

POLS 3201 Crisis and Cooperation in International Relations, Spring 2018
Theoretical Analysis Assignment

Write a critical analysis in which you assess the relative usefulness of two theoretical paradigms for understanding your case. Pick two theoretical approaches (i.e. realism, liberalism, Marxism, constructivism, and postcolonialism), evaluate how each would explain or understand your case, and make an argument for which approach offers a better account. You are welcome to make a more synthetic argument or use your case to critique the approaches if you prefer. What matters is that you demonstrate a strong understanding of two approaches and craft an argument that relates those approaches to one another by applying them to your case. You should draw on your initial case study as needed for evidence, but this is not a revision or resubmission of that work.

Rough Draft Due: Friday, March 23 by 5:00pm via Slack DM (**No Exceptions**)

Final Draft Due: Friday, March 30 by 5:00pm via Slack DM

Length: 1500 words, give or take 200 (not including bibliography)

Format: Title, 12-point, Times New Roman, one-inch margins, double spaced, .doc or .docx only

Citation: MLA, Chicago, or APA (just be consistent); in-text use (Author, pg #)

- You must draw on a minimum of three course readings in addition to your case bibliography.

Instructions for submission: Please send the rough draft to your group direct message and include me. For the final draft, please send it as a direct message to me. In both cases, you must receive a confirmation from me or the paper will not be considered submitted.

Rubric:

Introduction	Does the first paragraph introduce the subject, provide information about the question and topic under discussion, and indicate a brief roadmap of the paper?
Thesis	Does the paper have a real thesis that is <i>specific</i> and <i>debatable</i> ? Is the thesis clearly stated in the first paragraph? It should say “I argue...” or “this paper argues...”
Evidence	Does the paper provide sufficient evidence of appropriate quality and quantity to support the thesis? Has counterevidence been carefully considered and addressed?
Structure	Is the paper’s argument clear and logical? Has the evidence from sources been synthesized into a cohesive structure?
Argumentation	Does the paper avoid description in favor of analysis grounded in readings and research? Are the claims coherent, consistent, and thoughtful?
Organization	Does each paragraph address one specific point, stated clearly in a topic sentence, and does each point support the paper’s central argument? Is each paragraph clearly and logically organized?
Language/Style	Does the paper deploy appropriate concepts and terms, avoid generalizations and bias in its language and assumptions? Has irrelevant or extraneous material been eliminated? Do transitional words and phrases signal relationships within and between paragraphs? Is the prose clear and the meaning easy to grasp?
Grammar/Mechanics	Is the paper carefully proofread and free of grammatical and mechanical errors?
Conclusion	Does the conclusion tie the paper together, restate the argument, and indicate the significance of the argument?
Citation	Is the paper properly documented and free of plagiarism? Is there a properly formatted bibliography? If you plagiarize, you will fail.

Paper Workshop Instructions

1. Print all of the papers in your group, including your own.
2. Print a peer/self-evaluation form for each paper, including your own.
3. For each paper, read carefully, bearing in mind the following:
 - a. Underline the thesis and write “thesis” in the margin.
 - b. Place a question mark in the margin everywhere you find yourself confused or do not understand what the author is doing.
 - c. Place a check mark next to parts of the paper you find particularly compelling.
 - d. Write marginal notes where you disagree with the reasoning or where you think more evidence needs to be given to support the argument.
4. For each paper, complete a peer/self-evaluation prior to class and come prepared to discuss the papers in further detail with your group.
5. For your own paper, in addition to the above, read it out loud to yourself (or a friend). Also, think about the areas you are least satisfied with and be prepared to identify them in class.

Groups

Group 1

Shafi
MarieRose
Alex
Parrish

Group 2

Austin
Rahim
Jenny
Keziah
Reneé

Group 3

Arean
Youssef
Raquel
Ryan
Dylan

Group 4

Charlie
Ema
Mohammed
Dillon
LaAsia

Group 5

Nick
Araceli
Chavez
Amy
Damian