

# Syllabus

PLS455/555 – The Politics of Arms in International Relations

**Instructor:** Dr. Willardson

**Course:** The Politics of Arms in International Relations

**Class:** Tu 13:30-16:20 in 8.322B

**Office** 8.133

**Office Hours:** MWF 13:00-14:00 and by appt.

**Email:** [spencer.willardson@nu.edu.kz](mailto:spencer.willardson@nu.edu.kz)

## Course Objectives

In this course you will learn how to synthesize arguments within the study of arms transfers and arms control. You will be able to present your ideas and complex information in the appropriate format. You will be able to describe and interpret quantitative and qualitative data on arms transfers and share your interpretation. You will also learn the foundational literature in arms transfers. Finally, you will be exposed to new ideas and you will learn to be tolerant of different ideas and perspectives. [Course Learning Objectives: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7]

## Course Description

This class will examine arms in international relations from a number of perspectives and at different levels of analysis. The purpose of the course is to acquaint graduate (and advanced undergraduate) students with the literature, questions, and debates about the role that military equipment and technology plays in international relations. The course has four general topics: 1) theories of power and coercion in international relations, 2) states and the production of arms, 3) military sales and military aid, and 4) arms sales decision-making in the state. The course will be reading and discussion intensive. The course will include numerous writing assignments, presentations, an extended case study writing assignment, and discussion leader duties.

This course is for both undergraduate and graduate students. The main syllabus is for the undergraduate portions, while [Appendix D](#) describes the elements of the course that are different for graduate students enrolled in the course.

## Required Textbooks

There are no required textbooks for this course. Students will read from a selection of chapters of books (scanned), journal articles, and other sources. Chapters will be available on the course Moodle page. Articles will be referenced such that students can access them via the NU library and Google scholar. I will discuss how to find articles during the first week of class.

## Grading

Individual assignments and exams will be graded according to rubrics and instructions. Your overall grade for the course will be determined by the cumulative points that you earn on those assignments divided by the total number of points possible in the course. Grades are assigned using the following scale:

**Letter Grade Distribution:**

>= 95.00	A	65.00 - 69.99	C
90.00 - 94.99	A-	60.00 - 64.99	C-
85.00 - 89.99	B+	55.00 - 59.99	D+
80.00 - 84.99	B	50.00 - 54.99	D
75.00 - 79.99	B-	<= 50	F
70.00 - 74.99	C+		

Table 1 shows the graded items and their total points for the class. A description of these graded items is found in the next section. Your grade will be calculated by totaling the number of points earned by you on each of the graded items and dividing that total number by 500 total points for the course.

### Graded Items

Table 1: All Graded items and Total Points for Course

Item	Due	Points Possible
Participation	Ongoing	50
Discussion Leader	Ongoing	50
News Analysis	Ongoing	25
Quizzes (5 @ 10 points each)	Ongoing	50
Short synthesis (2 @ 50 points each)	See Schedule	100
Case Study Proposal	March 6	25
Case Study Draft	April 3	50
Case Study Presentation	April 17	50
Final Case Study	April 24	100
<b>Total Points</b>		<b>500</b>

## Description of Assignments

### Participation

Student participation in class will consist of multiple measures. The main thing to understand is that you cannot participate if you are not present. This is a seminar class and your prior preparation is key to making the class productive and meaningful. Student participation will be graded on consistency of preparation for discussion and debates. We will also do a number of in-class activities and assignments. Completion and quality of in-class work will count toward your final participation grade as well.

### Discussion Leader

Each week's class will have an assigned discussion leader. The discussion leader will prepare a list of questions about the week's readings, and will be responsible for starting the discussion. I will provide a template for discussion leaders on the first day of class that you will use to prepare. Depending on class size, there may be multiple discussion leaders for a week. If that is the case, the discussion will be divided by readings.

## News Analysis

After the break in each class, one or two students will be responsible for sharing news analysis. The news analysis consists of sharing a news story from the past week that relates to that week's reading in some way. The news analysis leader will explain the news event, the source of the news, and then explain how the event relates to the readings. Each analysis should take 4-5 minutes, after which the student will answer questions from the professor and class about the news item and its relation to the material.

## Quizzes

The course will have five quizzes spaced throughout the semester. These quizzes are worth 10 points each. They will test your knowledge of that week's reading. They are given at the beginning of class. No make-ups will be given for quizzes. If you are late, you miss the opportunity to take the quiz.

## Short Synthesis

The short synthesis is similar to a reaction memorandum for 1 week's reading. It is a bridge between a short reaction paper and a longer literature review. The synthesis is a review essay that is assigned to help students distill the main ideas from a group of readings, to find connections between different topics, and to write an engaging synthesis with an original viewpoint and thesis using evidence from assigned readings. Students are encouraged to also utilize additional readings to help justify the positions that they are taking vis-a-vis the assigned readings in their thesis. A one-page guide to writing the synthesis will be uploaded to Moodle at the beginning of the course. That guide includes a grading rubric for the papers.

## Case Study

The final paper project for this course is a case study of either a US or Russian arms relationship in the post Cold War. You can also look at a case of arms transfer or right after a civil war, or of a particular weapons system from a state. I will provide a list of potential cases for students to utilize on the Moodle page by week 2 of the semester. This document also contains an outline the required elements of this case study. The case study has four graded elements: 1) a proposal, 2) a draft, 3) a presentation about the case study in class, and 4) a final version that will be turned in during finals week.

## Policies

These are the standard policies for all of my courses. Some wording (as to assignment penalties) may be less applicable to the format of this particular class.

## Attendance

Attendance in this course is necessary for student success. **Any non-excused absence will be grounds for adjusting grades downward.** Excused absences (such as documented illness, university-approved travel, etc.) must be cleared with me as soon as possible. Students are responsible for making up work missed during absence. In-class quizzes and assignments cannot be made up due to an absence of any sort. Late work is penalized. I reserve the right to grant an extension

for work for absences that are cleared prior to occurring, or on the same day as class in the case of emergencies, but only in extraordinary circumstances.

## Academic Dishonesty

**Academic dishonesty will not be tolerated in any form or under any circumstances.**

All students have been notified of Nazarbayev University's Student Code of Conduct and you have agreed to follow the university's standards. Plagiarism is defined as "intentionally or carelessly presenting the work of another as one's own." In short, all of the work you turn in for this class is expected to be yours and yours alone. Plagiarized work will receive a zero and students will be reported to university authorities. Lying about absences, illnesses, or other circumstances will also be considered as academic dishonesty.

Asking for extra points, extra credit, or a higher grade is also a form of academic dishonesty. *This is also something that will ruin your reputation with faculty members.* The time to worry about grades is on each assignment and exam - not at the end of the term when the final tally is made. Students **earn** grades based on their effort and results, grades **are not given** by me. Students have the right to question the grading of a particular item, and to make an appeal if they feel a grade for a given assignment was not fair. This should be done within a week of receiving feedback on an assignment. Any appeal to an assignment that occurred earlier in the semester at the end of the term will not be considered.

## Office Hours

I hold regular office hours (indicated on the top of the syllabus.) Students are encouraged to come and see me during my office hours. I am also available by appointment, but I prefer that students come see me during scheduled office hours, if possible. I reserve the right to send students away who come and see me outside of office hours without an appointment. **Please be considerate of my time.**

## Writing Center

Writing is a key component of your education at NU. Your grade is dependent on you turning in assignments that convey ideas clearly using standard language, format, citation style, etc. Students are encouraged to work with the writing center to improve their writing. I will use my discretion in requiring students to use the writing center if assignments are consistently poorly written. I will notify you in writing if I will require you to work with the writing center on future papers.

## Writing Fellow

Our course has the privilege of having a writing fellow assigned for our two long writing assignments. **Kamila Auyezova**. Kamila is A PSIR major and has knowledge about good writing, and in writing in political science. She is extremely professional and will be an excellent help to you as you work to do your best ever writing as PSIR students in this class.

Kamila will be working with you on two assignments. You will write the first short synthesis paper on your own. Then, using feedback from me, and a drafting process and meeting with Kamila, you will write the second paper. Kamila will also work with you on your draft of the longer case-study assignment that is due at the end of the semester. More details on these assignments is given in the appropriate appendices of this syllabus, and more information will be given in class.

## Course Schedule

Table 2 shows an outline of the topics and deadlines for the course. See the next section *Readings* for each week's reading assignments.

Table 2: Course Schedule by Week

Week	Date	Topic	Deadlines
1	01/09/18	Intro to course	
2	01/16/18	The State	
3	01/23/18	Power in IR	
4	01/30/18	Balancing vs. Arms	Short Synthesis 1
5	02/06/18	Theories of Arms Transfers	Project Memo (555)
6	02/13/18	Arms and Aid	
7	02/20/18	Arms and Policy I	Draft Short Synth. 2
8	02/27/18	Arms and Policy II	
9	03/06/18	Arms Control	Case Study Proposal
10	03/13/18	Global Arms Sales: Patterns and Data	Final Short Synth 2.
11	<b>03/20/18</b>	<b><i>Spring Break</i></b>	<b><i>None</i></b>
12	03/27/18	Russian Arms Sales: Bureaucracy and the Market	
13	04/03/18	US Arms Sales: Bureaucracy and the Market	Case Study Draft
14	04/10/18	World Patterns of Arms Sales	
15	04/17/18	Case Studies of Arms Sales	Case Study Presentation

## Course Readings

### Week 2: The State

(126 pages)<sup>1</sup>

Porter, Bruce D. 1994. *War and the Rise of the State: The Military Foundation of Modern Politics*. The Free Press: New York. (Selection on Moodle)

Tilly, Charles. 1990. *Coercion, Capital and European States*. Blackwell: Cambridge. (Selection on Moodle)

Suchman, Mark C., and Dana P. Eyre. 1992. "Military Procurement as Rational Myth: Notes on the Social Construction of Weapons Proliferation." *Sociological Forum* 7:137-61.

### Week 3: Review of Power in IR

(93 pages)

Baldwin, David A. 2002. "Power and International Relations." *In Handbook of International Relations*, eds. Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse, and Beth Simmons. London: Sage, 177-91. (Moodle)

<sup>1</sup>The total number of pages for the course is just under 1200. You have readings for 12 weeks, which means an average of 100 pages per week of reading. Some weeks have more reading than others even though I tried to make them as consistent as possible. Thematically, there is variation. The largest reading week is week 4 with 128 pages. The lowest is week 8 with 60 pages.

Gilpin, Robert. 1988. "The Theory of Hegemonic War." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 18(4): 591-613.

Johnson, Jesse C., Brett Ashley Leeds, and Ahra Wu. 2015. "Capability, Credibility, and Extended General Deterrence." *International Interactions* 41(2):309-336.

Lieber, Keir A., and Gerard Alexander. 2005. "Waiting for Balancing: Why the World Is Not Pushing Back." *International Security* 30(1): 109-39.

#### **Week 4: Balancing vs. Arms**

(128 pages)

Kinsella, David. 1994. "Conflict in Context: Arms Transfers and Third World Rivalries during the Cold War." *American Journal of Political Science* 38(3): 557-81.

Morrow, James D. 1993. "Arms Versus Allies: Trade-Offs in the Search for Security." *International Organization* 47(2): 207-33.

Sanjian, Gregory S. 1999. "Promoting Stability or Instability? Arms Transfers and Regional Rivalries, 1950-1991." *International Studies Quarterly* 43(4): 641-70.

Yarhi-Milo, Keren, Alexander Lanoszka, and Zack Cooper. 2016. "To Arm or to Ally?: The Patrons Dilemma and the Strategic Logic of Arms Transfers and Alliances." *International Security* 41(2): 90-139.

#### **Week 5: Theories of Arms Transfers**

(73 pages plus review)

Review Suchman and Eyre (1992) from week 2.

Review Yarhi-Milo et al (2016) from week 3.

Willardson, Spencer L. 2013. "Under the Influence of Arms: The Foreign Policy Causes and Consequences of Arms Transfers." PhD. Thesis, University of Iowa. Chapters 1-2 (Moodle).

Willardson, Spencer L. 2017. "Arms as Socialization: Arms Transfers as a Mechanism for Creating and Enforcing International Roles." Working paper. pp. 1-27. (Moodle)

#### **Week 6: Arms and Aid**

(73 pages)

Blanton, Shannon Lindsey. 1999. "Instruments of Security or Tools of Repression? Arms Imports and Human Rights Conditions in Developing Countries." *Journal of Peace Research* 36(2): 233-44.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2005. "Foreign Policy in Transition? Human Rights, Democracy, and U.S. Arms Exports." *International Studies Quarterly* 49(4): 647-68.

Kinsella, David. 1998. "Arms Transfer Dependence and Foreign Policy Conflict." *Journal of Peace Research* 35(1): 7-23.

Johnson, Richard A.I., and Spencer L Willardson. (2018). “Human Rights and Democratic Arms Transfers: Rhetoric versus Reality with Different Types of Major Weapons Systems.” *International Studies Quarterly*.

## Week 7: Arms and Policy I

(70 pages)

Ashkenazi, Michael. 2008. “Kazakhstan: Where Surplus Arms Are Not a Problem.” *Contemporary Security Policy* 29(1): 129-50.

Caverley, Jonathan, and Ethan B. Kapstein. 2012. “Arms Away.” *Foreign Affairs* 91(5): 125-32.

Qingmin, Zhang. 2006. “The Bureaucratic Politics of US Arms Sales to Taiwan.” *The Chinese Journal of International Politics* 1(2): 231-65.

Smith, Ron, Anthony Humm, and Jacques Fontanel. 1985. “The Economics of Exporting Arms.” *Journal of Peace Research* 22(3): 239-47.

## Week 8: Arms and Policy II

(60 pages)

Berryman, John. 2000. “Russia and the Illicit Arms Trade.” *Crime, Law and Social Change* 33(1-2): 85-104.

Kovacic, William E., and Dennis E. Smallwood. 1994. “Competition Policy, Rivalries, and Defense Industry Consolidation.” *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 8(4): 91-110.

Mayer, Kenneth R., and Anne M. Khademian. 1996. “Bringing Politics Back in: Defense Policy and the Theoretical Study of Institutions and Processes.” *Public Administration Review* 56(2): 180-90.

Pearson, Frederic S. 1989. “The Correlates of Arms Importation.” *Journal of Peace Research* 26(2): 153-63.

## Week 9: Arms Control

(106 pages)

Betts, Richard K. 1980. “The Tragicomedy of Arms Trade Control.” *International Security* 5(1): 80-110.

Levine, Paul, and Ron Smith. 1995. “The Arms Trade and Arms Control.” *The Economic Journal* 105(429): 471-84.

Müller, Harald. 2002. “Security Cooperation.” *In Handbook of International Relations*, eds. Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse, and Beth Simmons. London: Sage, 369-391. (Moodle)

Erickson, Jennifer L. 2013. “Stopping the Legal Flow of Weapons: Compliance with Arms Embargoes, 1981-2004.” *Journal of Peace Research* 50(2): 159-174.

Erickson, Jennifer L. 2015. Saint or Sinner? Human Rights and U.S. Support for the Arms Trade Treaty.” *Political Science Quarterly* 130(3): 449-474.

**Week 10: Global Arms Sales: Patterns and Data**

(122 pages)

Sanjian, Gregory S. 1991. "Great Power Arms Transfers: Modeling the Decision-Making Processes of Hegemonic, Industrial, and Restrictive Exporters." *International Studies Quarterly* 35(2): 173-93.

Gerner, Debbie J. 1983. "Arms Transfers to the Third World: Research on Patterns, Causes and Effects." *International Interactions* 10: 5-37.

Mintz, Alex. 1986. "Arms Imports as an Action-Reaction Process: An Empirical Test of Six Pairs of Developing Nations." *International Interactions* 12: 229-43.

Willardson, Spencer L. 2013. "Under the Influence of Arms: The Foreign Policy Causes and Consequences of Arms Transfers." PhD. Thesis, University of Iowa. Chapter 3-4. (Moodle).

**Week 11: Spring Break: No Readings****Week 12: Russian Arms Sales I: Bureaucracy and Market**

(106 pages)

Blank, Stephen. 2007. Rosoboronekспорт: Arms Sales and the Structure of Russian Defense Industry. *Strategic Studies Institute*. [Link to Paper](#).

Kassianova, Alla. 2006. Enter Rosoboronexport. *Institute for European, Russian, and Eurasian Studies*. PONARS Memo. March 22, 2012. [Link to Paper on PONARS site](#).

Willardson, Spencer L. 2013. "Under the Influence of Arms: The Foreign Policy Causes and Consequences of Arms Transfers." PhD. Thesis, University of Iowa. Chapter 5. (Moodle).

**Week 13: US Sales I: Bureaucracy and Market**

(About 100 pages)

DSCA website. Topics assigned later. <http://www.dsca.mil/>

Theohary, Catherine A. 2016. "Conventional Arms Transfers to Developing Nations, 2008-2015." *Congressional Research Service Report*. R44716. [Link to Report online](#).

**Review** Willardson, Spencer L. 2013. "Under the Influence of Arms: The Foreign Policy Causes and Consequences of Arms Transfers." PhD. Thesis, University of Iowa. Chapter 5. (Moodle).

**Week 14: The Rest of the World: Arms Sales**

(104 pages)

Johnson, Richard A. I. 2015. "The Role and Capabilities of Major Weapon Systems Transferred between 1950 and 2010: Empirical Examinations of an Arms Transfer Data Set." *Defence and Peace Economics* 0(0): 1-26.



Holm, Kyrre. 2006. "Europeanising Export Controls: The Impact of the European Union Code of Conduct on Arms Exports in Belgium, Germany and Italy." *European Security* 15(2): 213-234.

Platte, Hendrik, and Dirk Leuffen. 2016. German Arms Exports: Between Normative Aspirations and Political Reality. *German Politics* 25(4): 561-580.

Akerman, Anders, and Anna Larsson Seim. 2014. "The Global Arms Trade Network 1950-2007." *Journal of Comparative Economics* 42(3): 535-551.

### **Week 15: Case Studies of Arms Sales**

No Readings for this week.

## Appendix A - Discussion Leader and News Analysis Description

### Discussion Leader

This course is a seminar, which means that much of the learning will come from a discussion of the week's readings. *In this course, the quality of your learning will be dependent on your own preparation and your interaction with your peers.* Every student is expected to read **all** of the readings **each** week and to be prepared to engage in discussion. The discussion leader is meant to guide the discussion, not to be the only one talking or making points. I will grade everyone each week on their quality of participation in the discussion as will the discussion leader(s).

To facilitate the discussion, each week 1 or 2 students will be assigned as discussion leaders. The discussion leader(s) will lead a discussion of the week's readings for approximately 1 hour each class period. Whether 1 or 2 people are discussion leaders, the responsibilities are the same. The only difference will be that I will assign certain readings to the discussion leaders in 2-person teams at the beginning of class. **Both will have to complete all parts of the assignment individually.**

The following are the responsibilities of the discussion leader:

1. Read all the week's readings thoroughly and in advance of the week's class.
2. By Monday at 12:00 p.m. (noon) the day before class, send a list of questions to Dr. Willardson
  - You should have 10-12 questions from the readings typed up in a word document (see list below for types of questions)
  - You should also have a written plan for how you will discuss readings, including order to discuss, background information, and potential problems included at the bottom of Word document<sup>2</sup>.
3. Lead the discussion of the readings for approximately 1 hour in class.
4. Write a brief (300-400 word) memo to be turned in the next week before class about what you learned from your discussion leader experience. At the end of this brief, please list the three students who were best prepared and participated most fully in the discussion, along with the three weakest-prepared students.

Your questions should help the class better understand the ways that readings fit together, to understand them at a deeper level, and raise questions about the overall subject of the class. Here is a list of types of questions that are appropriate for a discussion leader to ask:

- Questions about how 2 or more of the readings relate to each other
- Questions about how 2 or more readings contradict each other
- Questions about research design - including whether the research question is answered by the design, what flaws exist, whether the data are appropriate, etc.
- Questions that are implied by the readings
- Questions about how a reading relates to the overall theme of the course
- Questions about how a reading can be used to answer other questions from earlier in the course.

---

<sup>2</sup>This plan **will** change for those of you on 2-person teams since I will assign your roles the day of discussion

## News Analysis

On a week when you are not assigned to be the discussion leader you will be assigned to provide a news analysis to begin the day. This assignment is designed to do 2 things. The first is to get you reading the news and thinking about the way that what you are learning in the course can help you understand what is going on in the world currently. The second is to help you concisely describe an event and its relationship orally in a group setting.

I will have a list of 3-4 websites you can look at for recent arms news. **When it is your week to provide a news analysis you will be responsible for the following:**

- Find a news article about an arms sale/transfer or other development from the list of websites, or somewhere else reputable.
- Make a PowerPoint Slide with the following information
  - Title of the Article
  - Source of Article
  - Main point of Article
  - Your analysis of how this fits with the course
- You will save the PowerPoint Slide as a PDF (save as in the menu) and send the pdf to Dr. Willardson via email by Monday at 13:00.
- At the beginning of class, you will take five minutes to give a brief on the news. I will post your slide, but you are responsible for being prepared to discuss the event coherently, concisely, and precisely for 4-5 minutes.

**I will provide an example slide and brief during the first week of class.**

## Appendix B - Description and Rubric for Synthesis Papers

The essence of the synthesis paper (sometimes called a reaction paper) is to allow you as a student to critically and creatively play with ideas that are generated from a set of readings. This is used as a pedagogical tool by me to 1) assess how well students understood a group of readings, and 2) to help students to move beyond simple reading and learning what others have said and to begin to formulate their own ideas.

A synthesis paper in this class will be around 1000 words in length and no more than 1200 words.

You can approach a synthesis paper from a number of perspectives, but I suggest that you use one of the following:

1. Ask a question you feel is not addressed in the readings
2. Explore an interesting idea raised by an author in more detail
3. Argue against a perspective espoused by an author or multiple authors in the readings
4. Suggest a solution to a problem raised implicitly or explicitly in the readings
5. Explore contradictions between papers

In all cases, you are tasked with demonstrating a **mastery** of the selected readings. You must understand the arguments, nuances, approaches, and evidence of all of the authors of in the week. You will explicitly synthesize arguments and ideas from **all** of the papers in making your own argument. I recommend that you read or re-read Knopf (2005)<sup>3</sup> for ideas about how to treat this synthesis paper.

Your paper should follow APSA formatting for citations, headers, and other relevant information. You can single space the text. Neatness and presentation count, so make sure that you pay attention to the way that papers in political science look - including this syllabus. Each paper should include parenthetical references (author date, page#) and a full list of references at the end. You do not need a separate page for references, just begin the references section after the text ends with the appropriate header.

Each paper is worth 50 points. The rubric below is what I will use to grade the papers along with the point range for the five different elements that I will grade based on how well you address each element.

The first paper you will write on your own using your current writing methods. It is due at the beginning of class on 30 January 2018. The paper will address any week's worth of readings (The State, Power, or Balancing vs. Arms) or all of them as described above.

Your second paper will be written week 5, 6, or 7's topics as described above. It will be written as a draft that both Kamila and I will comment on. You will have a meeting with Kamila sometime during the week of February 26 2018. You will then write a final version of the draft based on feedback from that meeting. The draft will not be graded, but if you fail to turn in a draft and go through the writing process, you will not be able to turn in the final assignment - worth 10% of your grade.

*Kamila will help you improve your paper by helping you improve your thesis and use of evidence. She will help you think through whether you are making an original argument. Since she is not familiar with these readings, she will not be able to judge your understanding of the readings, and her job is not to help you with your mechanics (prof-reading), that is up to you.*

---

<sup>3</sup>Knopf, Jeffrey W. (2006) "Doing a Literature Review." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 39(1):127-132.

Table 3: Rubric for Synthesis Papers

	<b>Poor (0-5 points)</b>	<b>Average (6-7 points)</b>	<b>Good (7-8.5 Points)</b>	<b>Exceptional (8.5-10 Points)</b>
<b>Thesis</b>	No thesis is evident.	There is a thesis, but it is not clear.	Thesis is clear and relevant to the week's reading.	Thesis is clear, concise, and very logical.
<b>Evidence</b>	Evidence from readings is not used, or is used haphazardly.	Evidence from the reading is there, but it is not organized clearly throughout or doesn't clearly support thesis.	Evidence from reading is there, it is organized, and it supports the arguments of the thesis.	Evidence clearly and logically supports the hypothesis.
<b>Understanding</b>	Student demonstrates little understanding of selected readings, or shows a major misunderstanding.	Student demonstrates some understanding of readings. Some small misunderstanding may be evident.	Student demonstrates solid understanding of readings with no or few small misunderstanding.	Student demonstrates exceptional understanding of readings and provides deep insight into the issue.
<b>Originality</b>	Student makes no effort to make an original argument.	Student demonstrates some original thought, but paper is formulaic or rote in tone.	Student demonstrates original thought or original approach to understanding readings.	Student makes exceptional arguments, or points out profound issues/insights with the readings.
<b>Mechanics</b>	Major issues with grammar, style, and references throughout.	Some errors in grammar, style, or references throughout. May have major issues in one area.	Small errors in grammar, style, and references only.	No major and few minor errors in grammar, style, and references.

## Appendix C - Description and Rubric for Case Study

The final paper in this class is a case study that is meant to help you use the tools from the course to apply it to a real case in the real world. It is also meant to help you learn how to write a case study as part of research - one of the forms of qualitative research that is discussed, but not necessarily practiced in other PSIR courses. I provide the potential cases, and provide the basic framework for the case, so you have it framed already, but the way you write your case will depend on what theoretical perspective you take, the issues you choose to focus on, and your own personal interests. It is a chance to be creative within a set of constraints, which is an important way to learn new skills and develop creativity in general.

### Types of Case Study

There are three types of case study that you can write:

1. A case about the relationship between the US or Russia and a new supplier, or stopping supplies after the Cold War.
2. A case about weapons transferred to a state that has just come out of a civil war/or arms suppliers during a civil war.
3. A case about the development and sale of a certain type of weapon system by a state or partnership of states.

We will discuss all of these different options in class and address them in readings.

### Description of Requirements

The case study has four graded elements: a proposal and an outline of the project, a rough draft, and a final draft.

#### Proposal:

The proposal is due on 6 March and is worth 25 points. In the proposal you will do the following:

1. Identify the type of case you'll write
2. Identify the main elements of the case based on the theory/question/purpose of your case.
3. Identify 10 initial sources of information for arguments, policy analysis, or a literature review.
4. Identify your main argument or general theory and how your case is structured to answer it.
5. Write 2-3 paragraphs about the case, why you are interested in it, and the challenges you think you'll face while completing it.

I will grade this proposal as follows: Incomplete (60%), meets expectations (75-79%), good (80-84%), great (85-94%), and excellent (95-100%). I will provide feedback about my ideas for the project along with the grade. You are demonstrating to me that you have thought about this project **a lot** by this point in the semester (nearly 2 months worth of class) and that you have an idea about your project. You need to complete the draft of the project by 27 March, so it is important that you've got a good plan by this point.

**Rough Draft**

The rough draft is due April 3. It is a full draft of your final paper. I expect that it will be the full length, that all arguments will be made, and that you will have performed the analysis that you need.

I will provide thorough feedback on the rough draft and will use the same scale to grade as for the outline: Incomplete (60%), meets expectations (75-79%), good (80-84%), great (85-94%), and excellent (95-100%). I will also provide you with an expected grade if you make the changes suggested and turn the rough draft into a final draft.

As part of the writing process, you will also meet with Kamila before 24 April to go over the draft. She will provide you with additional feedback about the paper.

**Case Study Presentation**

On the last day of class each of you will give a 10 minute presentation about your case study. This presentation will consist of standard slides (that I will provide by April 3) that you will fill out with the appropriate information. You will give a brief (6-7 minute) outline of your case study and then answer questions for 2-3 minutes.

**Final Case Study**

The final paper is due on 24 April in lieu of a final exam. This paper will use a similar rubric as that used for the synthesis papers. That modified rubric is shown in the table on the next page.

All papers will use APSA formatting for headings and citations. That means an in-text citation format. You will also provide a full list of references at the end of the paper. On this long paper, that list of references should begin on its own page. Sloppy and lazy citations are graded very harshly, so make sure you are paying attention to this process. I will grade the paper according to the rubric. I will also grade on appearance, so make sure you format your papers correctly.

The final paper should be between 3000 and 3500 words in length, not including references at the end.

Table 4: Rubric for Case Study

	<b>Poor (0-10 points)</b>	<b>Average (10-14 points)</b>	<b>Good (15-19 Points)</b>	<b>Exceptional (19-20 Points)</b>
<b>Thesis/ Theory</b>	No thesis is evident. Underlying thesis/theory is unclear	There is a thesis, but it is not clear.	Thesis is clear and relevant.	Thesis is clear, concise, and very logical.
<b>Evidence</b>	Evidence from readings and other sources are weak or nonexistent.	Evidence is there, but it is not organized clearly or doesn't clearly support thesis.	Evidence is there. It is organized and it supports the arguments of the thesis.	Evidence clearly and logically supports the thesis.
<b>Understanding</b>	Student demonstrates little understanding of the project.	Student demonstrates some understanding of project, some small misunderstanding may be evident.	Student demonstrates solid understanding of project with no or few small misunderstanding.	Student demonstrates exceptional understanding of project and provides deep insight into the issue.
<b>Originality</b>	Student makes no effort to make an original argument.	Student demonstrates some original thought, but paper is formulaic or rote in tone.	Student demonstrates original thought or original approach to understanding problem.	Student makes exceptional arguments, or points out profound issues/insights with the problem.
<b>Mechanics</b>	Major issues with grammar, style, and references throughout.	Some errors in grammar, style, or references throughout. May have major issues in one area.	Small errors in grammar, style, and references only.	No major and few minor errors in grammar, style, and references.



## Appendix D - PLS555 Addendum

This course is a dual-enrollment undergraduate/graduate course. Graduate students are expected to be discussion leaders, do all reading, and to do the news analysis assignments as described for the undergraduate students in the syllabus above.

The following are the differences in the class for graduate students.

### Grading

Grades are assigned as letter grades and grade ranges (for example B+/A-) for each assignment. Letter grades below *B+* indicate that you are doing work below what is expected for graduate work. Any grade below a *B-* should be taken to mean that you are well below expectations. The final grade is assigned based on the graded assignments and trajectory of work in class. The final project (see below) carries the largest weight of all the assignments.

### Reaction Papers

Graduate students will write 10 reaction papers during the semester. The two weeks of readings that do not require reaction papers are week 12 and 13. These reaction papers should be around 750 words in length. They cover the readings for each week. These papers are due at the beginning of each class in hard copy and on the course Moodle site via Turnitin. See [Appendix B](#) for expectations for these papers in general.

### Final Paper

The final paper required of graduate students is longer than the case study required of undergraduate students. I expect a 6000-7500 word research paper, or completed and very research design that deals - at least tangentially - with the topic of this course.

Graduate students will write a project memorandum describing their project and it is due when listed on the [course schedule](#). This memorandum should be about 2 pages in length and will outline your research question, how it fits with the scope of the class, and how writing this paper will help you in your thesis preparation. The memorandum will also include as an appendix a list of 15-20 additional sources to read for the preparation and writing of this paper. This reading constitutes the additional reading for the course - and should be significant political science papers from well-ranked journals.

The other deadlines for paper drafts and the final draft are the same for graduate students.

### Other

I expect that graduate students **will come and see me at least every other week in office hours** to discuss progress and questions on their papers and their additional readings.

I also expect that graduate students **will be an example of preparedness** for each week's readings, and when it is their turn to be discussion leader, or to share a news item.