COLLEGE OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS
NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY

CISA 6744
POLICY ANALYSIS & CRITICAL THINKING

Academic Year 2015
Fall Semester

MICHAEL L. RUPERT, PH.D.   DR. MICHAEL S. BELL (COL. Ret.)
Assistant Professor of Regional & Analytical Studies   Chancellor, College of
Lincoln Hall, Fort McNair Room 2332   International Security Affairs

Theme	Class	Topic	Assignment
Fundamentals of Research & Analysis	1	Introduction Research and Analytical Frameworks JLA 1A, 1C	
	2	Academic Writing & Clarity JLA 2B	
	3	Critical Thinking JLA 1A, 1C, 2B, 4C	
	4	Argumentation & Evidence JLA 1D, 2B, 3B, 3D	Course Article JLA 1A, 1C, 2B, 4C
Defining the Problem	5	Research Statement JLA 2B	
	6	Problem – Literature Engagement JLA 1A, 2B	Course Article JLA 1A, 1C, 2B, 4C
	7	Literature Review JLA 1A, 2B, 3B	
Analytical Frameworks	8	Case Studies JLA 2B, 4C	Literature Review JLA 1A, 2B, 3B
	9	Historical Analysis JLA 2B, 2C, 4D	
	10	Policy Analysis JLA 2A, 2B, 2C, 2D	
	11	Sources JLA 2B	
	12	Conclusion, Research and Analytical Frameworks JLA 2B, 4C	Analytical Framework JLA 2A, 2B, 2C, 2D, 4C

Michael L. Rupert, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Regional & Analytical Studies
Lincoln Hall, Fort McNair Room 2332
202.685.9468
michael.rupert@gc.ndu.edu

Rameez Abbas, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Regional & Analytical Studies
Lincoln Hall, Fort McNair Room 2131
202.685.8633
rameez.abbas@gc.ndu.edu

Matt Dearing, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Regional & Analytical Studies
Lincoln Hall, Fort McNair Room 2130
202.433.5229
matt.dearing@gc.ndu.edu

Erica Marat, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Regional & Analytical Studies
Lincoln Hall, Fort McNair Room 2133
202.443.9657
erica.marat.civ@gc.ndu.edu

Ambassador Mary Jo Wills, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Regional & Analytical Studies
Lincoln Hall, Fort McNair Room 2136
202.443.1034
mary.wills@gc.ndu.edu

Spencer B. Meredith III, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Regional & Analytical Studies
Fort Bragg/JSOMA
910.643.6546
spencer.meredith@gc.ndu.edu

Michael S. Bell, Ph.D., (COL. Ret.)
Chancellor, College of International Security Affairs
Lincoln Hall, Fort McNair Room 2102
202.685.8685
bellm@ndu.edu

CISA main office phone number: 202.685.3870
Ft. McNair Emergency Number (24 Hour): 202.685.3767/8

Course Introduction

Policy Analysis & Critical Thinking (PACT) (CISA6744) is a required core course in the Master of Arts in Strategic Security Studies (MASSS) program. PACT enables students to apply appropriate analytical tools to real-world problems within real-world temporal constraints. Also, PACT introduces the student to the techniques researchers use to answer questions in the fields of international relations, security studies, and policy analysis. Research techniques will include how to read published research; collect and analyze qualitative and quantitative data; communicate research results; distinguish between empirical, ideological, theoretical, and ethical questions; formulate research questions; and, construct an academic argument. Students are expected to apply to all of these research techniques to all courses at CISA.

Course Learning Objectives

Students who complete this course should be able to demonstrate the ability to:

- Apply the basic concepts of research and analysis to research problems in the fields of international relations, security studies, and policy development. Students should be able to comprehend the central concepts of research and analysis, understand the basics of argumentation, and apply critical thinking to the arguments in published research.

- Develop a strong research problem statement. Students should be able to define a research problem, evaluate and synthesize the work of others, and produce a literature review that contextualizes the research problem.

- Apply analytical frameworks to research questions. Students should comprehend the basics of case studies, historical analysis, and policy analysis. Also, the student should be able to apply these analytical frameworks in their research.

- Apply and evaluate sources of evidence. Students should be able to identify qualitative and quantitative sources of evidence, evaluate that evidence, and apply evaluated evidence in support of their research.

Course Methodology

This course will use a mix of teaching and learning methods. The seminar will be the primary instructional method, informed by readings, lectures, discussions, and media. The seminar format requires active participation by students in the form of thoughtful and informed questions and comments to the discussion. Workshops will be the secondary instructional method. Workshops provide students with an opportunity to practice research skills, explore research topics, and apply constructive criticism to their work and others, an essential element of scholarly work.

Course Requirements

Students should read the required readings listed before the seminar meets. The faculty has selected the readings for their relevance, quality of ideas, readability, and timeliness. These readings are listed in an order reflecting the logical development of the topic and read the text in that order unless otherwise instructed. Supplemental readings (when listed) are offered for background reference and for those who might wish to pursue a particular topic in greater depth, but are neither required nor reprinted. The instructors will occasionally list other supplemental (not required) readings on Blackboard such as periodicals and government publications to inform students of current events.

Required Readings

Required reading for this course consists of the following text supplemented by articles and book chapters that will be available on **Blackboard**.

Booth, Wayne C, Gregory G. Colomb, and Joseph M. Williams. 2008. *The Craft of Research* 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Paul, Richard, and Linda Elder. 2009. *The Miniature Guide To Critical Thinking: Concepts And Tools*. Dillon Beach, California: Foundation For Critical Thinking.

Roselle, Laura, and Sharon Spray. 2012. *Research and Writing in International Relations* 2nd ed. New York: Longman.

Strunk, William Jr., and White, E. B. 2014. *The Elements of Style* 4th ed. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.

Required Assignments

The specific graded elements of the course are:

Class Participation & Workshops (30%) – Each student is expected to attend all classes and to contribute actively to class discussions through critical reading of the course material. Students are expected be prepared to participate in instructor determined workshop.

Course Articles (10% each) – Summarize the key points of assigned article. The summary is graded on the identification of (1) the central argument, (2) definitions with any ambiguity, (3) values and assumptions in the argument, and (4) any fallacies in the reasoning. The one (1) page summary does not require a title page, but will be in a bulleted format and double-spaced.

Literature Review (30%) - Write a literature review based on research interests, thesis, or counterterrorism plan. This assignment consists of two tasks. (1) Identify ten (10) potential sources for your literature review based on your topic statement/research problem, for each source provide proper citation information according to CISA style manual (10%). (2) Conduct a literature review of at least five (5) sources from your bibliography (20%).

Analytical Framework (20%) – Write a short paper on how you will research your topic. This paper should include (1) an introduction that identifies the relevance of the problem, topic, or threat group and (2) the analytical framework that you will apply in your research. Briefly state the basic concepts of the framework and how it applies to your research. This assignment should not be more than two (2) double-spaced pages.

Discretionary Instructor Assignment (10%) – Each instructor has a discretionary assignment available to introduce additional material (i.e. alternative analytical frameworks), re-assign and re-evaluate previous material (i.e. literature review), or provide additional training to the class (i.e. writing workshop).

Evaluation Criteria

Seminar Contribution: Instructors use different techniques to assess class participation (which is frequently called simply "discussion") and learning assessment. Nevertheless, all adhere to certain standards, as follows:

A (93-100): Strikes a good balance between "listening" and "contributing." Demonstrates superior preparation for each topic as reflected in the quality of contributions to group discussion. Frequently demonstrates insightful and original thought. Respects the opinions of others but challenges when appropriate.

A- (90-92): Above the average expected of a graduate student. Well prepared for classroom discussion at each seminar. Respects the views of colleagues and by the quality of contributions, commands their respect in return.

B+ (87-89): A solid contributor to seminars. Joins in most discussions. Contributions to group understanding of the topic and discussions reflect understanding of the material. Respects the views of other colleagues and instructors.

B (83-86): Contributions to discussions reflect average preparation for class. Supports group efforts. Occasionally interrupts others.

B- (80-82): Contributes. Often speaks out without having thought the issue through to the end. Sometimes fails to show regard for a colleague's opinions or proper consideration or courtesy toward others in the seminar group.

C (70-79): Preparation is adequate, but frequently fails to respect the views of others, is sometimes belligerent in discourse with colleagues and/or instructor. Rarely steps forward to assume a fair share of in-group discussions. Usually content to let others form the class discussions and develop required seminar positions.

F (69 and below): Class preparation and contributions do not merit graduate credit. The student will be referred to the faculty, faculty advisor or Dean of Students for counseling.

Written Assignments: CISA written assignments differ in length and format but are all designed to evaluate the achievement of learning objectives related to strategic reasoning and analysis. The following general standards are employed to assess student grades for written assignments:

A (93-100): Organized, coherent and well-written responses that completely address the questions, convey all applicable major and key minor points, and demonstrate a total grasp of the topic.

A- (90-92): Answers address all major and key minor considerations; demonstrate an excellent grasp of the topic.

B+ (87-89): Well-crafted answer that discusses important ideas related to the topic.

B (83-86): Answers reflect average graduate graduate-level performance, successfully considering the topic of each question.

B- (80-82): Answers address the questions but fail to address all relevant concepts or demonstrate a clear understanding of the topic.

C (73-76): Answers demonstrate poor understanding of the topic, marginal support for arguments, and/or miss major analytical elements or concepts.

F (69 and below): Answers do not merit graduate credit. The student may be asked to re-sit for the examination. Retests are at the instructor's discretion.

IMPORTANT NOTES on Requirements and Evaluation:

- All material assigned (REQUIRED), class instruction by faculty, and all in-class discussions are gradable.
- Students must be prepared to discuss required readings as assigned. This performance affects grades for seminar contribution.
- Instructors may provide additional reading as the course progresses.
- As instructed, students are responsible for setting individual meetings with the instructor by appointment to assist in shaping individual learning development and performance evaluation.
- Class instruction by faculty may introduce new concepts, readings, or additional information not included in the assigned readings.
- Students must attend class, be alert, and be prepared to answer and ask questions.
- Students are encouraged to form study groups to discuss reading and how to approach assignments, recognizing that the assignments are individual efforts and subject to CISA's academic integrity criteria.
- Students should have a copy of the syllabus with them each class as it serves as the road map for the course and planning for subsequent class sessions.
- Blackboard is predominantly for providing access to electronic files, submitting written assignments, and grading information. Additional uses of BB will depend on specific Methods instructors.

Grades are assessed using the following CISA grading scale:

Letter Grade	Grade Points	Numerical Scale	Criterion-referenced at grade level
A	4.0	93-100	Firm command of knowledge domain
A-	3.67	90-92.99	High level of analytical development
B+	3.33	87-89	Command of knowledge beyond minimum
B	3.0	83-86	Advanced analytical development
B-	2.67	80-82	
C	2.0	70-79	Command of only basic concepts of knowledge. Demonstrated basic analytical ability
F	0	69 and below	No command of knowledge domain
I	0		Failure to complete course requirements

Class One [25 SEP 15]: Introduction, Research Process & Analytical Frameworks

We will review the syllabus, course structure, and grading system. Also, we will discuss the role of critical thinking in relation to research. Finally, we will discuss what research methods means for this course and its application to the students' theses papers.

Objectives

- Review course objectives, activities, schedule, assignments, and delivery dates for the semester
- Identify the purpose of the course in the context of CISA curriculum and individual student goals
- Discuss the research process from topic selection to completed research paper or combatting terrorism plan
- Inform students of available resources

Required Readings

CISA 6744 Policy Analysis & Critical Thinking Course Syllabus
Booth, Colomb & Williams Ch. 1 & 2

Assignment for Next Class

Prepare for workshop exercise

Class Two [02 OCT 15]: Academic Writing & Clarity

Academic writing is used to convey a body of information about a particular subject in a semi-formal, impersonal, precise and objective format. Critical to academic writing is clarity of terms, concepts, and research problems. Imprecision in any of these elements often results in weak arguments. This class will give the students the opportunity to assess critically their writing and consider ways of improving it.

Objectives

- Recognize the qualities of good academic writing
- Distinguish between clearly and poorly defined terminology
- Integrate academic writing strategies and elements into written assignments
- Integrate academic writing and clarity into written assignments

Required Readings

Booth, Colomb & Williams. Ch. 12

University of Essex. *How to improve your academic writing.* Accessed August 1, 2015. **(On Blackboard)**

Duke Writing Studio. *A Short Guide to Academic Writing Style.* Accessed August 1, 2015. **(On Blackboard)**

Additional Readings on Academic Writing and Clarity

Swales, John M., and Christine B. Feak. 2012. "An Approach to Academic Writing." In *Academic Writing for Graduate Students: Essential Skills and Tasks*. 3rd ed., 1-53. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. Link: http://www.press.umich.edu/pdf/9780472034758-unit1.pdf

Assignment for Next Class

Prepare for workshop exercise

Class Three [09 OCT 15]: Critical Thinking

We will discuss some of the primary challenges to critical thinking that can impact research and analysis. We will identify cognitive "speed-bumps" in our reasoning such ambiguous definitions, hidden assumptions, and fallacious reasoning. In particular, we will discuss how these speed-bumps impact our understanding of national security and international affairs.

Objectives

- Describe the elements of thought and why critical thinking is important to research
- Recognize intellectual standards, criteria for evaluating reasoning and the habits of critical thinkers
- Integrate critical thinking in analyzing the logic of texts, problem-solving, and assessing research
- Recognize ambiguous terms, assumptions and fallacies in research

Required Readings

Paul and Elder's *Miniature Guide to Critical Thinking.*

Barnet, Sylvan, and Hugo Bedau. 2011. "Critical Reading: Getting Started." In *Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing: A Brief Guide to Argument.* 7th ed., 32-71. Beford/St. Martins: Boston. **(On Blackboard)**

Addition Reading on Critical Thinking

Barnet, Sylvan and Hugo Bedau. 2011. "Critical Reading: Getting Deeper in the Arguments." In *Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing: A Brief Guide to Argument.* 7th ed., 73-123. Beford/St. Martins: Boston. **(On Blackboard)**

Facione, Peter A. *Critical Thinking: What it is and why it counts*. Accessed on August 2, 2015. **(On Blackboard)**

College of International Security Affairs. 2012. *Reading for Graduate Study*. Accessed on August 2, 2015. **(On Blackboard)**

Purdue Online Writing Lab

Assignment for Next Class
Summarize instructor assigned article. The summary will be graded on the identification of (1) the central argument, (2) ambiguous terms, (3) values and assumptions in the argument, and (4) any fallacies in the reasoning. Submit the one (1) page bullet-formatted and double-spaced summary to **Blackboard by 16 Oct 15 unless instructed otherwise by instructor.**

Class Four [16 OCT 15]: Argumentation & Evidence

Theses, master's research papers, and counter-terrorism plans are similar in that they each make a research argument. A research argument makes a claim supported by reason and evidence. Defining claims, reasons, evidence and the relationship between the three will provide the foundation for making a good research argument.

Objectives

- Recognize a good research argument
- Locate the central elements of a research argument; claim, reasons, evidence, and warrants and comprehend the relationship between the central elements
- Develop an outline of a research argument and assess its effectiveness
- Recognize the limitations of research arguments

Required Readings
Booth, Colomb & Williams Ch. 7, 8, 9 & 11

Additional Readings on Argumentation & Evidence

Barnet, Sylvan and Hugo Bedau. 2011. "Developing an Argument of Your Own." In *Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing: A Brief Guide to Argument.* 7th ed., 226-261. Beford/St. Martins: Boston. **(On Blackboard)**

Assignment for Next Class

Prepare for workshop exercise

Class Five [23 OCT 15]: Research Statement

One of the most difficult challenges in the research process is narrowing a broad subject area to a manageable research problem. This process is more than the identification of a problem. A good research problem is answerable by the researcher. This task can be difficult considering time constraints, available resources, and other requirements.

Objectives

- Describe the process of turning a broad subject to a manageable and significant research question
- Distinguish between practical and research problems
- Develop a significant research question

Required Readings

Booth, Colomb & Williams Ch. 3 & 4

Roselle & Spray Ch. 1

Assignment for Next Class
Summarize assigned article.

[Joseph S. Nye, Jr., The Future of Power (New York: Public Affairs, 2011), 3-24].

The summary will be graded on the identification of (1) the central argument, (2) ambiguous terms, (3) values and assumptions in the argument, and (4) any fallacies in the reasoning. Submit the one (1) paragraph double-spaced summary to **Blackboard by 30 Oct 15 unless instructed otherwise by instructor.**

Class Six [30 OCT 15]: Problem – Literature Engagement

The 'answerability' of a research problem or statement is dependent on identifying sources that contextualize your research problem. In the information age, the number of sources on any topic can easily overwhelm a researcher. Successful source engagement depends on the effective use of electronic, academic, and faculty resources to create a manageable, but comprehensive set of sources.

Objectives

- Describe the relationship between a research problem, variables, and sources
- Distinguish between primary, secondary, and tertiary sources
- Carry out a search for sources using faculty, library, and other electronic resources
- Evaluate the scholarship of a source
- Demonstrate knowledge of the CISA citation format

Required Readings

Booth, Colomb & Williams Ch. 5 and 6

Roselle & Spray Ch. 1 (review), 2 & 3

CISA Citation Style Guide

Assignment for Next Class

Prepare for workshop exercise

Class Seven [06 NOV 15]: Literature Review

One of the most common errors made with respect to the literature review is that many people tend to view it as an essay about the research problem. The literature review is, in effect, an essay about the literature on the research problem but not the problem itself. The literature review should navigate the reader through the relevant discussions on your research problem, analyze those discussions, and relate them to how you are going to address the problem.

Objectives

- Review the process for conducting a literature review
- Distinguish between chronologically, thematically, and methodologically organized literature review
- Recognize common literature review mistakes
- Synthesize literature to create an effective literature review

Required Readings

Cronin, Patricia, Frances Ryan and Michael Coughlan. 2008. "Undertaking a literature review: a step-by-step approach." *British Journal of Nursing*, 17, no. 1: 38-43. **(On Blackboard)**

Rhodes, E.A. 2011. "A commentary on literature reviews." *Volta Reviews*, 111, no. 3: 353-368. **(On Blackboard)**

Taylor, Dena B. and Margaret Proctor. 2007. *The Literature Review: A Few Tips On Conducting It.* Health Sciences Writing Centre. Accessed on July 31, 2015. **(On Blackboard)**

Additional Readings on Literature Reviews

Fink, Arlene. 2014. *Conducting Research Literature Reviews: From The Internet To Paper*. 4th ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Machi, Lawrence A., and Brenda T. McEvoy. 2009. *The Literature Review: Six steps to success*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Assignment for Next Class

Conduct a literature review of at least five (5) sources. In no more than five (5) double-spaced pages without a title page conduct a review of the literature structured along one of the literature review methods discussed in class. Turn in the assignment in via **Blackboard by 13 Nov 15 unless instructed otherwise by instructor**.

Class Eight [13 NOV 15]: Case Studies

One dominant source of evidence in the fields of international relations and security studies is the case study. What is a case study, what type of evidence does it provide, and what are the concerns in using a case study as a form of evidence will be the focus of this class. Also, this class will provide the basic concepts, designs, and analytical tools for using a case study to address your research problem.

Objectives

- Recognize the advantages and disadvantages of using case studies as evidence
- Identify the role of case studies in developing theory
- Recognize the various case study designs
- Understand the role of case studies in international relations and security studies

Required Readings

Yin, Robert K. 2014. "Getting Started: How to know whether and when to use the case study as a research method." In *Case Study Research; Design and Methods*. 5th ed. 3-26. Los Angeles: Sage. **(On Blackboard)**

Yin, Robert K. 2014. "Designing Case Studies: Identifying your case(s) and establishing the logic of your case study." In *Case Study Research; Design and Methods*. 5th ed. 27-70. Los Angeles: Sage. **(On Blackboard)**

Allison, Graham T., 1999. "Conceptual Models and the Cuban Missile Crisis." *The American Political Science Review,* 63, no 1: 689-718. **(On Blackboard)**

Additional Readings on Case Studies

Bennet, Andrew. 2007. "Case Study Methods in International Relations Subfield." *Comparative Political Studies*, 40, no. 2. 170-195. **(On Blackboard)**

Geddes, Barbara. 1990. "How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics." *Political Analysis*, 2, no. 1: 131-150. **(On Blackboard)**

Assignment for Next Class

Prepare for workshop exercise

Class Nine [20 NOV 15]: Historical Analysis

A dominant form of analysis and evidence in international relations and security studies is historical. Historical analysis focuses on the relationship between actors and events based on primary and secondary sources. Identifying the actors, events, and the factors of the relationship between the two are often used as evidence of how contemporary and future events may unfold. Historical analysis is often the primary means to analyze military and security events.

Objectives

- Understand how to employ historical sources as evidence in research
- Recognize the challenges in using secondary and tertiary historical sources as evidence
- Recognize the potential bias in historical and policy sources

Required Readings

Black, Jeremy, and Donald M. MacRaild. 2007. "Approaches to History: Sources, Methods, and Historians." In *Studying History* 3rd ed., 89-127. New York: Palgrave MacMillan. **(On Blackboard)**

Morillo, Steven, and Michael F. Pavkovic. 2013. "An Introduction to Military History" In *What is Military History?* 2nd ed. 1-10. Cambridge: Polity, 2013. **(On Blackboard)**

Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. 1995. "The Power in the Story" In *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History.* 1-30. Boston: Beacon Press. **(On Blackboard)**

Additional Readings in Historical Analysis

Baudet, Floribert, and Eric A. Sibul. 2014 "Historical Research in the Military Domain" In Routledge Handbook of Research Methods in Military Studies edited by Joseph Soeters, Patricia M. Shields, and Sebastian Rietjens 67-77. Abingdon: Routledge.

Black, Jeremy, and Donald M. MacRaild. 2007 *Studying History,* 3rd ed., New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Furay, Conal, and Michael J. Salevouris. 2009. *The Methods and Skills of History: A Practical Guide*, 3rd ed., Wheeling, Ill.: Harlan Davidson.

Gaddis, John Lewis. 2002. *The Landscape of History: How Historians Map the Past.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Storey, William K., 2012. *Writing History: A Guide for Students*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Assignment for Next Class

No Class Next Week [Research Week)

Class Ten [04 DEC 15]: Policy Analysis

Policy analysis is a framework used to determine which policies will most effectively achieve a set of goals. Policy analysis can be divided into two fields. Descriptive policy analysis reviews past and current policies to understand their development and effectiveness. Prescriptive policy analysis evaluates potential policy designed to meet future goals. Both types of analysis are useful in reviewing, revising, and designing counterinsurgency, counterterrorism, military planning and foreign policy.

Objectives

- Recognize and distinguish between different policy analysis models
- Describe the various tools available for policy analysis
- Apply a policy analysis model to a historical, current, or potential problem or threat
- Integrate case studies and historical analysis in policy analysis and foreign policy analysis

Required Readings

Gvosdev, Nikolas K. 2015. "Should Military Officers Study Policy Analysis." *Joint Forces Quarterly* 76 (1st Quarter): 30-34. **(On Blackboard)**

Kugler, Richard L. 2006. "Policy Analysis and Methodology: A necessary discipline for the future." In *Policy Analysis in National Security Affairs: New Methods for a New Era*. Washington D.C.: NDU Press. **(On Blackboard)**

Walter Carlsnaes. 2013 "Foreign Policy." In *Handbook of International Relations*. 2nd ed., edited by Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse, and Beth A. Simmons. 298-325. London: Sage. **(On Blackboard)**

Additional Readings in Policy Analysis

Carlsnaes, Walter. 2013. "Actors, structures, and foreign policy analysis." In *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases,* edited by Steve Smith, Amelia Hadfield, and Tim Dunne. 113-129. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kraft, Michael, and Scott Furlong. 2008. "Policy Analysis: An Introduction." In *Public Policy: Politics, Analysis, and Alternatives*. 97-123. Washington, DC: CQ Press.

Schmidt, Brian C. 2012. "The primacy of national security." In *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases,* edited by Steve Smith, Amelia Hadfield, and Tim Dunne. 188-202. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Assignment for Next Class

Prepare for workshop exercise

Class Eleven: Sources

Surveys and interviews are two sources of evidence used by CISA students in addressing a research problem in international relations and security studies. Most students will not design and implement a survey, but they may use survey data and conclusions of others in their research argument. Researchers need to be able to identify good survey data and determine the applicability of that data to their argument. Also, we will cover the basic elements of conducting a good interview, including choice of the interviewee, questions, and evaluation of interview data.

Objectives
- Provide an overview of surveys as a source of evidence and potential problems
- Outline the design, development, and implementation of interviews and focus groups
- Discuss the role of the IRB in research

Required Readings

Australian Bureau of Statistics. 2010. *A Guide for Using Statistics for Evidence Based* Policy. Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics. **(On Blackboard)**

DiCicco-Bloom, Barbara, and Benjamin F. Crabtree. 2006. "The Qualitative Research Interview." *Medical Education* 2006, 40: 314-321. **(On Blackboard)**

Liamputtong, Pranee. 2011. "Focus group methodology: Introduction and history." In *Focus Group Methodology: Principles and Practice*. 1-14. London: Sage. **(On Blackboard)**

Additional Readings on Sources

Huff, Darrel, and Irving Geis. 1982. *How to Lie with Statistics*. 2nd edition. New York: W. W. Norton & Company

Leech, Beth et al. 2002. "Symposium on Interview Techniques." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 35: 663-688.

Mishler, Elliot G. 1986. *Research Interviewing: Context and Narrative*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.

Assignment for Next Class

Write a short paper on how you will research your topic. This paper should include (1) an introduction that identifies the relevance of the problem, topic, or threat group and (2) the analytical framework that you will apply in your research. Briefly state the basic concepts of the framework and how it applies to your research. This assignment should not be more than two (2) double-spaced pages. Submit assignment to **Blackboard by 11 Dec 15 unless instructed otherwise by instructor.**

Class Twelve [11 DEC 15]: Conclusion, Research and Analytical Frameworks

In the final class, we will go back to the beginning and review the relationship between critical thinking and making a research argument. We will discuss potential challenges that the student will face and how to overcome those challenges. This class will also be an opportunity for students discuss any other topics associated with research methods.

Objectives
- Ensure students are prepared to continue their research.