysis	Organization and Clarity	Delivery	Engagement and visual aids	Overall impact
	credible sources to support arguments (e.g., including some academic references and relevant data).		(e.g., mostly clear with some minor ambiguities).	gestures (e.g., appropriate gestures, some eye contact).	presentation (e.g., useful slides, mostly clear visuals).	offering some new insights (e.g., some original ideas, moderate creativity).
3	Shows a basic understanding of the topic with some explanations and analysis (e.g., covering main points without depth). Uses some sources, but they may not all be credible or relevant (e.g., relying on fewer sources or less authoritative ones).	Provides a basic comparative analysis with limited insight (e.g., mentioning differences without detailed explanation).	Presentation has a basic structure but lacks smooth transitions (e.g., some parts feel disjointed). Main points are somewhat clear but could be better articulated (e.g., some points are clear, others are vague).	Speaks clearly but may lack confidence or have minor articulation issues (e.g., occasional hesitation or misarticulations). Uses some body language, but it could be more effective (e.g., limited gestures, occasional eye contact).	Engages the audience but with limited interaction (e.g., some engagement, minimal interaction). Visual aids are used but may not fully enhance the presentation (e.g., some useful visuals, others less effective).	Presentation shows some preparation; presenter is somewhat professional (e.g., some preparation, minor lapses in professionalism). Presentation shows some originality and creativity (e.g., some creative elements, but mostly standard).
4	Shows limited understanding of the topic with incomplete or unclear explanations (e.g., only discussing	Provides a limited or unclear comparative analysis (e.g., superficial comparison with minimal details).	Presentation is poorly structured with unclear transitions (e.g., hard to follow the sequence of points). Main points	Speaks unclearly or lacks confidence, with noticeable articulation issues (e.g., frequent hesitations, unclear speech). Uses	Shows minimal effort to engage the audience (e.g., mostly monologue, little audience engagement). Visual aids are	Presentation shows minimal preparation; presenter lacks professionalism (e.g., poorly prepared,

Assessment criteria—marking rubric

	Understanding of Topic and Research	Comparative Analysis	Organization and Clarity	Delivery	Engagement and visual aids	Overall impact
	economic factors superficially). Uses few sources or sources that are not credible (e.g., relying on general websites or outdated data).		are unclear or poorly articulated (e.g., difficult to discern the main arguments).	minimal or ineffective body language (e.g., few gestures, little eye contact).	poorly designed or do not enhance the presentation (e.g., cluttered slides, unclear visuals).	unprofessional). Presentation shows limited originality and creativity (e.g., few new ideas, limited creativity).
5	Lacks understanding of the topic with incorrect or missing explanations (e.g., failing to identify key factors of social mobility). Uses no sources or sources that are not credible or relevant (e.g., unsupported claims and lack of references).	Provides no comparative analysis or analysis that is incorrect (e.g., failing to compare or incorrect information).	Presentation lacks structure and is difficult to follow (e.g., no clear beginning, middle, or end). Main points are not articulated or are missing (e.g., lack of clear arguments).	Speaks unclearly, too quickly or slowly, with poor articulation (e.g., difficult to understand). Uses no body language or body language that distracts from the presentation (e.g., distracting movements, no eye contact).	Does not engage the audience (e.g., no interaction). Visual aids are not used or distract from the presentation (e.g., irrelevant or confusing visuals).	Presentation is poorly prepared; presenter is unprofessional (e.g., no preparation, unprofessional behavior). Presentation lacks originality and creativity (e.g., repetitive, no new insights).