

SEST 710
Research Seminar in International Security

Fall 2018

Tuesdays: 5:00 to 7:30 pm

C. Christine Fair, Ph.D.

Room: Car Barn 317

Phone: 202-460-9295
202-687-7898

Office: Mortara Center, Rm. 202

Office hours: Tuesdays, 3:00-4:00 p.m. (or by appointment)

E-mail: ccf33@georgetown.edu
c_christine_fair@yahoo.com

About Me: A Content Warning

I am not a political scientist although I am frequently mistaken for one due to the kinds of work I do and the scholars with whom I collaborate. In fact, I completed my PhD in the Department of South Asian Languages and Civilization—which is formally in the humanities—and an MA from the Harris School of Public Policy, also at the University of Chicago. I suffered about ten years in total over two stints with the RAND Corporation and another four years at the United States Institute of Peace before being fortunate enough to join the faculty at Georgetown. (You can read more at my website: christinefair.net.) I have spent the vast majority of my adulthood studying various issues within the domains of political and military affairs of South Asia, particularly in the countries of Afghanistan, Pakistan, India, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka. My own research is mixed methods in that I draw upon qualitative and quantitative data. As I am fond of saying, if someone like me with a PhD in Punjabi literature can figure out data...*anyone* can. While my strong suit is South Asia, I have a solid grounding in interdisciplinary research, finding and using data, and generally helping students to get the most out of a process that many fear and loath. I also have very well-developed BS-detectors given my RAND experiences.

My teaching approach is straight forward: I want you to write the best paper that you can in the time that you have to do so. I understand that many of you have not done this kind of work before. You should think of me as your sherpa as you make this forced ascent up a hill that most of you would prefer not to climb at all. I believe in being direct in providing verbal and written feedback, as this is most efficient means and time is a premium in this course. You will often want to accuse me of “squashing your genius” because sometimes genius is not your best friend in a course like this. The best proposals are simple and elegant with minimal moving parts. The best papers are similarly elegant: they ask a crisp question and use data and methods that you are comfortable using to answer this question and they exhibit clear, jargon-free, well-structured prose in active voice. Sometimes students want to solve enormously complex puzzles or learn new research methods. These are not the best courses of action for this course. I hope that you will trust me as we move through this process together.

As a warning, I have a ribald sense of humor and some of these readings will reflect that. If you want to see what you are getting into before signing up for my course, you can peruse videos at my Youtube channel: <https://www.youtube.com/user/TheChristinefair>. You can also peruse some of the quotidian nonsense that a woman in this business has to endure by gandering at the comments! (Trigger warning: some of them are not nice at all.)

I have been teaching this course every semester since Fall 2009. This is one of my favorite courses to teach because it affords unparalleled opportunity to work with SSP students closely and help them develop intellectually. I find that this is one of the most rewarding courses to teach. I also believe that we should have fun in this class and I make every effort to make that happen.

About this Course: Background and Goals

The Security Studies Program (SSP) Research Seminar is intended to guide students through the conceptualization, planning, and execution of a major original project on a policy-relevant topic. This course is not intended to train students to become social science scholars. However, the same basic principles underlie all solid research and analysis on which policy is based. Whether it is a scholarly book, a policy brief, or an oral presentation of analysis, strong research provides insightful and balanced perspectives on important policy problems.

The goals of the Research Seminar are:

1. To provide students with additional training in research design, research methods, and effective writing;
2. To guide students through the process of conducting original research and analysis, leading to the production of substantial, professional-quality papers. This course also helps students recognize common research mistakes and biases, while learning more about what constitutes strong research; and
3. To help students develop their abilities to constructively critique and contribute to the work of others.

I have prepared a webpage for resources for this course. It is available here:
<http://guides.library.georgetown.edu/c.php?g=75848>

Email Etiquette

This is not the only course I teach, you are not my only students and teaching is not my only obligation. I receive about 100 emails each day. Please expect that it will take one full business day to respond to you. If you email me between Friday evening and Monday morning, expect that I will get back to you by late Monday or Tuesday morning. Also, please do not address your emails to me using my first name.

Policy on Computers, Phones and Social Media

It is expressly forbidden to film or record these lectures. Students who do so will be asked to leave the class and you will receive no credit for attending the class. I will also report this to SSP

leadership. It is also forbidden to post quotes or photos to other social media attributable to me, this class or your classmates. This is to ensure that we all can have a safe environment to engage the literature and the intellectual objectives of this course. There will be no exceptions.

Plan for Class Continuity During University Closures

The Washington D.C. metropolitan area can experience severe weather. In some cases, the University will close the campus. Given that our classes meet once a week and given your varied schedules, it is nearly impossible to reschedule a cancelled class. **For these reasons, classes will NOT be cancelled when the university is closed.** In some cases, extreme weather may mean that some of us will not have internet access or even electricity. For this reason, I have arranged for a conference call. Details are below:

Conference Dial-in Number: (515) 603-3171

Host Access Code: 288542*

Participant Access Code: 288542#

Please follow this procedure when the university is closed.

Academic honesty

Please be certain that you understand Georgetown's policy and procedures regarding academic honesty. It is available here: <https://honorcouncil.georgetown.edu/system/policies>.

For additional guidance please read "What is plagiarism?"

(<https://honorcouncil.georgetown.edu/whatisplagiarism>) and "Plagiarism checklist"

(<https://honorcouncil.georgetown.edu/https%3A/honorcouncil.georgetown.edu/faculty/plagiarism-checklist>).

Note on physical or learning disabilities. If you have a documented physical or learning disability, I will be glad to make appropriate accommodations. Please contact me so that we can discuss these arrangements.

Religious obligations: If you anticipate any conflicts between this schedule and your religious obligations, please inform me so that we can make alternate arrangements.

University Policy on Equal Opportunity and Non-Discrimination in Education

Georgetown University's Center for Securities Studies (CSS) and the Security Studies Program supports the University's commitment to diversity. The University has a policy on Equal Opportunity and Non-Discrimination in Education. Additionally, the University considers acts of hate and bias unacceptable and antithetical to its commitment to an inclusive and respectful community. Students who have concerns about treatment that they have experienced are encouraged to discuss these concerns with a representative of the Office of Institutional Diversity, Equity & Affirmative Action (IDEAA). Students wishing to pursue a formal complaint of discrimination in a non-academic matter may do so through IDEAA (<http://ideaa.georgetown.edu>). Additionally, students may report concerns of hate and bias at

<http://biasreporting.georgetown.edu/>. A member of the Hate & Bias team will discuss your concerns with you.

Assessing Student Progress on Meeting Learning Objectives

Students will be graded upon several written products noted below. Students will meet in class settings with the instructor and their peers, as well as one on one with the instructor to discuss their progress throughout the semester.

Students will be graded on the objective quality of their work rather than in comparison to the work of other students. In other words, you will get the grade your work merits rather than on a curve. (See **Appendix 8** for a description of grades and the level of performance expected commensurate with each.)

Final course grades:

5 percent: Class participation: attendance and commentary on other projects and presentation of the first draft (5%).

95 percent: Written work, including:

- Research proposal (5%);
- Literature review strategy (5%);
- Literature review (10%);
- Data acquisition plan (5%)
- Research design (20%);
- First draft (20%);
- Final paper (30%).

Policy on Grade Disputes: I make every effort to be fair and I spend much time on your written work with the aim of helping you refine your argument, use of data, and paper structure as needed. Ultimately, grading of products for this course is subjective. If you believe that I was unfair in my assessment, you must request a reconsideration of your grade within **48 hours of receiving your grade**.

Be aware that while I may have mistakenly assessed your paper downward by overlooking some critical virtue(s), I may also have missed serious flaws upon first review and unfairly assessed it upward. My re-grade of your paper will reflect the results of this review. Thus your grade may go up, down or remain the same. Make your case wisely.

Policy on Lateness: These deadlines are very firm. For each day that a deliverable is late (without a qualifying excuse), you will lose **one full letter grade** for the assignment. For example, if your paper was an A-quality paper, you will receive a B. If delays arise due to illness, family emergency, or other excused absence, please discuss this with me as soon as possible to avoid penalty.

Policy on Missed Classes: This class does not meet every week. I have structured this course to allow you to use as much of your time actually conducting the necessary research for specific assignments, including the actual draft of your research papers. During weeks when we do not have class, I expect students to meet with me individually. As the semester progresses, our one-on-one interactions will intensify. However, when we do meet regularly it is because the course material and subsequent discussions and/or class interactions are crucial for successful completion of your research paper. ***For this reason, you cannot miss more than one scheduled class and pass this class. Plan accordingly.***

Course Requirements

Procedures for Submitting Assignments

- All students must ensure that their name and e-mail appears on all materials submitted for review.
- ALL documents must be submitted in Word — not PDF — as I extensively use the “Track Changes” function for feedback. Also, students should ensure that pages are numbered.
- Please follow the template for products provided in the syllabus main body or in the appropriate appendix.
- In writing, do not use the passive voice **EVER**. Instead of saying “It has been claimed that...”; say “Scholars such as X, Y and Z have claimed....” Why do I insist upon this? First, the passive voice obfuscates and allows you to be lazy. The active voice requires you to identify sources. Second, in general the active voice is more succinct. I also encourage you to use the first-person pronoun (i.e. “I” instead of “this author”) also for reasons of brevity and clarity.
- Intermediate products, which are to be discussed in class, are to be distributed to the entire class for constructive commentary. Please use Canvas to do so.

Class Participation and Commentary: Students are expected to participate actively in class discussions. Student must provide constructive — yet courteous — commentary on other students’ projects. This is an important goal of this seminar. Students are expected to provide commentary on the project statements, project proposals, and first drafts of other students.

Description of Written Products

1. **Proposal Statement:** Before the start of the first class, students must send to me a BRIEF proposal statement. Please consult **Appendix 1** (Topic Selection) before considering your proposed work and concomitant proposal.

***Very Important:** If you plan on conducting interviews for research in this course, you **MUST** receive IRB clearance before the start of the semester. (See Appendix 10). This is not negotiable. Without this clearance before this course starts, you may not conduct interviews for this research project.*

2. **Literature Review Strategy:** Students will execute a brief discussion of the strategy they will use to identify the most relevant published literature for their paper.

3. **Literature Review:** Students will next draft a literature review. The purpose of the literature review is to ensure that their topic has not been covered extensively before, that their query is informed, and that they have the necessary information to answer their question. The literature review should cover the most significant secondary works that inform the proposed research proposal. Peruse **Appendix 3** before commencing this exercise. Follow the template in Appendix 3 closely.
4. **Data Acquisition Plan:** Students will next submit a one-two page writeup in which they identify the sources of data that they will use in their research. This is a vital step. Some students develop superb questions but are unable to identify data that will allow them to answer their research question. What are “data”? First, the noun “data” is a plural noun. Therefore, you should always say “data are.” Second, “data” simply means “useful, reliable, verified information.” You may derive data from, *inter alia*, primary sources, secondary sources, or datasets. You want to be sure that you have data sources before moving onto your research design.
5. **Research Design:** Students will next submit an exposition of the proposed research design. Refer to the George reading (Case Studies and Theory Development, pp. 54-56) to refresh your memory about the various tasks that research designs involve. Please follow closely the Research Design Template in Appendix 5.

Students will present their research design to the class and all students are expected to participate in constructive critique of the proposal. Please consult Appendices 6 and 7 for advice on presenting your work and critiquing that of others.

6. **First Drafts:** Students will write the first drafts of their research papers and present these drafts to the seminar in the second half of the semester. Students will circulate their drafts four days before the day on which they are presenting, to ensure that all seminar participants can offer a constructive critique of the paper. Students are expected to give a formal presentation of their first draft to the class. See Appendix 5 for a generic organizational template for the first draft. Please peruse the guidelines for presentations and criticism in appendices 6 and 7.
7. **Final Drafts:** Students will submit the final drafts of their seminar paper to me on time. Final drafts should reflect the suggestions and commentary on the first draft. Final papers should evidence scholarly and analytical rigor, cast light upon important policy issues, and discuss implications that derive from the research and conclusions. These papers should make original contributions to the subject under study.

Final papers not exceed 10,000 words inclusive of notes and bibliography. Depending upon the subject, data used, and methodology employed, individual paper lengths may be less than this. Consult with me if you expect serious divergence from these guidelines. Note that this limit is set by the program and must be strictly followed.

Course Outline

Note that I should have all proposals before 5 p.m., August 31. Send them to the entire class using the Canvas email function.

Class 1 (Tues. Sept. 4): Approaches to Research: Getting Started.

Note that for this class ONLY, we will meet in the Dubin Classroom (156 Lauinger) for an introduction by Bill Olsen to library resources.

Main Topics

- Research Proposal: “Question feedback loop.”
- Databases: Literature review strategy
- Literature Review
- Research Designs
- Quickly and clearly introducing the debate and your argument to capture and sustain reader interest.
- Evidence/data and bias (to be revisited throughout the course)
- Methods (to be revisited throughout the course)

Follow the template in Appendix 2. Be sure your project comports with the criteria in Appendix 1.

*Be prepared to discuss your proposed research plan with the class on this **FIRST** day of class. This is considered an important part of your class participation grade.*

Required Readings: You will need to review these prior to writing your proposal.

Eugene Kiely and Lori Robertson, “How to Spot Fake News,” Factcheck.org, November 18, 2016. <http://www.factcheck.org/2016/11/how-to-spot-fake-news/>.

Institute of International Studies, Dissertation Proposal Workshop: read sections on Process and Parameters, Nuts & Bolts, and Style: <http://iis.berkeley.edu/content/process-parameters>.

Social Science Research Council, “On the Art of Writing Proposals,” <http://www.ssrc.org/publications/view/7A9CB4F4-815F-DE11-BD80-001CC477EC70/>,

Teresa Pelton Johnson, “Writing for International Security: A Contributor’s Guide,” *International Security*, Vol. 16, No. 2 (Fall 1991), pp. 171-180.

Steven D. Levitt and Stephen J. Dubner, *Freakonomics*, “Introduction: The Hidden Side of Everything,” pp. 1-14.

Gordon Pennycook et al. “On the reception and detection of pseudo-profound bullshit,” *Judgment and Decision Making*, Vol. 10, No. 6, November 2015, pp. 549–563. Available at <http://journal.sjdm.org/15/15923a/jdm15923a.pdf>. [Content Warning: This paper uses profanity]

and suggests that Deepak Chopra's musings comprise "pseudo-profound bullshit." Kindly brace yourselves appropriately.]

Peruse this interactive on-line model on critical thinking:
<http://www.criticalthinking.org/ctmodel/logic-model1.htm>

Class 2 (Tues. Sept. 11): Approaches to Research: Designing a Research Paper

Main Topics

- What are literature reviews, how do you do them, and why are they important?
- When are data adequate?
- Case studies and process tracing
- How do you test a theory using data or cases?
- Understanding data from interviews. How to verify interview data.

Required Readings

John Gerring, "What Is a Case Study and What Is It Good for?" *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 98, No. 2 (2004), pp. 341–354.

Alexander George, "Case Studies and Theory Development: The Method of Structured, Focused Comparison," in Paul G. Lauren (ed.), *Diplomacy: New Approaches in History, Theory and Policy* (1979), pp. 43-68.

Andrew Bennett and Colin Elman, "Qualitative Research: Recent Developments in Case Study Methods," *Annual Review of Political Science*, 2006, no. 9, pp. 455-476.

Stephen Van Evera, "What are Case Studies: How should they be performed?" in *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997), pp. 49-89.

Skim the below readings on surveys and interviews:

Beth L. Leech, "Asking Questions: Techniques for Semi-Structured Interviews," *PS: Political Science and Politics* 35:4 (December 2002), pp. 665-668.

Joel D. Aberbach and Bert A. Rockman, "Conducting and Coding Elite Interviews," *PS: Political Science and Politics* 35:4 (December 2002), pp. 673-676.

Brian J. Gaines, James H. Kuklinski, and Paul J. Quirk, "The Logic of the Survey Experiment Reexamined," *Political Analysis*, Vol. 15, No. 1 (2007), pp. 1–20.

Revisions to Assignment 1: Revised Research Proposals are due by 5 p.m. on Sept. 14

Assignment 2: Literature Review Strategy Papers due by 12 pm Sept. 17. Send them to the entire class using the Canvas email function.

Class 3 (Tues. Sept. 18): Review of Literature Review Strategies

Your literature review strategy paper should be approximately two pages in length (double space, 12-pt font, one-inch margins) and should include the following elements:

- Name of librarian consulted and how you communicated (live chat, in person, email, phone)
- Identification of key databases to be employed and an explanation of why these are germane.
- What other databases did you consider? Why did you reject them?
- Key word strategy
- List of 10 references useful to your study that you found through this process.

Be prepared to discuss your strategies in class.

Assignment 3: Data Acquisition Plan due by 12 pm Sept. 25.

Class 4 (Tues. Sept. 25): Qualitative Research: Complexities of Case Studies

Required Readings

George, Alexander L. and Andrew Bennett, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences* (Cambridge: MA, MIT Press, 2004) Chs. 1, 3, 10-12, pp. 205-285; Appendix, pp. 287-325. Skim examples of research designs.

Gochal, Joseph R. and Jack S. Levy, "Crisis Mismanagement or Conflict of Interests? A Case Study of the Origins of the Crimean War," in Zeev Maoz, Alex Mintz, T. Clifton Morgan, Glenn Palmer, and Richard Stoll, eds., *Multiple Paths to Knowledge in International Relations: Methodology in the Study of Conflict Management and Conflict Resolution* (Lexington Books, 2004), pp. 309-42

Geddes, Barbara, "How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics", *Political Analysis* (Vol. 2) pp. 131-150.

Ian S. Lustick, "History, Historiography, and Political Science: Multiple Historical Records and the Problem of Selection Bias," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 90, No. 3 (September 1996), pp. 605-618.

John W. Creswell, *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* 3rd Edition (Sage Books, 2009), Ch. 1 (pp. 3-20) & Ch. 9 (pp. 173-202).

In class we will review the document "Van Evera Variable Types." Please print out a copy and bring it with you to class. Do NOT review this document before class. Trust me.

Class 5 (Tues. Oct. 2): Issues of Quantitative Analysis

While most of you are NOT employing quantitative analyses for your paper, you should be able to be good consumers of quantitative data both in your professional lives and in the execution of this paper. (In some cases, I include critiques of the papers in question. READ the critiques AFTERWARDS. How much of the critique did you pick up?) In reading these papers focus upon the following questions:

- How to ask the right question and find the right data to answer it
- How are the data in the studies collected?
- How reliable are the data?
- What kinds of biases inhere in the data?
- Are the data suitable for the question?
- Is the question even valid?
- What biases undergird the question in the first place?
- Would you trust the results of the analysis: why or why not?

Remember: I selected these articles because they are sub-optimal in one or more ways with respect to the above questions.

Required Readings

Cresswell, John W., *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*, Ch. 8, pp. 145-170.

Pape, Robert A., "The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 97, No. 3 (2003), pp. 1-19.

CRITIQUE: Assaf Moghadam, "Suicide Terrorism, Occupation, and the Globalization of Martyrdom: A Critique of Dying to Win," *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism* Vol. 29, No. 8 (2006), pp. 710-711.

CRITIQUE: Ashworth, Scott, Joshua D. Clinton, Adam Meirowitz and Kristopher W. Ramsay "Design, Inference, and the Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism," *American Political Science Review* (Vol. 102, No. 2, May 2008), pp 269-273

International Human Rights and Conflict Resolution Clinic (Stanford Law School) and Global Justice Clinic (NYU School of Law), "Living Under Drones: Death, Injury, and Trauma to Civilians from US Drone Practices in Pakistan." September 2012.

Vijayendra Rao et al., "Sex Workers and the Cost of Safe Sex: The Compensating Differential for Condom Use in Calcutta," *Journal of Development Economics*, Vol. 71 (2003), pp. 585– 603.

Peter Furia and Russell E. Lucas, "Arab Muslim Attitudes Toward the West: Cultural, Social, and Political Explanations," *International Interactions*, Vol. 34, No. 2 (2008), pp. 186-207.

Mark Tessler and Michael D.H. Robbins, "What Leads Some Ordinary Arab Men and Women to Approve of Terrorist Acts Against the United States?" *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 51, No. 3 (2007): pp. 305-328.

Class 6. (Tues Oct. 9) No formal class. Work on literature reviews. Contact me for individual appointments.

Review examples of literature reviews on the Canvas website. There will be no excuses for failing to understand what is required. If you have *any questions*, call, text, or email me to discuss your concerns.

Assignment 3: Literature Reviews are due by 12 pm, Oct. 12. Send them to the entire class using the Canvas email function.

REVIEW the examples of literature reviews placed on Canvas. Note that these literature reviews may not be the best model for YOUR literature review. Consult Appendix 3 for a detailed template.

Class 7 (Tues. Oct. 16): Research Designs.

Stephen Van Evera, Ch. 1 “Hypotheses, Laws, and Theories: A User’s Guide.”
in *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997): 7-43.

John Gerring, Part III “Research Designs” in *Social Science Methodology: A Critical Framework* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001): pp. 155-199.

Alexander George, “Case Studies and Theory Development: The Method of Structured, Focused Comparison,” in Paul G. Lauren (ed.), *Diplomacy: New Approaches in History, Theory and Policy* (New York: Free Press, 1979), pp. 43-68.

Assignment 4: Research Designs due at 8 am on Oct. 19. You should send them to the entire class using the Canvas email function.

All students are expected to contribute to constructive discussion of research designs.

Class 8 (Tues. Oct. 23): Review of Research Designs: Batch 1
Everyone is expected to provide constructive criticism.

Class 9 (Tues. Oct. 30): Review of Research Designs, Cont.: Batch 2
Everyone is expected to provide constructive criticism

Class 10 (Tues. Nov. 6): Approaches to Final Products.

Review the below completed research papers as well as the others in the folder containing Past Portfolios. Make appointment with me to discuss progress, or issues.

This is a DRAFT and is subject to change.

Example of a good final paper I, “Provincial Reconstruction Teams: A Solution for Resolving Africa’s Deadliest Conflicts?” pp. 1-45

Example of a good final paper II, “Women’s Inclusion in DDR Processes in Africa: Does Inclusion Matter?” pp. 1-48.

Class 11 (Tues. Nov. 13): No formal class. Work on First Drafts
Make appointment with me to discuss progress, or issues.

Assignment 5: First drafts of research papers are due 12 p.m., Nov. 16.
E-mail to entire class and to me via Canvas.

Class 12 (Tues. Nov. 20): Discuss First Draft – Batch 1
Everyone is expected to provide constructive criticism.

Class 13 (Tues. Nov. 27): Discuss First Draft – Batch 2
Everyone is expected to provide constructive criticism.

Class 14 (Tues. Dec. 4): No formal class. Work on Final Draft.
Make appointment to discuss problems that are outstanding.

Assignment 6: Final drafts of research papers are due at 9 p.m., Dec. 13.

Appendix 1: Topic Selection

How does one make an “original contribution” to our understanding of important issues? Here are some of the possibilities:

- Examine an old security problem that has received insufficient attention from scholars, analysts, and/or policymakers.
- Examine important aspects of a problem that have been overlooked by scholars, analysts, and/or policymakers.
- Examine a new security problem that has not yet been examined in a serious, systematic manner.
- Challenge a conventional wisdom that is wrong or simplistic.
- Stake out a new position in a policy debate, or resolve a policy debate.
- Sharpen thinking in an area where analysis is fuzzy and consequently misguided.
- Examine the origins of an issue that have perhaps been overlooked due to a focus on more recent developments.

In substantive terms, students have a vast number of options for their projects. Here are some possibilities:

- One can analyze the evolution of a security problem over time (e.g., proliferation; transnational terrorism).
- One can analyze the regional and international ramifications of a security problem (e.g, the impact of civil unrest and/or civil war on regional stability).
- One can analyze the track record and changing role of a key actor (e.g., a key state; a regional organization; an international organization; or a non-governmental organization).
- One can analyze the use and misuse of a policy instrument (e.g., economic sanctions; use of military force).
- One can analyze the strengths and weaknesses of policymaking processes and current policy responses (at the state, regional, and/or international levels).

Appendix 2: Proposal

Proposals should include the following items:

1. Title of the project
2. Overview of the project with concise statements about:
 - a. The focus of the project. In other words, what is your research question?;
 - b. Why this question is important or the “so what?” question;
 - c. Your working hypotheses and expected policy implications.
 - d. A roadmap paragraph to the rest of the document. This is VERY important
3. Brief Literature review which should include:
 - a. Brief review of the theoretical literature in which your topic/puzzle is situated
 - b. Identification of an anchor text if appropriate
 - c. Conclude with a clear statement of what contribution to this literature YOUR work will make
4. Overview of the research plan. This should include the following elements:
 - a. A concise statement of how you will study the topic (methodological approach, including independent variables and dependent variables) and how you will answer your question;
 - b. A brief discussion of the primary and secondary sources you plan to draw on;
 - c. A concise statement about how your project will involve original research and make a contribution to our understanding of the issue under investigation.
5. Conclude with a brief discussion of the implications of this work.

Appendix 3: Literature Review

A. Purpose:

The review should cover at least four or five texts. The goal of the literature review is to explore the major texts of a sub-field that you might be interested in contributing to in your major research project. The chosen texts should be the primary, most controversial or most current representatives of that field. Thus, the most effective way of choosing the texts for the literature review is to first explore the sub-field of your choice by reading as broadly as possible. Once you've read a representative number of readings (no less than 10), you should choose 4-5 texts that strike you as the most suitable.

B. Finding the right texts:

One key to finding the right texts to review is to find a single favorite text. This text would not only address an issue that you are potentially interested in exploring further but it would also do so in a manner that you find theoretically compelling. This text will function as the "anchor text" for exploring the rest of the literature.

One method for finding this anchor text – especially when focusing on policy-relevant issues -- is to use keyword searches using a search engine such as Google Scholar. Note how the citations link will lead you to other sources. You will need to be discriminating when choosing your sources from these lists but they can provide a useful roadmap for understanding the state of the field.

The next logical step is to move backwards and forwards in time to see (1) who this anchor text was influenced by and (2) who was influenced by this anchor text. The first is easy: look in the footnotes and the bibliography of your anchor text. Obviously, doing so will only uncover texts written before your anchor text was published (indeed, given the time lag required for publication, these texts were probably written long before your anchor text.) Repeat this step as necessary to see who the older texts cite as their sources, read those in turn, etc.

Therefore, to find younger texts that were influenced by the anchor text, you should employ a "forward citation" search. Use the Social Science Citation Index (accessed through ISI web of knowledge), locate the anchor text and see who cited your anchor text in subsequent articles. This step, too, is iterative: if you find interesting pieces that cite your anchor text, see when and where they, in turn, were cited.

Finally, repeat the last two steps for all the new articles you've found. By tracing the origins of texts you've found through a forward citation search or, conversely, by conducting a forward citation search on the old texts that inspired your anchor text, you will be conducting a thorough sweep of the literature. You should now possess texts that inspired your anchor text, were contemporaneous to your anchor text or that were inspired by your anchor text. You will know that you've accomplished a thorough search of the literature on your topic when new texts you encounter repeatedly reference in their footnotes texts that you are already familiar with.

Of the large pile of texts you've amassed, be sure to choose texts that you find compelling. You

should also select texts that bear an interesting relation to one another, either because they reference one another explicitly or because they complement one another in ways that may be obvious to you but not to others.

List the texts you are reviewing at the outset of the review. In the review, you should feel free to refer to other readings you did on the subject (to show off your proficiency in the area reviewed) but you should underline the key texts when you first introduce them in the review.

C. Structure:

Like all good papers, the literature review should have a structure that is both clear and explicit: Tell the reader what you are doing, in what order, and why. Summarize your argument where appropriate.

A strong literature review is composed of three sections:

- A) An introduction that sets the stage for the field you are reviewing. Why is this topic important? Who/what are the authors responding to? What was the state of the art before their writing?
- B) An analysis of each of the texts that stresses strengths and weaknesses. You need not provide a summary of the arguments of the text, beyond one or two sentences. A good review will tie the texts together to show how they complement, overlap, or contradict one another.
- C) A summary of the state of the art given the contribution of the authors. What is left to be done? How should one go about doing that?

This is arguably the most important component of the literature review, because it sets the stage for your own contribution to the field in the form of your major research project. You, after all, will be the one to fill in the gaps left by these authors. Suggest one or two ways in which one might go about filling these gaps. The point of this part of the process is to position your own argument within the context of the literature. Try to be as detailed as possible: what cases would you pick? What method would you use? Do you have a plan for filling in the gap that has not occurred to others? Have you found a new literature, case, evidence or method that nobody else encountered?

Appendix 4: Template for Research Designs

Research designs should be about 20 pages in length, and should include the following:

A Cover Page with your name and title of your paper as well as the data.

The title should be something that piques your reader's curiosity, posing a question or making a statement up front that will memorably encapsulate the argument you are making in your paper. However the title should accurately reflect what you do rather than mislead or overstate the contributions of your effort.

Outline (1-2 pages)

The outline is the paper's preliminary "Table of Contents." The outline should identify the paper's main sections and sub-sections, and it should estimate how long (i.e., how many pages) each section will be.

An Introductory Background Narrative (4-5 pages)

The narrative should discuss the following:

- The focus of the project.
- The main question the project seeks to answer. (Description of the main empirical questions, identification of the dependent variables and other study variables, specification of your cases.)
- The reason(s) why this question is important
- The ways in which this project will involve original research, and the ways it will make original, important contributions to our understanding of the issues under investigation
- Your working hypothesis or hypotheses, as well as possible alternative explanations
- Any information that is necessary to understand the background to the study
- ALWAYS CONCLUDE WITH A ROADMAP PARAGRAPH FOR THE REST OF THE DOCUMENT.

Literature Review (4-6 pages)

This section will identify the main themes in the existing literature. This includes laying out the standard wisdom or range of opinions and views about your subject, noting important gaps, and describing and analyzing the various disagreements between other analysts looking at this problem. Please note that it is not enough to simply list the sources – you should briefly describe each and its relevance to your work, making clear to your reader your own view of the positions that other scholars/analysts have taken to the question under consideration. It should state your contribution to this literature clearly. *A good literature review may also conclude with a statement of testable hypotheses that derive from the literature reviewed.*

Analytical Methods and Data (4-5 pages)

This section should describe the analytical methods you will use. If you are using an anchor text, explain HOW you will use it. What elements will you test and how? What data will you use? How will you obtain data? You should detail any data coding or other aspects of data handling germane to your project. For example, how will you instrumentalize variables derived from your anchor text? How will you code variables?

The Project's Implications and Lessons (2 pages)

This section should briefly answer for the reader:

- What does your research suggest about the current direction of policy?
- What information should policymakers be aware of or prioritize based on your research?
- What recommendations, if any, would you offer to change policy?

Bibliography (2-3 pages)

List the major sources you will draw on for your research.

Appendix 5: Generic Template for Research Papers

- I. Cover page with name, date, email and title of paper.
- II. TOC
- III. Introduction
 - a. State clearly your question
 - b. Why its important
 - c. How you are going to answer (data and methods)
 - d. Preview your findings
 - e. END with a roadmap paragraph
- IV. Literature Review
 - a. This should review the relevant literature
 - b. Identify an anchor text if needed/appropriate
 - c. Identify YOUR contribution to the literature
 - d. End with testable hypotheses
- V. Research Methods and Data
 - a. This section to detail all aspects of the methods (i.e. CONDUCT) of your research.
 - b. It should also identify the data you will use. This discussion should reflect the weaknesses of your data. Do these data limit the generalizability of your research.
- VI. Analysis of the Cases
 - a. This is where you will conduct the analyses of your case(s)
- VII. Conclusions and implications
 - a. This should not be a list of your greatest ideas!
 - b. Conclusions and implications should not stretch the credibility of your data. In other words, this should stem from the research you did.
- VIII. Bibliography

Appendix 6: How to critique another student's paper/research design

A good critique is like good writing: there are general guidelines, but the final product is more art than science. When doing a critique, consider the following:

- Is the topic itself important?
- When the topic is reduced to a question, does the question's answer matter? To whom? Are there ways to change the question slightly to make it more relevant to more people?
- Is the research puzzle and argument presented clearly?
- Is the research design appropriate? How would you try to answer the same question? Does the question have more than one plausible answer? If not, it is probably not a very interesting question. Does answering the question require the researcher to predict the future? If so, the question needs to be reformulated.
- Are the hypotheses truly hypotheses? Are all of the important alternative hypotheses properly considered? Are all of the predicted observations from each hypothesis presented?
- What data sources are being used? Can you suggest additional data sources?
- Has the person identified a theoretical framework and gaps in the literature?
- If the person is using case studies, is he or she drawing out the proper and most relevant information? Are the case studies being
- Is implementing the research design feasible? Is there enough data, and/or can the data be collected? In other words, would the researcher be able to collect the information needed for this project?
- Are there sections that can be omitted with little or no loss?
- Is the paper written clearly? Is it polished? Does it present the findings in a clear and compelling manner?

For all of the above, it is best if you can provide suggestions and alternatives. Pointing out problems is important, but it is only the first step toward improving someone's paper.

Appendix 7: Presenting Your Own Work

After you have completed your research design and a first draft, a formal presentation of your work is in order. You may feel free to use PowerPoint or any other program that would help you organize your thoughts, but be sure to avoid leaning on PowerPoint as a crutch. Do not feel that you have to use props or visual assists to supplement your presentation if you believe it would be strongest as a stand-alone talk. Your presentation, however conceived, will be judged by the standard of whether or not it strengthens and enhances your ability to communicate your findings to your audience.

A few pointers:

- Remember, a talk is for the listener, not for you. It is not enough that you know what you mean: the listener must understand it.
- Remember the goal of the presentation will vary. For the research design, the goal is to convince the listeners that you have the best possible research plan; for the first draft, the goal is to convince people of your analytic findings.
- Time yourself repeatedly, remembering that presenting to a live audience almost invariably takes a bit longer than you expect it to.
- Focus on the organization of your presentation
- If you use slides, be sure that you don't overcrowd your slides. The slide should not contain all the information you plan to present. Rather, they should help guide a reader through your main points and offer relevant lists (e.g. archives to be consulted). Most important, slides should present pictures, graphics, or other visual displays of information.
- Again, if you use slides such as PowerPoint, make sure that you do not read your slides verbatim. Most people read faster than you speak, so you risk repeating what they have just read.

Appendix 8: Sample Explanation of Grading Criteria

Grade	GPA	100 pt.	Description
A	4.0	93-100	Brilliant and <u>original</u> work; nearly publishable. Commendably clear and thoroughly analytical; comprehensively supported by, and systematically substantiated with, voluminous empirical evidence.
A-	3.67	90-92	Excellent work; powerful analysis with distinctive, well-structured argument; critical and full awareness of the literature alongside masterful use of empirical evidence to support and substantiate the arguments presented.
B+	3.33	87-89	Very good; fine analysis with a coherent argument, most of the most important points are developed in a structured discussion; well-substantiated with clear and firm command of supporting empirical evidence.
B	3.0	83-86	Good; sound analytical skill shown from identification and understanding of the core intellectual problem accompanied by a clear discussion of the subject substantiated with some (albeit, perhaps insufficient) empirical evidence.
B-	2.67	80-82	Satisfactory; basic analytical skills apparent from identification of the intellectual problem and an insufficiently developed discussion of it. Poorly structured with inadequate empirical evidence provided.
C+	2.33	77-79	Average; little analysis and an insufficiently developed argument. <i>Some</i> , albeit cursory knowledge of the main intellectual problem; <i>some</i> key empirical points may have been identified and touched on, basic, but are anemically developed. No detailed familiarity with the literature evident.
C	2.0	73-76	Below average; weak analysis and an incoherent argument, bare evidence of ability to identify intellectual problem, little use of empirical evidence and minimal knowledge of literature.
F	0.0	0-72	Totally unsatisfactory, absence of argument, analysis; and Little if any reference to, much less knowledge of, the literature.

Appendix 9: Citation Methods Guidance:

(Taken from the guidance provided by *International Security*,
http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/project/58/quarterly_journal.html?page_id=180&parent_id=46)

See *The Chicago Manual of Style* (<http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/home.html>) for less common citation forms.

- For citations after the first full citation, do not use op. cit.; instead, use the author's name and a short form of the title, in the following format:

1. Albertini, *War of 1914*, pp. 180, 183.
2. Kaplan, "LeMay."
3. Posen, "Measuring the Conventional Balance," p. 70 n. 30.
4. Ibid., p. 72 [only where the immediately preceding note contains only the relevant reference].

- State or country name should follow the place of publication if ambiguous (Cambridge, : Ballinger) or not widely known (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., but New York: Knopf).
- Use standard abbreviation (Calif., Washington, D.C.), rather than USPS style (CA, MA).
- Anglicize foreign place names, but retain the standard English version of publisher's name (Moscow: Gospoltizdat, 1949).
- Avoid extracts, tables, and paragraphing in notes.

Notes Format

These examples demonstrate the basic note format; when in doubt, check *The Chicago Manual of Style* and provide all bibliographic information in a format that most closely resembles the following. Present notes as double-spaced endnotes.

Periodicals and Dailies

- Observe order and punctuation of elements.
- Include full author name and title.
- Give volume number, issue number and date, per publication's numbering and dating system.
- Note omission of usual comma after article title ending in question mark or exclamation point.

Barry R. Posen, "Measuring the European Conventional Balance: Coping with Complexity in Threat Assessment," *International Security*, Vol. 10, No. 3 (Winter 1984/85), p. 74.

Selig S. Harrison, "A Breakthrough in Afghanistan?" *Foreign Policy*, No. 51 (Summer 1983), p. 23.

Gerard C. Smith, "Time is Running Out," *Newsweek*, January 31, 1983, p. 8.

- For popular periodicals and dailies carrying no volume or issue numbers, note that parentheses are not needed around the date.
- Authors and page numbers should be included where available.
- Punctuation of titles should be copied exactly rather than conformed to *IS* style.

Books, Manuscripts:

Books:

- Note order of items.
- Note placement of punctuation.
- Use the author's full name.
- Provide full page number, that is, pp. 163-167, not "163-7":

John J. Mearsheimer, *Conventional Deterrence* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1983), pp. 163-164.

Article or chapter in edited volume; note use of book's full title and subtitle:

Edward N. Luttwak, "The Operational Level of War," in Steven E. Miller, ed., *Conventional Forces and American Defense Policy: An International Security Reader* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1986), pp. 211-229.

Volume in a series; use chapter where appropriate:

Stephen E. Ambrose, *Eisenhower*, Vol. II: *The President* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1985), Ch.7.

Annual; note the introduction and use of acronym:

International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS), *The Military Balance, 1987-88* (London: IISS, 1987).

Translated and edited version; multivolume work:

Luigi Albertini, *The Origins of the War of 1914*, 3 vols., trans. and ed., Isabella M. Massey (London: Oxford University Press, 1952), p. 171.

Reprint/Revised/Enlarged edition: note "Dell" stands alone without "Books," but full name of a university press is given:

Bernard Brodie and Fawn M. Brodie, *From Crossbow to H-Bomb* (New York: Dell, 1962; rev. and enl. Ed., Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1973).

Paper in a series: Note the use of IISS acronym which has been introduced in an earlier note; "Summer 1983" per publisher's dating system:

Desmond Ball, *Targeting for Strategic Deterrence*, Adelphi Paper No. 185 (London: IISS, Summer 1983), p. 1.

Unpublished paper or dissertation:

Alexander L. George, “Case Studies and Theory Development,” paper presented at the Second Annual Symposium on Information Processing in Organizations, Carnegie-Mellon University, October 15-16, 1982, p. 2.

Stephen W. Van Evera, “Causes of War” (Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1984), p. 1.

Government report; subsequent citations may use U.S. GPO abbreviation:

Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger, *Annual Report to the Congress*, Fiscal Year 1984 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office [U.S. GPO], p. 127.

Congressional reports; for testimony, list individual first:

Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, *The Mutual Security Act of 1956*, 84th Cong., 2nd sess., 1956, S. Rept. 2273, p. 20.

Archival Material

Give the title of the cited item first and supply all the bibliographical dates necessary to permit identification and location of the source.

- Use consistent format throughout.
- Where there are repeated references to particular archives, introduce a short form for similar references in subsequent notes.

Leven C. Allen to Joint Chiefs of Staff, May 26, 1950, and memorandum for the Secretary of Defense, n.d., CCS 383.21 Korea (3-19-45), sec. 21, Records of the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff, Record Group 218, National Archives.

Appendix 10: Institutional Review Board (IRB)

SSP IRB POC Kristen Katopol: krk63@georgetown.edu

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) is responsible for the review and approval of all research involving human subjects, as well as scientific validity and ethical review. You are strongly encouraged, especially if you are teaching the Research Seminar (SEST 710), to go to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) Web Site and go through IRB 101 at this link: <https://ora.georgetown.edu/irb/101>

Although most people assume IRB review focuses on medical testing of human subjects, it actually includes any kind of ***research involving human subjects in which the collection of information and data may put them at risk***. It is designed to ensure the ***ethical*** collection of data and protection of that data. Although the vast majority of security studies research done by students in SEST 710 ***does not*** require IRB approval, as a rule of thumb, any kind of data collection, use of surveys, and the collection of demographic information ***may*** require IRB approval.

Importantly, IRB approval cannot be granted retroactively; it must be obtained prior to the initiation of any aspect of the data collection, including recruitment and selection of human subjects.

It is the student's responsibility to seek IRB approval if their methodology involves data collection from human subjects. There are three "levels" of IRB review - Exempt, Expedited and Full Board, and the final determination of the level rests with the IRB. The IRB process can be very long, from two weeks from the point at which the Department has approved the study for an exempt review to two or three months for a full board review depending on when it is submitted (please see the deadlines for submission: <https://ora.georgetown.edu/GHUCCTSirbmeetings>).

If you have any questions please contact the Social and Behavioral Sciences Committee of the IRB at [202-687-6553](tel:202-687-6553)/1560; irboard@georgetown.edu for assistance.

This is a DRAFT and is subject to change.

After reading this syllabus, you should be in no doubt about class policies and assignments. If you have any remaining questions, I strongly encourage you to contact me as soon as possible. Please sign the below statement and return this page on our second day of class.

I have carefully read the syllabus for SEST 710 – 06 Research Seminar in International Security and understand its contents.

Printed Name

Signature

Date