

COURSE SYLLABUS

International Relations Research Methods

Course code: IRS 288

Semester and year: Spring 2022

Day and time: Wednesday 14.45-17.30

Instructor: Dr Silviya Lechner

Instructor contact: silviya.lechner@aauni.edu

Consultation hours: Wednesday 10.00-11.00 & 17:45-18.45

Credits US/ECTS	3/6	Level	Intermediate
Length	15 weeks	Pre-requisite	Choose an item. IR 2019 req. 2014 IR, CEA
Contact hours	42 hours	Course type	Bachelor Required

1. Course Description

This course is intended to equip students with advanced methodological skills necessary to successfully complete a major research project in the social sciences. In the spirit of interdisciplinarity, its aim is to enable learners to develop an understanding of the basic methodological choices available in the field of political science and in cognate fields such as International Relations, Law, and sociology.

Problems of methodology and research design will be approached in the broader context of the philosophy of social science. Throughout the course students will have the opportunity to engage a series of debates concerning the core methodological and philosophical traditions in the social sciences such as positivism, hermeneutics, Marxism, poststructuralism, and formal theory. These include perspectives which seek to understand human action from ‘the inside’, by paying attention to its subjective or intersubjective meaning, as well as rival, scientific perspectives of studying the social world which assume the human subject away. An alternative set of theories present the entire social reality as a ‘text’, whereas rival formal theories discard the idea of meaning, language and reflexivity. Additionally, students will acquire competences in research design with a particular emphasis on qualitative research

(ethnography, participant observation, case studies). The aim is to enable each researcher to develop an independent research project by identifying a methodological tradition of choice and by acquiring basic knowledge of its fundamental principles, as an indispensable prerequisite for sound research.

2. Student Learning Outcomes

Upon completion of this course, students should be able to:

- demonstrate basic understanding of the main methodologies and philosophies of social science (positivist, critical, interpretive, and formal theoretical)
- show awareness of the opportunities and pitfalls associated with specific research methodologies, including the hazards of mixing incompatible methodologies
- understand the practical, ethical, and budgetary constraints of conducting research in the social sciences
- develop an independent piece of research such as a term paper, a thesis proposal or grant application which exhibits a clear logical design, conceptual consistency, and methodological maturity.

3. Reading Material

Required Materials

- (1) **Halperin, Sandra & Heath, Oliver** (2019) *Political Research: Methods and Practical Skills*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (**AAU library, reserve section, see below**)
- (2) **Bryman, Alan** (2012) *Social Research Methods*, 4th edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press (**AAU library, reserve section, see below**)
- (3) Martin, Michael & McIntyre, Lee C. (eds.) (1994) *Readings in the Philosophy of Social Science*. MIT Press. (probably the best available anthology) (**NEO & order placed via AAU library**)
- (4) Rugg, Gordon & Petre, Marian (2007) *A Gentle Guide to Research Methods*. New York: Open University Press/McGraw-Hill (**NEO**)
- (5) Baylis, John, Smith, Steve & Patricia Owens (2011) *The Globalization of World Politics*, 5th edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press (**AAU library reserve section, multiple copies available – call number 327 BAY**)

Sources (1) and (2), designated as 'Halperin & Heath' and 'Bryman', contain the key readings on research design for this course. You are strongly advised to purchase at least one of these sources – both are available in the reserve section of the AAU library ('Bryman', 2012 edition, call number 302.3 BRY; Halperin & Heath call number 320.072 HA).

The rest of the required readings will be posted on NEO LMS (designated with 'NEO').

Recommended Materials

The following represents a short list of the key recommended readings – some of the readings will be made available via NEO for each week.

On the Philosophy of Social Science

- Chalmers, Alan (2013) *What Is This Thing Called Science?* 4th edn. St Lucia, QLD: University of Queensland Press (**NEO**).
- *French, Steven (2007) *Science: Key Concepts in Philosophy*. London: Continuum (**NEO**).
- Hollis, Martin (1994) *The Philosophy of Social Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (**NEO**).
- King, Gary, Keohane, Robert O. & Sidney Verba (1994) *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press (useful for positivist methodology). (**AAU library, reserve section 300.72 KIN**)
- Ladyman, James (2002) *Understanding Philosophy of Science*. New York and London: Routledge (NEO)
- *Marsh, David & Stoker, David (2002) *Theory and Methods in Political Science* 2nd edn. Basingstoke: Palgrave (emphasis on epistemology and ontology)
- Nagel, Ernest (1961) *The Structure of Science: Problems in the Logic of Scientific Explanation*. Harcourt, Brace & World. (classical statement of positivism)
- Delanty, Gerard & Piet Strydom (2003) *Philosophies of Social Science: The Classic and Contemporary Readings*. Maidenhead: Open University Press

On Politics and International Relations

Hollis, Martin & Smith, Steve (1991) *Explaining and Understanding International Relations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Burchill, Scott, Linklater, Andrew, Richard Devetak et al. (2009) *Theories of International Relations*. 5th edn Basingstoke: Palgrave.
Smith, Steve, Booth, Ken & Marysia Zalewski (eds.) (1996) *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (**AAU Library - call number 327.101 SMI**)

Further Supplementary Materials

Moses, Jonathon W. & Knutsen, Torbjorn L. (2007) *Ways of Knowing: Competing Methodologies in Social and Political Research*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
Delanty, Gerard (1997) *Social Science: Beyond Constructivism and Realism*. Buckingham: Open University Press (research methods with an emphasis on sociology)
Rosenberg, Alexander (1988) *Philosophy of Social Science*. Boulder: Westview Press.
Smith, Mark J. (2003) *Social Science in Question*. London: Sage.
Bird, Alexander (2000) *The Philosophy of Science*. London: UCL Press.

Materials on How to Write a Research Project or Dissertation

Booth, Wayne C., Colomb, Gregory G., & Joseph M. Williams (2003) *The Craft of Research*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2nd edn. (a popular guide to the writing of a dissertation—everything from how to identify a research question to the final draft).
Turabian, Kate L (2007) *A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations*, 7th edn. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
Harvey, Michael (2003) *The Nuts and Bolts of College Writing*. Indianapolis: Hackett (a classic).
Bell, Judith (2005) *Doing Your Research Project: A Guide for First-Time Researchers in Education, Health and Social Science*, 4th edn. Open University Press.
Punch, Keith F. (2006) *How to Write an Effective Research Proposal*. London: SAGE.
Robson, Colin (2007) *How to Do a Research Project*. Blackwell.

4. Teaching Methodology

Weekly sessions of circa 150 min (lecture + seminar).

Lectures conducted by Dr Lechner followed by seminars including class discussion of the weekly readings and student-led presentations.

In order to facilitate class discussion and exchange of ideas, it is important to attend all lectures and seminars having read the assignments in advance. You should read the **required readings** for each session carefully and more than once if necessary. Please take written notes and whenever certain concepts or arguments seem difficult or unclear to you, do not hesitate to bring these questions up for discussion during our seminars. You are encouraged to read the weekly **recommended readings** as well but this is not *per se* necessary. Rather, the recommended readings are supposed to help you write the final **research proposal** for the course as well as your final presentation.

5. Course Schedule

Date	Class Agenda
09.02.2022	<p>Week 1. Methodology of Social Science. Research Question. Ethics. Literature Review</p> <p>Description: researchable vs. non-researchable questions, sifting through the literature (pitfalls), ethical concerns (harm via the conduct of research, anonymity, informed consent).</p> <p>Reading: Bryman, Ch. 3 'Formulating a Research Question', Ch. 4 'Literature Review', Ch. 5 'Ethics and Politics in Social Research' (AAU library, reserve section, 392.3 BRY – 2012 edition) Recommended: Halperin & Heath, Ch. 4 'How to Do Research', Ch. 6 (part 2 only) 'Ethical Research' & 'Ethical issues' (AAU library, reserve section, 320.072 HA)</p> <p>Assignments/deadlines: Allocation and explanation of course assignments</p>

16.02.2022	<p>Week 2. Theory as a Guide to the Research Question. Central Theories in IR.</p> <p>Description: Theories of IR. Realism & Neorealism. Neo liberal institutionalism. Constructivism. Normative Theory. Poststructuralism</p> <p>Reading: Chris Brown (2019) 'International Relations Theory Today', in <i>Understanding International Relations</i>, Ch. 3, pp. 37-61. London: Red Globe Press/Springer Nature (NEO). Halperin & Heath (2019), Ch. 5 'Finding Answers: Theories and How to Apply Them' (AAU library, 320.072 HA)</p> <p>Recommended:</p> <p>Brian Fay and J. Donald Moon, 'What Would an Adequate Philosophy of Social Science Look Like?', in Martin and McIntyre, <i>Readings in the Philosophy of Social Science</i>, pp. 21-35. Baylis, Smith & Owens (2011) <i>The Globalization of World Politics</i>, Chapters 5, 7, 9, 10, 12 (Part Two) (AAU library, call number 327 BAY – multiple copies). Smith, Booth & Zalewski (eds.), (1996) <i>International Theory: Positivism and Beyond</i>. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (AAU library - call number 327.101 SMI). Robert Keohane (1988) 'International Institutions: Two Approaches', <i>International Studies Quarterly</i>, Vol. 32 (4): 379-396 (NEO). Hedley Bull (1966) 'International Theory: The Case for a Classical Approach' <i>World Politics</i> 18 (3): 361-377 (NEO). Colin Hay (2002) <i>Political Analysis: A Critical Introduction</i>, pp. 6-55. Basingstoke, Palgrave. [Introduction to the mainstream theories in Political Science, with an emphasis on rational choice] (NEO) Scott Burchill, Andrew Linklater, Richard Devetak et al. (2009) <i>Theories of International Relations</i>. Basingstoke: Palgrave.</p> <p>Assignments/deadlines: None</p>
------------	--

23.02.2022	<p>Week 3. Explanation in Science Part 1. The Problem of Induction. Hume on Causation.</p> <p>Description: Causation, Hume, the Regularity View</p> <p>Reading: James Ladyman (2002) 'The Problem of Induction', in <i>Understanding Philosophy of Science</i>, pp. 32-61. London: Blackwell (NEO). John Losee (2011) 'Hume on Causality' (Ch. 6), in <i>Theories of Causality: From Antiquity to the Present</i>, pp. 29-36. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers (NEO).</p> <p>Recommended: *Carl G. Hempel (1962) 'Explanation in Science and in History' (Chap. 1), in Robert G. Colodny (ed.), <i>Frontiers in Science and Philosophy</i>. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press. (Read Ch. 1, sections 1-3, pp. 10-19): https://digital.library.pitt.edu/islandora/object/pitt%3A31735057893632/viewer#page/14/mode/2up Steven French, 'Discovery' (Ch.2), in <i>Science: Key Concepts in Philosophy</i>, pp. 8-23 (NEO). Ernst Nagel (1961) <i>The Structure of Science</i>. Harcourt: Brace & World (classic work on scientific theory from a logical positivist standpoint).</p> <p>Assignments/deadlines: None</p>
02.03.2022	<p>Week 4. Explanation in Science – Part 2. Logical Empiricism. Deduction & Falsification.</p> <p>Description: Karl Popper's attack on inductivism. Deduction. Falsification and its Critics</p> <p>Reading: Popper, <i>The Logic of Scientific Discovery</i>, Ch. 1 (NEO). Martin Curd & J A Cover (eds), 'Science and Pseudo-Science' (Ch. 1), in <i>Philosophy of Science: The Central Issues</i>, pp. 1-27, 62-72. New York: WW Norton (NEO).</p>

	<p>Recommended: Wesley Salmon (2000) 'Logical Empiricism' (Ch. 36), in W. H. Newton-Smith (ed.), <i>Companion to the Philosophy of Science</i>. London: Blackwell (NEO). Popper, <i>Conjectures and Refutations</i>, Chap. 1 (skip section 5) (NEO). Steven French, Ch. 4 'Justification', in <i>Science: Key Concepts in Philosophy</i>, 43-59. Carl G. Hempel, 'The Function of General Laws in History', <i>Journal of Philosophy</i> 39: 35-48 (NEO)</p> <p><u>Relevant to international studies</u> *Steve Smith, 'Positivism and Beyond', in Smith, Booth, and Zalewski (eds.), <i>International Theory: Positivism and Beyond</i>, pp. 11-44 (NEO). Michael Nicholson, 'The Continued Significance of Positivism?', in Steve Smith, Ken Booth and Marysia Zalewski (eds.), <i>International Theory: Positivism and Beyond</i>, pp. 128-145. King, Keohane, and Verba (1994) <i>Designing Social Inquiry</i>, Ch. 1, pp. 3-28 (AAU library, reserve section).</p> <p>Assignments/deadlines: First assignment (research question essay) due.</p>
09.03.2022	<p>Week 5. Beyond Positivism. Rationality, History, and Science.</p> <p>Description: The scientific theories of Thomas Kuhn, Imre Lakatos & Paul Feyerabend</p> <p>Reading: Thomas Kuhn (1970) <i>The Structure of Scientific Revolutions</i>, 2nd edn. Chicago: Chicago University Press. Ch.4 ('Normal Science as Puzzle Solving') and Ch. 10 ('Revolutions as Changes of World View'), pp. 35-42, 111-135 (NEO). Paul Feyerabend (1975) 'Outline of an Anarchist Theory of Knowledge', in Ahmad Raza (ed.), <i>Philosophy of Science since Bacon</i> (2011), pp. 121-136. New York: Nova Science Publishers. (Originally published as Paul Feyerabend, <i>Against Method: Outline of an Anarchist Theory of Knowledge</i>, pp. 17-22 ('Introduction') & pp. 295-309 (Ch. 18). London: Verso. (NEO)</p> <p>Recommended: Alan Chalmers (2013), 'Theories as Structures II: Research Programs', in <i>What is this Thing Called Science</i>, 4th edn, pp. 121-137 (NEO).</p>

	<p>Imre Lakatos (1970), 'Criticism and the Methodology of Scientific Research', <i>Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society</i> Vol. 69 (1968 - 1969): 149-186.</p> <p>Assignments/deadlines: None</p>
16.03.2022	<p>Week 6. Hermeneutics. Explanation vs. Understanding.</p> <p>Description: Holism (parts and wholes). Language. Norms and Rule-following.</p> <p>Reading: Charles Taylor (1971) 'Interpretation and the Sciences of Man' <i>Review of Metaphysics</i> 25: 3-51 (NEO). Peter Winch, <i>The Idea of Social Science and Its Relation to Philosophy</i>, 2nd edn. London: Routledge, Ch. 2 (40-65) and Sect. 5&6 from Ch. 3 (83-91) (NEO).</p> <p>Recommended:</p> <p>William Dray, 'The Rationale of Action', in Martin and McIntyre (eds.), <i>Readings in the Phil. Soc. Science</i>, pp. 173-180 (NEO). Martin Hollis (1996) 'Explaining and Understanding' (Ch. 9), in <i>The Philosophy of Social Science</i>, pp. 183-201 (NEO). Carl G. Hempel 'Explanation in Science and in History' (Chap. 1) in <i>Frontiers in Science and Philosophy</i> (read Ch. 1 only pp. 19-31, sections 4-7): https://digital.library.pitt.edu/islandora/object/pitt%3A31735057893632/viewer#page/14/mode/2up. Hans-Georg Gadamer (1981) <i>Reason in an Age of Science</i>, trans. Frederick G. Lawrence. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. Michael Oakeshott (1975) <i>On Human Conduct</i>, pp. 33-58, 91-107. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Max Weber, ' "Objectivity" in Social Science and Social Policy', in Martin and McIntyre (eds.), <i>Readings in the Philosophy of Social Science</i>, Ch. 34. *Hollis, Martin & Smith, Steve (1991) <i>Explaining and Understanding International Relations</i>. Oxford: Clarendon Press.</p> <p>Assignments/deadlines: None</p>

23.03.2022

Week 7. Formal Methods. Rational Choice

Description: Methodological Individualism. Rational Choice and Game Theory.

Reading:

Jon Elster (1989) 'Rational Choice' (Ch. 3) and 'When Rationality Fails' (Ch. 4), in *Nuts and Bolts for the Social Sciences*, pp. 22-29, 30-41. New York: Cambridge University Press **(NEO)**.

Martin Hollis (1994) 'Games with Rational Agents' (Ch. 6) in *The Philosophy of Social Science*, pp. 115-141 **(NEO)**.

Recommended:

*Joe A. Oppenheimer (2010) 'Rational Choice Theory' in Mark Bevir (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Political Theory*, 1150-1159. Thousand Oaks: SAGE.

Jon Elster, 'The Nature and Scope of Rational Choice Explanation', in Martin and McIntyre, *Readings in the Philosophy of Social Science*, Ch. 20, pp. 311-322 **(NEO)**.

Martin Hollis (1987) 'Rational Choice' in *The Cunning of Reason*, pp. 15-28. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press **(NEO)**.

Thomas Schelling (1960) *The Strategy of Conflict*, pp. 55-56. [On the concept of 'focal point'].

Thomas Schelling (1985) 'The Life You Save May Be Your Own', in *Choice and Consequence*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, Ch. 5.

Relevant to international studies

Duncan Snidal (1985) 'The Game Theory of International Politics' *World Politics* 38: 25-57 **(NEO)**.

Gabriel A. Almond (1991) 'Rational Choice Theory and the Social Sciences', in Kristen Renwick Monroe, ed., *The Economic Approach to Politics*, New York: HarperCollins.

Donald P Green & Ian Shapiro (1994) *Pathologies of Rational Choice: A Critique of Applications in Political Science*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Assignments/deadlines: **Second assignment (literature review essay) due**

28.03.2022-01.04.2022	Mid-term break. No Class
06.04.2022	<p>Week 8. Neo-Marxism and Critical Theory</p> <p>Description: Traditional and critical theory, mass culture and the ‘culture industry’, irrationality and fascist tendencies of modernity and the Enlightenment.</p> <p>Reading:</p> <p>Max Horkheimer, ‘Traditional and Critical Theory’ (Ch. 33), in Delanty and Strydom, <i>Philosophies of Social Science</i>, pp. 218-223 (NEO)</p> <p>Theodor Adorno (1991) ‘Culture Industry Reconsidered’ and ‘Free Time’, in Theodor Adorno, <i>The Culture Industry</i> [1976], ed. J. M. Bernstein, pp. 98-106, 187-197. London and New York: Routledge (NEO).</p> <p>Recommended:</p> <p>Jürgen Habermas, ‘The Tasks of Critical Theory’ (Ch. 36), <i>Knowledge and Human Interests</i>, in Delanty and Strydom, <i>Philosophies of Social Science</i>, pp. 234-245 (NEO).</p> <p>Theodor W. Adorno & Max Horkheimer (1979) <i>Dialectic of Enlightenment</i> [1947], trans. John Cumming. London and New York: Verso.</p> <p>Raymond Geuss (1981) <i>The Idea of a Critical Theory</i>. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.</p> <p>David Couzens Hoy & Thomas McCarthy (1994) <i>Critical Theory</i>. Oxford: Blackwell.</p> <p>William Outhwaite (1987) <i>New Philosophies of Social Science: Realism, Hermeneutics and Critical Theory</i>. Basingstoke: Palgrave.</p> <p><u>Relevant to international studies</u></p> <p>Chris Brown (1994) ‘“Turtles All the Way Down”: Anti-Foundationalism, Critical Theory and International Relations’ <i>Millennium</i> 23 (2): 213-236 (NEO).</p> <p>Andrew Linklater (1990) <i>Beyond Realism and Marxism: Critical Theory and International Relations</i>. Houndmills: Palgrave.</p> <p>Andrew Linklater (2007) <i>Critical Theory and World Politics</i>. New York and London: Routledge.</p>

	<p>Robert W. Cox (1983) 'Gramsci, Hegemony and International Relations: An Essay in Method' <i>Millennium</i> 12 (2): 162-175.</p> <p>Mark Hoffman (1987) 'Critical Theory and the Inter-Paradigm Debate' <i>Millennium</i> 16 (2): 231-250.</p> <p>Assignments/deadlines: None</p>
13.04.2022	<p>Week 9. Poststructuralism</p> <p>Description: Understanding reality as a 'text'. Overcoming structuralism, deconstructing meaning, the signifier/the signified. Discourse & Power.</p> <p>Reading: Jacques Derrida (2001) 'On Cosmopolitanism' in <i>On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness</i>, ed. Simon Critchley, and Richard Kearney, 1-24. New York: Routledge (NEO).</p> <p>Michel Foucault (1995) <i>Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison</i> (1975), trans. Alan Sheridan, New York: Vintage Books. Available from archive.org (registration required, borrowing slot 1hr) Part III, Chs. 1 & 3. https://archive.org/details/disciplinepunish0000fouc</p> <p>Recommended: Michel Foucault (2007) 'Governmentality', in <i>Security, Territory, Population. Lectures at the Collège de France 1977–1978</i>, trans. Graham Burchell, pp. 87–114. Palgrave.</p> <p>Michel Foucault (1980) 'Truth and Power', in <i>Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews & Other Writings 1972–1977</i>, trans. Colin Gordon, Leo Marshall, John Mepham & Kate Soper, ed. Colin Gordon, pp. 109–133. New York: Vintage Books.</p> <p>Friedrich Nietzsche (1994) <i>On the Genealogy of Morality</i> [1887], trans. Carol Diethe, ed. Keith Ansell-Pearson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.</p> <p><u>Relevant to international studies</u> Jacques Derrida (1992) <i>The Other Heading: Reflections on Today's Europe</i>, trans. Pascale-Anne Brault and Michael B. Naas. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.</p> <p>James Der Derian (1999) 'A Virtual Theory of Global Politics, Mimetic War and the Spectral State', <i>Proceedings of the Annual Meeting (Am. Society of International Law)</i> 93 (2): 163-176 (NEO).</p>

	<p>RBJ Walker (1993) <i>Inside/Outside International Relations as Political Theory</i>. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.</p> <p>Assignments/deadlines: None</p>
<p>20.04.2022 Week 10</p>	<p>Topic: Research Design</p> <p>Description: Various types of research design. Variables. Measurement. Validity. Reliability.</p> <p>Reading: Halperin & Heath, Ch. 6 'Research Design', Ch. 7 'What is Data', Ch. 9 'Comparative Design' (AAU library, 320.072 HA)</p> <p>Recommended: Bryman, Ch. 2 'Research Design' (AAU Library, 302.3 BRY 2012 edition) Rugg & Petre (2007), Ch. 2 'Research Design' in <i>A Gentle Guide to Research Methods</i> (NEO). Prof. William Trochim, <i>Research Knowledge Database</i> - https://conjointly.com/kb/</p> <p>Assignments/deadlines: None</p>
<p>27.04.2022</p>	<p>Week 11. Quantitative Research. Surveys. Interviewing</p> <p>Description: Discussion of quantitative methodology, sampling, sampling error, survey methods and structured interviews.</p> <p>Reading: Halperin & Heath, Ch. 15 'Qualitative Analysis. Description & Inference', Ch. 11 'Surveys', Ch. 12 'Interviewing' (AAU library, 320.072 HA).</p> <p>Recommended: Lisa Harrison (2001) 'Using Surveys in Political Research' (Ch. 5), in <i>Political Research: An introduction</i>, pp. 40-55. London: Routledge (NEO). Halperin & Heath, Ch. 17 'A Guide to Multivariate Analysis' (read chapter up to 'OLS regression') Bryman, Ch 7 'Sampling' & Ch. 8 'Structured Interviewing'. Rugg & Petre (2007) 'Interviews', in <i>A Gentle Guide to Research Methods</i>, pp. 135-151. Prof. William Trochim, <i>Research Knowledge Database</i> - https://conjointly.com/kb/</p>

	<p>Assignments/deadlines: None</p>
04.05.2022	<p>Week 12. Qualitative Methods</p> <p>Description: Ethnography, Participant Observation, Case Study</p> <p>Reading: Halperin & Heath, Ch. 13 'Ethnography and Participant Observation', Ch. 9 'Comparative Research' (esp. section 'Case Study' & 'Small N comparison') (AAU library) Bryman, Ch.2 'Case Study Design', Ch. 17 'Ethnography and Participant Observation' (AAU library) Rugg and Petre (2007), 'Observation', in <i>A Gentle Guide to Research Methods</i>, pp. 109-114 (NEO)</p> <p>Recommended: Robert K. Yin (2009) <i>Case Study Research: Design and Methods</i>, 4th edn. Thousand Oaks: SAGE, Chs. 2, 3, 5.</p> <p><u>Relevant to International Studies:</u> Nicholas Wheeler (2000) <i>Saving Strangers: Humanitarian Intervention in International Society</i>. Oxford: Oxford University Press (various case studies on humanitarian intervention in the 1990s).</p> <p>Assignments/deadlines: None</p>
11.05.2022	<p>Week 13. Student Presentations, Part I</p> <p>Description: In-class presentation followed by discussion Reading: None Assignments/deadlines: Student presentations Pt. 1 (Assignment 4), Group 1. Please submit the written notes accompanying your presentation to NEO and to the instructor</p>
18.05.2022	<p>Week 14. Student Presentations, Part II</p> <p>Description: In-class presentation followed by discussion Reading: None</p> <p>Assignments/deadlines: (1) Research Proposal due (Assignment 3) for all students (2) Student presentations Pt. 2 (Assignment 4), Group 2. Please submit the written notes accompanying your presentation to NEO as well as to the instructor as a paper copy</p>

6. Course Requirements and Assessment (with estimated workloads)

Assignment	Workload average	Weight in Final Grade	Evaluated Course Specific Learning Outcomes	Evaluated Institutional Learning Outcomes*
Attendance & Class Participation	42	5%	Ability to outline, analyse and criticise the texts explored in the classroom	1, 2, 3
Research question essay (Assignment 1)	30	20%	Ability to articulate a research problem by identifying its disciplinary and its theoretical context	1, 2
Literature review essay (Assignment 2)	30	20%	Ability to analyse a problem by locating it in the relevant scholarly literature	1,2
Research proposal (Assignment 3)	48	35%	Ability to develop an independent piece of research following the canons of scientific methodology	1,2,3
Seminar presentation + written notes (Assignment 4)	30	20%	Ability to present scientific findings to an audience & to receive feedback from peers	2,3
TOTAL	150	100%		

*1 = Critical Thinking; 2 = Effective Communication; 3 = Effective and Responsible Action

7. Detailed Description of the Assignments

Research Question Essay (Assignment 1) In no more than 1000-1200 words, please formulate a **research question**. Explain the reasons for choosing this particular question. Does it promise any methodological, historical, conceptual or theoretical innovation? In what ways does it contribute to the main theoretical, empirical or policy debates within your respective field (Political Science, International Relations, Law or a cognate field)?

The essay is due in **Week 4 (02.03.2022, 14.45 CET/Prague time)** – please submit it both to NEO and to the instructor as a paper copy.

Assignment 1:

Assessment breakdown

Assessed area	Percentage
Ability to articulate a research question in a coherent manner	50%
Proper use of conceptual vocabulary	20%
Understanding of the scholarly debates in one's disciplinary field	30%
TOTAL	100%

Literature Review Essay (Assignment 2) Drawing on your previous research question essay (Assignment 1), please **compile a literature review** in the form of an annotated bibliography with 7 to 10 academic sources (Wikipedia is not an academic source). For each individual source, please summarise *in your own words* its main argument in a short paragraph (100 to 200 words max). You should strive to use an appropriate conceptual vocabulary and to craft arguments (how does X affect Y?) rather than provide descriptions or paraphrases of what someone else has said. The essay should be between 1500-2000 words long. **It is due in Week 7 (23.03.2022, 14.45 CET/Prague time)** – please submit it both to NEO in an electronic format and to the instructor, as a paper copy.

Assignment 2:

Assessment breakdown

Assessed area	Percentage
Ability to identify relevant sources in conjunction with a guiding research question and a background scholarly debate	50%
Ability to analyse and articulate the main arguments of various academic sources	50%
TOTAL	100%

Research Proposal (Assignment 3) Drawing on the academic literature (integrating **Assignment 2**) relevant to your research project, please **write a research proposal essay** specifying: a (1) manageable research question (integrating **Assignment 1**), and justify your: (3) research design, as well as the (4) methodology (positivist, hermeneutic, critical, formal methodological, etc.) used to approach this question. It is not enough to mention a methodology. You have to explain in detail the basic principles of the methodology you have chosen as principles which have been developed within social science and within your own discipline (i.e., Political Science, International Relations, Law).

The research proposal essay should be about 2500 words in length. The essay is due in Week 14 (18.05.2022, 14.45 CET/Prague time) – please submit it both to NEO and to the instructor as a paper copy.

In developing the **literature review** as well as the **research proposal**, you may use paper-based as well as electronic sources (i.e., the academic database of scholarly journals **JSTOR**). To get access to JSTOR you must fill out a form and submit it in person to the AAU library. Instructions are provided here:

<https://sites.google.com/a/aauni.edu/aaulib---23-05-2012/research/online-databases>

You may also use official websites (with the extension ‘.org’) such as the UN website, or the International Criminal Court website. Useful overviews of basic philosophical issues with extensive bibliographies are available online at the *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, the *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, and *Britannica*. Free ebooks are available on **project Gutenberg** <https://www.projekt-gutenberg.org> as well as on **achive.org** (requires registration, texts are available to read for an hour slot which can be extended by the user as needed). Please avoid popular websites, as the analyses they provide do not meet scholarly criteria of rigor, clarity and accuracy.

Assignment 3:

Assessment breakdown

Assessed area	Percentage
Ability to develop and articulate propositions concerning a given research area, guided by a research question and supported by a literature review	20%
Ability to formulate an effective section on methodology using academic sources	40%
Independent thinking and ability to apply abstract concepts to different contexts	20%
TOTAL	100%

Student Presentations & Written Notes (Assignment 4) In the last two weeks of term, each student will make one short presentation (5-7 minutes) of their **research proposal (Assignment 3 above)**, followed by a discussion with peers (5-10 minutes). A presentation of about 5 minutes corresponds to 500 to 700 words of written text (1 to 1.5 pages, 1.5 space). This means that in presenting your ideas you should focus on *the most important points in your research project* (you will not have time to present the project in detail).

The class will be divided into two Groups. Group 1 (students with surnames beginning with 'A' – 'H', e.g. 'Anderson', 'Hadid') will present during the discussion section in Week 13 (11.05.2022), and Group 2 (Students with surnames beginning 'I'-'Z, i.e. 'Ivanovych', 'Zair') , during the discussion section in Week 14 (18.05.2022). **Group 1 should submit the written notes accompanying their presentations (500-700 words) to NEO on 11.05.2022 by 14.45 CET/Prague time, Group 2 should submit their notes on 18.05.2022 by 14.45 CET/Prague time. Please also submit a paper copy of your written notes to the instructor in class.**

Assignment 4:

Assessment breakdown

Assessed area	Percentage
Presentation skills (ability to communicate clearly and to respond to questions and comments)	40%
Ability to convey ideas in a logical order	30%
Written notes and visual aids	30%
TOTAL	100%

Participation and Contribution to class discussion

Assignment 5:

Assessed area	Percentage
Knowledge and comprehension of the weekly reading assignments	50%
Critical thinking about the issues explored in the readings	50%
TOTAL	100%

Please note that your contribution to class discussion is based on the quality of your interventions, not on their quantity.

8. General Requirements and School Policies

General requirements

All coursework is governed by AAU's academic rules. Students are expected to be familiar with the academic rules available in the Codex and Student Handbook and to maintain the highest standards of honesty and academic integrity in their work.

Electronic communication and submission

The university and instructors shall only use students' university email address for communication. It is strongly recommended that any email communication between students and instructors take place in NEO LMS.

Each e-mail sent to an instructor that is about a new topic (meaning not a reply to an original email) shall have a new and clearly stated subject and shall have the course code in the subject, for example: "COM101-1 Mid-term Exam. Question".

All electronic submissions are carried out through NEO LMS. No substantial pieces of writing (especially take home exams and essays) can be submitted outside of NEO LMS.

Attendance

Attendance is required. Students who are absent 35 percent of classes will be failed (or administratively withdrawn from the course if most absences are excused). Students might also be marked absent if they miss a significant part of a class (by arriving late or leaving early) as specified in the syllabus.

Absence excuse and make-up options

Should a student be absent from classes for relevant reasons (illness, serious family matters), s/he must submit to the Dean of Students an Absence Excuse Request Form supplemented with documents providing reasons for the absence. The form and documents must be submitted within one week of the absence. If possible, it is recommended the instructor be informed of the absence in advance. Should a student be absent during the add/drop period due to a change in registration this will be an excused absence if s/he submits an Absence Excuse Request Form along with the finalized add/drop form.

Assignments missed due to unexcused absences cannot be made up which may result in a decreased or failing grade as specified in the syllabus.

Students whose absence has been excused by the Dean of Students are entitled to make up assignments and exams provided their nature allows for a make-up. Students are responsible for contacting their instructor within one week of the date the absence was excused to arrange for make-up options.

Late work: No late submissions will be accepted – please follow the deadlines.

Electronic devices

Electronic devices (phones, tablets, laptops...) may be used only for class-related activities (taking notes, looking up related information, etc.). Any other use will result in the student being marked absent and/or being expelled from the class. No electronic devices may be used during tests or exams.

Eating is not allowed during classes.

Cheating and disruptive behavior

If a student engages in disruptive or other conduct unsuitable for a classroom environment of an institution of learning, the instructor may require the student to withdraw from the room for the duration of the activity or for the day and shall report the behavior to the Dean.

Students engaging in behavior which is suggestive of cheating (e.g. whispering or passing notes) will, at a minimum, be warned. In the case of continued misbehavior the student will be expelled from the exam and the exam will be marked as failed.

Plagiarism and Academic Tutoring Center

Plagiarism is “the unauthorized use or close imitation of the language and thoughts of *another author and the representation of them as one’s own original work.*” (*Random House Unabridged Dictionary, 2nd Edition, Random House, New York, 1993*).

Turnitin’s White Paper ‘The Plagiarism Spectrum’ (available at <http://go.turnitin.com/paper/plagiarism-spectrum>) identifies 10 types of plagiarism ordered from most to least severe:

1. *CLONE: An act of submitting another’s work, word-for-word, as one’s own.*
2. *CTRL-C: A written piece that contains significant portions of text from a single source without alterations.*
3. *FIND–REPLACE: The act of changing key words and phrases but retaining the essential content of the source in a paper.*
4. *REMIX: An act of paraphrasing from other sources and making the content fit together seamlessly.*
5. *RECYCLE: The act of borrowing generously from one’s own previous work without citation; To self-plagiarize.*
6. *HYBRID: The act of combining perfectly cited sources with copied passages—without citation—in one paper.*
7. *MASHUP: A paper that represents a mix of copied material from several different sources without proper citation.*
8. **404 ERROR:** A written piece that includes citations to non-existent or inaccurate information about sources
9. **AGGREGATOR:** The “Aggregator” includes proper citation, but the paper contains almost no original work.
10. **RE-TWEET:** This paper includes proper citation, but relies too closely on the text’s original wording and/or structure.

As the minimum policy the types of plagiarism from 1 through 8 results in the failing grade from the assignment and must be reported to the Dean. The Dean may initiate a disciplinary procedure pursuant to the Academic Codex. Allegations of bought papers and intentional or consistent plagiarism always entail disciplinary hearing and may result in expulsion from AAU.

If unsure about technical aspects of writing, students are encouraged to consult their papers with the tutors of the AAU Academic Tutoring Center. For more information and/or to book a tutor, please contact the ATC at: <http://atc.simplybook.me/sheduler/manage/event/1/>.

Students with disabilities

Students with disabilities are asked to contact their instructor as soon as possible to discuss reasonable accommodation.

9. Grading Scale

Letter Grade	Percentage*	Description
A	95 – 100	Excellent performance. The student has shown originality and displayed an exceptional grasp of the material and a deep analytical understanding of the subject.
A–	90 – 94	
B+	87 – 89	Good performance. The student has mastered the material, understands the subject well and has shown some originality of thought and/or considerable effort.
B	83 – 86	
B–	80 – 82	
C+	77 – 79	Fair performance. The student has acquired an acceptable understanding of the material and essential subject matter of the course, but has not succeeded in translating this understanding into consistently creative or original work.
C	73 – 76	
C–	70 – 72	
D+	65 – 69	Poor. The student has shown some understanding of the material and subject matter covered during the course. The student’s work, however, has not shown enough effort or understanding to allow for a passing grade in School Required Courses. It does qualify as a passing mark for the General College Courses and Electives.
D	60 – 64	
F	0 – 59	Fail. The student has not succeeded in mastering the subject matter covered in the course.

* Decimals should be rounded to the nearest whole number.

Prepared by and when: Silviya Lechner, 13 Jan 2022

Approved by and when: George Hayes, 16 Jan 2022