INR 6607
International Relations Theory
Credit hours: 3
Spring 2014

Professor: Michael Mousseau
Office: 302M Howard Phillips Hall
Phone: 407-823-2608
E-mail: Michael.Mousseau@ucf.edu

Class meets: M 06:00 – 8:50 PM HPH 0305G
Office Hours: M 3:20 – 5:00 PM, W F 3:20 – 4:00, and by appointment.

UCF Catalogue Description: A survey of primary theoretical approaches to understanding and explaining international relations.

Course Goals/Objectives: Promote understanding of the primary theoretical approaches to explaining international relations.

Required Texts: The main texts on sale at Barnes and Noble's at the University of Central Florida bookstore are:

Douglas M. Gibler, *The Territorial Peace: Borders, State Development, and International Conflict*. Cambridge University Press, September 2012.

Kenneth Waltz, *Man, the State and War: A Theoretical Analysis*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.

Kenneth Waltz, *Theory of International Politics*. Addison-Wesley Pub. Co., 1979.

Michael E. Brown (editor), *Rational Choice and Security Studies : Stephen Walt and his Critics*. MIT Press, 2000.

Supplemental texts: Books on reserve, in which only a chapter or two are assigned, are:

John Gerard Ruggie. *Constructing the World Polity*: *Essays on International Institutionalization*. Routledge, 1998.

Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

John A. Vasquez and Colin Elman, *Realism and the Balancing of Power: A New Debate*. Prentice Hall, 2002.

Colin Elman and Miriam Fendius Elman, *Progress in International Relations Theory: Appraising the Field*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2003.

Manus Midlarsky, ed., *Handbook of War Studies II.* Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press, 2003.

It is best to read the material for each week in the order listed.

Course Outline

EPISTEMOLOGICAL AND CONCEPTUAL ISSUES

January 6 **Rules of Evidence**

Suggested Readings:

Stuart Bremer, Patrick Regan, and David Clark. "Building a Science of World Politics: Emerging Methodologies and the Study of Conflict." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 47(2003): 3-12.

Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1996 [1962].

Imre Lakatos, 1978 [1970]. "Falsification and the Methodology of Scientific Research Programs." In *Mathematics, Science and Epistemology: Philosophical Papers Volume* 1, ed. John Worrall and Gregory Currie. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 7 and 8 summarize Lakatosian methodology.

Larry Laudan, *Progress and its Problems : Towards a Theory of Scientific Growth*. Berkeley : University of California Press, 1978. Chapters 3 and 4 offer a concise coverage of the issues involving Popper, Kuhn, and Lakatos.

Michael Shermer, *Why People Believe Weird Things: Pseudoscience, Superstition, and Other Confusions of our Time*, New York: W. H. Freeman, 1997.

January 13 **Rational Choice and Security Studies**

Michael E. Brown (editor.), *Rational Choice and Security Studies: Stephen Walt and His Critics*. Cambridge, MA : MIT Press, 2000.

January 20 **Martin Luther King Day (holiday).**

January 27 **Levels of Analysis**

Kenneth Waltz, *Man, the State and War: A Theoretical Analysis*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.

NEO-UTILITARIAN APPROACHES IN GLOBAL POLITICS

February 3 **Structural Realism and the Balance of Power**

Kenneth Waltz, *Theory of International Politics*. Addison-Wesley Pub. Co., 1979.

Suggested Reading:

Edward Hallett Carr, *The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations*. London: Macmillan, 1961[1946].

Hans Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, revised by Kenneth W. Thompson. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1993.

John Vasquez, "Coloring it Morgenthau: New Evidence for an Old Thesis on Quantitative International Politics." *British Journal of International Studies* 5 (1979): 210-228.

February 10 **Is Structural Realism Over?**

John A. Vasquez, "The Realist Paradigm and Degenerative versus Progressive Research Programs: An Appraisal of Neotraditional Research on Waltz's Balancing Proposition," *American Political Science Review* 91: 4 (December 1997): 899-912.

Kenneth N. Waltz, "Evaluating Theories," *American Political Science Review* 91:4 (December 1997): 913-917.

Thomas J. Christensen and Jack Snyder, "Progressive Research on Degenerate Alliances," *American Political Science Review* 91:4 (December 1997): 919-922.

Colin Elman and Miriam Fendius Elman, "Lakatos and Neorealism: A Reply to Vasquez," *American Political Science Review* 91:4 (December 1997): 923-926.

Randall L Schweller, "New Realist Research on Alliances: Refining, Not Refuting, Waltz's Balancing Proposition" *American Political Science Review* 91:4 (December 1997): 927-930.

Stephen M. Walt, "The Progressive Power of Realism" *American Political Science Review* 91:4 (December 1997): 931-935.

John Vasquez, "The New Debate on Balancing Power: A Reply to My Critics", in John A. Vasquez and Colin Elman, *Realism and the Balancing of Power: A New Debate*. Prentice Hall, 2002.

Stephen G. Brooks and William C. Wohlforth, "Hard Times for Soft Balancing," *International Security* 30: 1 (Summer 2005): 72-108.

Jack S. Levy and William R. Thompson, "Balancing on Land and at Sea: Do States Ally against the Leading Global Power?" *International Security* 35: 1 (Summer 2010): 7-43.

David W. Blagden, Jack S. Levy, William R. Thompson, "Correspondence," *International Security* 36: 2 (Fall 2011): 190-202.

Suggested Reading:

John A. Vasquez and Colin Elman, *Realism and the Balancing of Power: A New Debate*. Prentice Hall, 2002.

John Vasquez *The Power of Power Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Ernest R. May, Richard Rosecrance, and Zara Steiner (editors), *History and Neorealism.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

J. David Singer, Stuart Bremer, and John Stuckey, "Capability Distribution, Uncertainty, and Major Power War, 1820-1965," in John A. Vasquez and Marie T. Henehan, (editors)., *The Scientific Study of Peace and War*. New York: MacMillan/Lexington Books, 1992 [1972].

Jeffrey Legro, and Andrew Moravcsik, "Is Anybody Still a Realist?" *International Security* 24:2 (1999): 5-55.

Keir A Lieber. and Gerard Alexander, "Waiting for Balancing: Why the World Is Not Pushing Back," *International Security* 30: 1 (Summer 2005): 109-139.

Kenneth N Waltz., "Structural Realism after the Cold War," *International Security* 24 (2000): 5-41.

February 17 **<u>Rationality and Bargaining</u>**

James Fearon, "Rationalist Explanations for War," *International Organization* 49: 3 (Summer 1995): 379-414.

David A. Lake, "Two Cheers for Bargaining Theory: Assessing Rationalist Explanations of the Iraq War," *International Security* 35 (Winter 2010-11): 7-52.

February 24 **<u>Neo-liberal Institutionalism</u>**

Robert O. Keohane and Lisa Martin, "Institutional Theory as a Research Program," chapter 3 in Elman and Elman, *Progress in International Relations Theory*. *Appraising the Field*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2003. On reserve.

Robert Jervis, "Realism, Neoliberalism, and Cooperation," chapter 8 in Elman and Elman, *Progress in International Relations Theory*. *Appraising the Field*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2003. On reserve.

Charles Duelfer and Stephen Benedict Dyson, "Chronic Misperception and International Conflict: The U.S.-Iraq Experience," *International Security* 36 (2011): 73-100.

Andrew Moravscik, "Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics," *International Organization* 51:4 (Autumn 1997): 513-553.

Suggested Reading:

Robert Axelrod, *The Evolution of Cooperation.* New York: Basic Books, 1984.

Robert Jervis, *Perception and Misperception in International Politics.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1976.

Robert O. Keohane, (editor), *Neo-Realism and its Critics*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1986.

Robert O Keohane., *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World political Economy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984. Especially pp. 7-10, 48-65; 85-98, and 111-116.

Robert Jervis, "Cooperation Under the Security Dilemma," *World Politics* 30: 2 (January, 1978).

Joshua S. Goldstein and John R. Freeman, *Three-Way Street: Strategic Reciprocity in World Politics*. University of Chicago Press, 1990.

G. John Ikenberry, *After Victory*: *Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Rebuilding of Order After Major Wars*. Princeton, N.J. : Princeton University Press, 2001.

Robert O. Keohane, *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World political Economy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984. Especially pp. 7-10, 48-65; 85-98, and 111-116.

John J. Mearsheimer, "The False Promise of International Institutions," *International Security* 19: 3 (1994): 5-49.

Robert O. Keohane and Lisa L. Martin, "The Promise of Institutionalist Theory," *International Security* 20: 1 (Summer 1995): 39-51.

Charles A. Kupchan and Clifford A. Kupchan, "The Promise of Collective Security," *International Security*, Vol. 20, No. 1 (Summer 1995), pp. 52-61.

John Gerard Ruggie, "The False Premise of Realism," *International Security*, Vol. 20, No. 1 (Summer 1995), pp. 62-70.

Alexander Wendt, "Constructing International Politics," *International Security*, Vol. 20, No. 1 (Summer 1995), pp. 71-81.

John J. Mearsheimer, "A Realist Reply," *International Security*, Vol. 20, No. 1 (Summer 1995), pp. 82-93.

March 3 **No seminar due to spring break.**

March 10 **<u>The Constructivist Critique</u>**

John Gerard Ruggie, 1998. *Constructing the World Polity*: *Essays on International Institutionalization*. Routledge. Pages 1-40 offer an overview of constructivism.

Peter J. Katzenstein, Robert Keohane, and Stephen Krasner, "International Organization and the Study of World Politics," *International Organization* 52:4 (Fall 1998): 645-685.

Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999. Chapters 1, 4, 6, and 7 on how state identities can change and affect the nature of the interstate system.

Suggested Reading:

Robert O. Keohane (1988). "International Institutions: Two Approaches," *International Studies Quarterly*, 32 (4), 379-396.

Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*. Columbia University Press; 3rd edition, 2002. Argues that the international system is simultaneously realist, liberal, and institutional.

Alexander Wendt, "Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics," *International Organization* 46 (Spring 1992): 391-425.

John Vasquez. (1995). "The Post-Positivist Debate: Reconstructing Scientific Enquiry and International Relations Theory after Enlightenment's Fall." in *International Relations Theory Today*, edited by Ken Booth and Steve Smith. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

S. Guzzini, and Leander, A. (2006) 'Wendt's Constructivism' in S. Guzzini and A. Leander (editors) *Constructivism and International Relations: Alexander Wendt and his Critics,* New York: Routledge, Ch. 5, pp. 73-91.

CLASSICAL LIBERAL APPROACHES IN GLOBAL POLITICS

March 17 **<u>The Democratic Peace</u>**

Jameson Ungerer, "Assessing the Progress of the Democratic Peace Research Program," *International Studies Review* 14:1 (2012).

Jack Snyder and Erica D. Borghard, "The Cost of Empty Threats: A Penny, Not a Pound," *American Political Science Review* 105: 3 (August 2011).

Douglas M. Gibler, *The Territorial Peace: Borders, State Development, and International Conflict*. Cambridge University Press, September 2012.

Suggested Reading:

Bruce Bueno de Mesquita, James D. Morrow, Randolph M. Siverson, and Alastair Smith, "Testing Novel Implications from the Selectorate Theory of War," *World Politics* 56 (April 2004): 363–88.

Bruce Russett *Grasping the Democratic Peace : Principles for a Post-Cold War World*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Edward D Mansfield and Jack Snyder, *Electing to Fight: Why Emerging Democracies Go to War*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2005.

Jack S. Levy "Domestic Politics and War," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 18: 4 (Spring 1988): 653-673.

Karen Rasler and William Thompson, "Borders, Rivalry, Democracy and Conflict in the European Region, 1816-1994," *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 28 (July 2011): 280-305.

Michael C. Desch, "Democracy and Victory: Why Regime Type Hardly Matters," *International Security* 27: 2 (2002): 5-47.

Sebastian Rosato"The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory." *American Political Science Review* 97: 4 (November 2003): 585-602.

Steven Miller and Douglas Gibler, "Democracies, Territory, and Negotiated Compromises," *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 28 (July 2011): 261-279.

March 24 **<u>Interdependence and Free Markets</u>**

Oneal, John R., and Bruce Russett. "The Classical Liberals Were Right: Democracy, Interdependence, and Conflict, 1950–1985" *International Studies Quarterly* 41:2 (June 1997): 267–94.

Erik Gartzke. "The Capitalist Peace," *American Journal of Political Science*: 51(2007): 166-191.

Patrick J. McDonald. "The Purse Strings of Peace," *American Journal of Political Science* 51(2007): 569-582.

Suggested Reading:

Gerald Schneider and Nils Petter Gleditsch (editors), *Assessing the Capitalist Peace*, Routledge, 2013.

Erich Weede, *Economic Development, Social Order, and World Politics*. Boulder, CO: L. Rienner, 1996.

Erik Gartzke, Quan Li and Charles Boehmer, "Investing in the Peace: Economic Interdependence and International Conflict," *International Organization* 55 (2001): 391-438.

Bruce Russett and John R. Oneal, *Triangulating Peace: Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations*. New York, Norton, 2001.

Norman Angell, *The Great Illusion: A Study of the Relation of Military Power in Nations to Their Economic and Social Advantage.* 3rd ed. New York: Putnam, 1911.

Patrick J McDonald. *The Invisible Hand of Peace: Capitalism, the War Machine, and International Relations Theory*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, Jr., *Power and Interdependence*. Glenview, Ill. : Scott, Foresman, 1989[1977]. Pages 3-60.

STRUCTURAL APPROACHES IN GLOBAL POLITICS

March 31 **<u>World Systems Approaches</u>**

Immanuel Wallerstein, "The Rise and Future Demise of the World Capitalist System," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 16: 4 (September 1974): 387-415.

Peter Gourevitch, "The International System and Regime Formation: A Critical Review of Anderson and Wallerstein," *Comparative Politics*, Vol. 10, No. 3 (Apr., 1978), pp. 419-438.

Suggested Reading:

Andre Gunder Frank, "The Development of Underdevelopment," *Monthly Review* 18 (1966).

James A. Caporaso. (editor) "Dependence and Dependency in the Global System," special issue, *International Organization* 32:1 (Winter 1978).

John A. Hobson, *Imperialism: A Study*. Library of Economics and Liberty, 1902. Retrieved October 28, 2010 from the World Wide Web: http://www.econlib.org/library/YPDBooks/Hobson/hbsnImp.html.

Jonathan Kirshner, *Appeasing Bankers: Financial Caution on the Road to War*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2007.

Vladimir Lenin, *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism*. Peking: Foreign Language Press, 1970 [1917].

April 7 **Power Hierarchies on World Politics**

Robert Gilpin, *War and Change in World Politics*. Cambridge ; New York : Cambridge University Press, 1999, chapters 2-5.

http://www.scribd.com/doc/48427694/War-and-Change-in-World-Politics

Jonathan M. DiCicco and Jack S. Levy, "The Power Transition Research Program: A Lakatosian Analysis," chapter 4 in Elman and Elman, *Progress in International Relations Theory*. *Appraising the Field*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2003. On reserve.

Karen Rasler and William Thompson, "Global War and the Political Economy of Structural Change," in Manus Midlarsky, ed., *Handbook of War Studies II.* Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press, 2003. On reserve.

Suggested Reading:

A. F. K Organski. *World Politics*. New York: Knopf, 1968.

A. F. K Organski. and Jacek Kugler, *The War Ledger*. University of Chicago Press, 1980.

Jacek Kugler and Douglas Lemke, *Parity and War: Evaluations and Extensions of The War Ledger*. Ann Arbor : University of Michigan Press, 1996.

Jack S. Levy, "Power Transition Theory and the Rise of China," in Robert S. Ross and Zhu Feng, eds., *China's Ascent: Power, Security,*

*and the Future of international Politic*s. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2008, pp. 11-33.

Karen Rasler and William R. Thompson, *Puzzles of the Democratic Peace: Theory, Geopolitics, and the Transformation of World Politics.* Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Michael Mousseau, "Some Systemic Roots of the Democratic Peace," *International Studies Review*, Vol. 9, No. 1 (Spring 2007), pp. 93-95. Review of Karen Rasler & William Thompson, *Puzzles of the Democratic Peace: Theory, Geopolitics and the Transformation of World Politics* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2005).

April 14 **First draft of literature review due at 10 am.**

April 14 **<u>Economic Norms Theory</u>**

Michael Mousseau, "Market Civilization and its Clash with Terror," *International Security*, Vol. 27, No. 3 (Winter 2002-03), pp. 5-29.

Nicholas Lees, "Structural Inequality, Quasi-rents and the Democratic Peace: A Neo-Ricardian Analysis of International Order", *Millennium - Journal of International Studies* June 2013 41: 491-515.

Michael Mousseau, "The Democratic Peace Unraveled: It's the Economy", *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 57, No. 2 (May 2013), pp. 186-197.

James Lee Ray, "War on Democratic Peace," *International Studies Quarterly* (2013) 57, 198–200.

Allan Dafoe, John R. Oneal, and Bruce Russett, "The Democratic Peace: Weighing the Evidence and Cautious Inference," *International Studies Quarterly* (2013) 57, 201–214. Read only pp. 203-210.

Michael Mousseau, "Lies, Damned Lies, and Democratic Peace", Unpublished manuscript, 2014, University of Central Florida.

Suggested Readings:

Karl Polanyi, *The Great Transformation: The Political And Economic Origins Of Our Time*; foreword by Joseph E. Stiglitz ; introduction by Fred Block. Beacon Press, 2001. $24.00.

Mark Neiman, "Moments in Time: An Analysis of Temporal Patterns in European Conflict Using a Change-point Model" (2013). Unpublished paper, University of Missouri.

Michael Mousseau, "Capitalism and Peace: It's Keynes, not Hayek" (with Omer Orsun, Jameson Ungerer, and Demet Yalcin Mousseau)

in Gerald Schneider and Nils Petter Gleditsch (editors), *Assessing the Capitalist Peace*, Routledge, 2013.

Allan Dafoe and Bruce Russett, "Does Capitalism Account for the Democratic Peace? The Evidence Still Says No," in Gerald Schneider and Nils Petter Gleditsch (editors), *Assessing the Capitalist Peace*, Routledge, 2013.

Michael Mousseau, "Does the Market-Capitalist Peace Supersede the Democratic Peace? The Evidence Still Says Yes" (with Omer Orsun and Jameson Ungerer) in Gerald Schneider and Nils Petter Gleditsch (editors), *Assessing the Capitalist Peace*, Routledge, 2013.

Michael Mousseau, "Capitalist Development and Civil War", *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 56, No. 3 (September 2012), pp. 470-483.

Michael Mousseau, "Urban Poverty and Support for Islamist Terror: Survey Results from Muslims in Fourteen Countries," *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 48, No. 1 (January 2011), pp. 35-47.

Michael Mousseau, "The Contracting Roots of Human Rights," (with Demet Yalçin Mousseau), *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 45. No. 3 (May 2008), pp. 327-344.

Michael Mousseau, "Terrorism and Export Economies: The Dark Side of Free Trade", in *The Making of a Terrorist: Recruitment, Training, and Root Causes*, *Volume III*, edited by James Forest. Praeger Publishers (November 2005).

Michael Mousseau, "Globalization, Markets, and Democracy: An Anthropological Linkage", in *Globalization and Civilizations*, edited by Mehdi Mozaffari. London: Routledge (August 2002), pp. 97-124.

North, Douglass C., John J. Wallis, and Barry R. Weingast. *Violence and Social Orders: A Conceptual Framework for Interpreting Recorded History*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Michael Mousseau, review of Douglass C. North, John Joseph Wallis and Barry R. Weingast, *Violence and Social Orders: A Conceptual Framework for Interpreting Recorded Human History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), *Journal of Peace Research*, , Vol. 48, No. 1 (January 2011).

Stephen Pinker. *The Better Angels of our Nature*. New York: Viking, 2011.

Nils Gilman. *Mandarins of the Future: Modernization Theory in Cold War America*. The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003.

Janet Abu-Lughod. *Before European Hegemony: The World System A.D. 1250-1350*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Emile Durkhein, *The Division of Labor in Society*, Chapter 2.

Joseph Schumpeter, *Imperialism; Social Classes: Two Essays*, translated by Heinz Norden. New York : Meridian Books, 1955.

Jack L. Snyder, "Anarchy and Culture: Insights from the Anthropology of War," *International Organization* 56:1 (Winter 2002).

April 21 **Back-up.**

April 28 **Final draft of literature review due at 10 am.**

Evaluation

50% Attendance and Participation. Assessment includes quality as well as quantity of questions and participation. Quality is indicated by the student's apparent awareness of the required reading material, relevance of questions to the topic at hand, and thoughtfulness of contributions. For each seminar week, an 'A' goes for those who contributed very well to discussion, with a clear understanding that they were well aware of the required readings and thought deeply about them; a 'B' goes for those who contributed moderately to the discussion, indicating at least some awareness of the material and perhaps having thought about it; a 'C' goes to those who are present but did not contribute much beyond asking questions; a 'D' goes to those who are not present. Within one week after each seminar you will find your participation grade either in your mailboxes or at the course web page on Webcourses@UCF. TIP: Arrive at each seminar with notes that outline the main points of each reading and your thoughts about them. Remember that it is best to read the material for each week in the order listed.

50% Literature Review (*1st draft 20%, 2nd draft 30%*). Write a concise review of the literature in any area of international relations theory that interests you (other than my own work on economic norms theory). *You must consult with me before you get started*, so I can advise you on the boundaries of the paper and useful steps to proceed. I offer the option of submitting a first draft by the deadline of *Monday April 14 at 10 am*. This draft will be worth 20% of the course grade. We will then meet individually and I will give my feedback for the final draft, due on *Monday April 28 at 10 am*, which is worth 30% of the course grade. You are expected to go well beyond the literature assigned in class, with your research updated as much as possible to the time of writing. Expected length is 6,000 to 8,000 words; maximum 12,000 words, including everything. Please abide by my following preferences:

- Turn in an electronic copy as well as a hard copy.
- Double-space your pages and use standard margins, 12-point *New Times Roman* or *Palatino Linotype* font.
- Use the citation style of the *American Political Science Review*.
- Number your pages and staple the paper (one staple is better than a plastic cover).
- Align text left.
- Use Microsoft Word's "widow/orphan control" function.

I assess the paper as I would any literature review that may be submitted to a quality journal. A good review establishes the boundaries of the topic and reviews the course of knowledge accumulation in it over time. It shows how studies are related, points of agreement and discord, and whether they built on one another or talked past one another. It considers all works within the field that have contributed to the present state of theory and evidence, without getting bogged down into the details of every last study. It highlights the issues at hand—whether it's about data, measurement, theory, ontology, level of analysis, research design, or what-have-you—in a way that presents a coherent picture of the important issues.

A good literature review also builds a clear idea of what kind of research is needed at the time of writing. You should thus present at least one hypothesis test or plan of research that derives from the review. You are assessed in part on the practicality of the proposed research, so you should devote some space to making this part convincing (eg., if you propose a large-N data analysis, are the data reasonably available?). Your review is also assessed in part on the extent at which your proposed hypothesis test is convincing as an important next step.

<u>Guidelines for a Literature Review</u>:

- A good literature review simplifies complex literature by identifying patterns and labeling them, and then refers to these labels when necessary. For instance, "democratic structuralists" vs. "democratic constructivists." Do NOT treat the conceptualizations of lectures, the syllabus, or anyone else as if they are universally understood concepts, or granted to us from some supreme being. Ideally you will create your own organizing concepts, but I know that some organizing concepts published in the literature may be useful. If you use those already out there, you must clearly identify the originator (otherwise you are plagiarizing).
- A good literature review is broken into sections and, perhaps, sub-sections. At the start of each section identify its purpose: let the reader know what kinds of studies are in the section.

- The paper must go well beyond anything discussed in class (and you should search for articles that may come up to the very month before the first draft is due).

Stupid Things to Avoid in a Literature Review:

- You do not need to identify every study that might fall in a given section, or treat all of them equally. Some studies are more influential than others and require more attention. You need to make judgments on what to discuss and what to leave out. It is the quality of these judgments that lie at the root of a good literature review. One can make these decisions well if they know the literature well.
- This literature review is supposed to be your original work. This means you do not claim the literature has some characteristic simply because someone said so. If you agree with someone's claim you can say so, but you must clearly identify the originator of it (otherwise you are plagiarizing).
- Write as if you are submitting to a journal. This means, among other things, that you do not write, "as we said in class . . ."!
- In most cases it is not appropriate to refer to theories or research programs by using someone's name. Just because we have an article in class that argues X theory does not mean that the author of this particular paper is the originator of X theory.
- Avoid meaningless coverage. For instance, do not write: "George claims X increases probability of Y; Harold counters that X is not sufficient for explaining Y". Duh. What may matter is *why* Harold disagrees. Also, we are after the real state of knowledge here: if the scholarly bickering is irrelevant then do not need to discuss it.
- Do not assert something as true merely because somebody you think is famous says it is true. Of course, you can mention a point of view or a claim, and cite the author who makes the claim. But this is not the same thing as asserting the claim as true.

General Writing Tips:

- Don't use jargon or catch phrases, like "play the democracy card." All words and sentences must be universally understandable; if they are not then you must explain them.
- The introduction is not a place to just fill space and be cute. The purpose of the introduction is to draw interest (why does the topic matter?), identify the purpose of the paper, and outline the paper structure.
- Write in an active prose. For instance, "This paper argues . . ." or "I argue . . " are far better than "In this paper, I will argue. . ."
- Do not write as if talking to me. For instance, do not write: "In my literature review, I mainly focus . . ."
- Avoid rhetorical questions unless you answer them.

- All good papers of more than several pages are divided into appropriate sections clearly marked with headings and, if appropriate, sub-headings.
- Aside from the introduction (where you say what you are going to say), and conclusion (where you say what you said), each section of the body of the paper should have an introductory paragraph, the body paragraphs, and a summary/conclusion paragraph.
- Most—but not all—good paragraphs start with a topic sentence that says what the paragraph will say, and end with a summary sentence that summarizes the main point of the paragraph. Sometimes several paragraphs may be 'linked,' with one topic sentence at the top of the first paragraph, and one summary sentence at the bottom of the last paragraph. Paragraphs over one page in length are often too long, and should be broken into two or more paragraphs.
- Before you turn your paper in you should give it test: read the introduction and then, for each section, read only the introductory and summary/conclusion paragraphs (and maybe the first sentences of each body paragraph). Then read the conclusion section. If your reading does not flow easily and logically—and if you do not instantly remember the main points of your paper— then your paper probably is not written well.
- Once you think you have it right, do something else for few days. After that, at your next reading you may be amazed at how incomprehensible parts of your paper are. A good paper is re-drafted dozens of times, with some gaps in time between some drafts.
- You may save time and produce a better paper by first outlining it, and then outlining each section. Then, stick to this outline.
- You should cite the source every time you use someone else's arguments, research, or quotations (otherwise you are plagiarizing).
- Please reference your sources in the text in parenthetical format: "(last name(s) year: page number(s))". For example, ". . . although some bozos might think so (Mousseau 1996: 8–9)." when referring to particular pages, or ". . . some bozos think otherwise (Mousseau, 1996)." when referring to a whole article or book. **Note how the period at the end of the sentence appears <u>AFTER</u> the ending parenthesis.**
- With parenthetical format, use footnotes only if you have something to say that does not fit well with the flow of your paper.
- A paper is a product of your creation: it should look sharp. Remember that Microsoft Word has spelling and grammar check, and a "widow/orphan control" function.

Miscellaneous

Late Paper Policy

Late papers are acceptable but accrue penalties of 5% reduction for each day late. Exceptions are allowed for exceptional circumstances at instructor's discretion.

Letter/Grade Equivalencies

95% - 100%	A
90% - 92.99%	A-
87% - 89.99%	B+
83% - 86.99%	B
80% - 82.99%	B -
77% - 79.99%	C +
73% - 76.99%	C
70% - 72.99%	C -
65% - 69.99%	D +
60% - 64.99%	D
Below 60%	F

Curve Policy: No curve.

Method of Grade Reporting: Webcourses@UCF.

Campus Resources: You should be aware that help is available if you are struggling with this course! First see me, your instructor: I want you to understand the material and would be most pleased to help if you are having trouble. Other resources include the Student Academic Resource Center (SARC), for supplemental instruction and academic tutoring, and the University Writing Center.

Final exam date: There is no final exam.

Disability Access Statement: The University of Central Florida is committed to providing reasonable accommodations for all persons with disabilities. This syllabus is available in alternate formats upon request. Students who need accommodations must be registered with Student Disability Services, Student Resource Center Room 132, phone 407-823-2371, TTY/TDD only phone 407-823-2116, before requesting accommodations from the professor.

Academic Conduct Statement: UCF is committed to promoting a culture of academic integrity where faculty and students work together to meet our personal, professional, and social responsibilities. A degree from UCF is only valuable to the extent it reflects valid assessments of student learning. Misrepresenting your learning on tests, projects, reports, or papers invalidates your grades and tarnishes the credibility of UCF. While collaboration is encouraged in the learning and studying process, you should assume that all tests, quizzes, etc. require your individual effort unless explicitly directed otherwise. Unauthorized collaboration, whether voluntary or not, is cheating. Unauthorized use of materials during a test, quiz, or other assessment is cheating. Regarding papers and projects, one of the core fluencies that students need to demonstrate is the ability to discern information that is common to the public from the intellectual property of individuals. Use of protected ideas, processes, or language without attribution or proper citation is plagiarism.