# 2017/18 Unit Guide

## POLIM3014 – THEORIES OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

### Teaching Block: 1  
### Weeks: 1-12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Owner</th>
<th>Credit points:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Filipo Dionigi  
Co taught by: Rob Yates | 20 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level:</th>
<th>Prerequisites:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M/7</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email:</th>
<th>Office:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:fd17626@bristol.ac.uk">fd17626@bristol.ac.uk</a></td>
<td>Curriculum area:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Relations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit owner office hours:** Please check the SPAIS MSc Blackboard site for office hours.  
(Please note, there are no regular office hours during Reading Weeks)

**Timetabled classes:**  
Please check your online timetable for day, time and venue of each seminar

You are also expected to attend **ONE** seminar each week. Your online personal timetable will inform you to which group you have been allocated. Seminar groups are fixed: you are not allowed to change seminar groups without permission from the office.

Weeks 6, 12, 18 and 24 are Reading Weeks; there is **NO** regular teaching in these weeks.

In addition to timetabled sessions there is a requirement for private study, reading, revision and assessments. Reading the required readings in advance of each seminar is the *minimum* expectation. The University Guidelines state that one credit point is broadly equivalent to 10 hours of total student input.

**Learning outcomes:**  
An understanding of a variety of theories that are employed for the analysis of international relations and as a guide for policy makers. The unit will also help you identify your own position and viewpoints within the epistemology and theory of International Relations.  
When you have completed this unit successfully, you should be able to demonstrate orally and in your essay writing that you can:

- **PLACE** each theoretical approach in appropriate historical, analytical and epistemological contexts.
- **DEFINE** key concepts employed in theories of IR.
- **ANALYSE** the merits and limitations of different theoretical approaches.
- **APPLY** different theoretical approaches to contemporary international relations.
- **EVALUATE** the contributions of different theories to our understanding of global politics.
- **EXPLAIN** different theories of international relations.

**Requirements for passing the unit:**  
Satisfactory attendance at seminars  
Completion of all formative work to an acceptable standard  
Combined mark of all summative work must be a pass (50 or above)
### Unit description

International Relations (IR) as a discipline has always been characterized by extensive and significant theoretical ferment. This unit provides you with an overview of key theoretical traditions in IR and their evolution and contestations in recent years. The goal of this unit is not to get you to adopt a particular IR theory or representation of global politics. Instead, it aims to help you develop analytical tools to uncover the assumptions, both implicit and explicit, behind the ways in which questions and texts are framed, to consider what questions are left unasked, and to recognize which theories have been used or misused. Overall, the unit is designed to equip you with foundational knowledge of theories of International Relations so as to get you better prepared as a scholar and as a citizen to understand the workings of global politics.

### Teaching arrangements

There are ten seminars in the unit (Weeks 1-5 and 7-11) and two reading weeks (week 6 and 12). Attendance is required.

### Requirements for credit points

For credit points to be awarded for this unit, you must complete all required work (the presentation and the essay) to at least a passing standard (a mark of 50) and have no more than two non-excused seminar absences.

### Summative assessment

The final grade for the course will be based on the following:
- Final Paper (4,000 words in length) 100% of mark

The essay for this unit is a summative essay, that is, it decides the final mark for this unit. In contrast, the presentation is formative, that is, it does not count towards the final mark for the unit but instead is aimed at, among other things, assisting you in preparing for the summative assessment. **The essay and the oral seminar presentation must be on different topics.** Essay questions will be distributed early in term. The presentation can build upon required readings but should treat them as starting points only. Under no circumstance the presentation should be a summary of the required readings.

Full details about all requirements and rules regarding essays — including formatting, submission, pass marks, extensions, feedback, resubmissions, and so on — are in the Departmental Graduate Studies handbook.

### Core reading

In addition, John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens (eds.) *The Globalization of World Politics. An Introduction to International Relations*, 5th edition, 2011 (*JZ1305 GLO*) is by far and away the best-known textbook designed mainly for undergraduate courses in International Relations. I have, however, listed some chapters in the required and recommended readings in this unit. If you are new to the field of International Relations, it is advisable to start with chapters in Baylis, Smith and Owens. Another useful textbook is Burchill, Scott, et al., 4th edition, Basingstoke: Palgrave/Macmillan, 2009.

Students are required to read THREE readings per week (one textbook chapter, one key text and one ‘debate’ text as indicated in the syllabus). Where there is more than one text listed in a section you can choose which one you would like to read. Naturally, you are encouraged to read more than the required three readings.

**Objectives**

The objective of this unit is to help you as citizens and future decision-makers to develop an understanding of a variety of theories that are employed for the analysis of international relations and as a guide for policy makers. The unit will also help you identify your own position and viewpoints within the epistemology and theory of International Relations.

**Learning outcomes**

There are three levels of skill which you are going to learn and practice in this unit:

- **Synthesis & Evaluation**

- **Application & Analysis**

- **Knowledge & Comprehension**

When you have completed this unit successfully, you should be able to demonstrate orally and in your essay writing that you can:

When you have completed this unit successfully, you should be able to demonstrate orally and in your essay writing that you can:

- **PLACE** each theoretical approach in appropriate historical, analytical and epistemological contexts.
- **DEFINE** key concepts employed in theories of IR.
- **ANALYSE** the merits and limitations of different theoretical approaches.
- **APPLY** different theoretical approaches to contemporary international relations.
- **EVALUATE** the contributions of different theories to our understanding of global politics.
- **EXPLAIN** different theories of international relations.
Each of these skills will be assessed in your summative essay at the end of the semester.

**Transferable skills**
- Presentation skills
- Analytical skills
- Evaluative skills
- Application skills
- Ability to summarize and explain texts
- Teamwork skills

**Development and feedback**
Your skills will be developed through several practices including:
- Investigative reading of texts
- Preparation of a class presentation
- Use of PowerPoint
- Preparation of a handout
- Small group exercises
- Large group discussions

You will have feedback from your teacher as follows:
- Oral comments during the seminar
- Oral and/or written feedback on your presentation
- The feedback on your essay will be returned to you via the Graduate Studies Coordinator.

Oral presentation and a one page handout due on the dates assigned in Week 1.

**Seminar schedule**
Ten 100-minute seminars of this unit are scheduled in weeks 1-10 as follows:

- **Week 1** Introduction: Why IR theory? What theories and whose theories?
- **Week 2** IR as a Discipline: History, Theory and Science
- **Week 3** Classical Realism and Neo-Realism: Contentions and Debates
- **Week 4** Liberalism and Neoliberal Institutionalism
- **Week 5** The ‘English School’ and Its Critics
- **Week 6** Reading week
- **Week 7** Reading week
- **Week 8** The Constructivist Turn in IR Theory
- **Week 9** Marxism and Critical Theory
- **Week 10** Poststructuralism
- **Week 11** Postcolonialism and Global IR theory
- **Week 12** Feminism
- **Reading week**
Unit Readings

Each week’s seminar will proceed on the assumption that you have completed ALL of that week’s required reading. The syllabus organizes the required reading in such a way as to help you enhance the first two skill levels shown in the diagram 'learning outcomes' above:

Required Text No. 1 ⇒ Learning objective: Knowledge
The first text is usually from a textbook. It introduces you to the theory by summarizing key texts from a number of authors and provides an overview of the debates surrounding it. It is usually the easiest text to read for the week and is best read first.

Required Text No. 2 ⇒ Learning objective: Comprehension
The second text is a book or article by a/the key author who has defined a theory. It explains the details of a theory to you in the author’s own words. This is the most important text that you read in the week because it allows you to make up your own mind about a theory. It is usually moderately difficult and is best read second.

Required Text No. 3+ ⇒ Learning objective: Application, Analysis, Critique
Further texts either present an application of the theory or an analysis of its merits and limitations. These are frequently the most difficult texts because they introduce you to new skills. It is best to read these texts last.

Other readings
Beyond the required readings, additional readings for this unit are divided into two categories: strongly recommended reading and supplementary reading. Those under the heading ‘strongly recommended’ have been chosen because they offer important analytical arguments, are written by prominent authors, and/or are particularly illuminating of the perspective under discussion. You might start with these when you pursue further reading about a given theoretical tradition. Those readings under the heading ‘supplementary reading’ have been chosen to give you a range of examples of work in, or critical of, a particular theoretical tradition. These are listed at the end of this syllabus.

Journals: Most journals are now available online through the library's home page at: http://www.bristol.ac.uk/is/library/electronicjournals/. The following is a list of key International Relations journals that often publish essays on IR theories. Many in the reading list for this unit are in fact drawn from these journals.

American Political Science Review
British Journal of Politics and International Relations
European Journal of International Relations
Global Governance International Affairs
International Journal International Organization
International Security
International Relations
International Studies Perspectives
International Studies Quarterly
Millennium
Review of International Studies
World Politics

Foreign Affairs and Foreign Policy are two key policy journals from which we have drawn some readings.

Week 1. Introduction: Why IR theory? What theories and whose theories?

In this session, I will talk to you about Teaching and Learning, brief you about the requirements of the unit and go through this syllabus with you to ensure that you understand its contents. Towards the end of the session, oral presentations at seminars will be allocated for each class.

Essential readings:

Textbook:
Smith, Steve, ‘Introduction: ‘Diversity and Disciplinarity in International Relations Theory’ [Text]

Key works (please read at least ONE of the following):
Cox, Robert W. ‘Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory’, Millennium June 1981 vol. 10 no. 2 126-155. [available on Blackboard]

Debate:
Zambernardi, Lorenzo, ‘Politics is too important to be left to political scientists: A critique of the theory–policy nexus in International Relations’, European Journal of International Relations 2016, Vol. 22(1) 3–23. E-Journals

Seminar Topics:
1. The purposes and usefulness of theory
2. The relevance of theory to policy

Week 2. IR as a Discipline: History, Theory and Science

Essential readings:

Textbook:Kurki, Milja and Colin Wight, ‘International Relations and Social Science’ [Text]

Key Works (please read at least ONE of the following):

Debate:
Waever, Ole, 'The sociology of a not so international discipline: American and European developments in international relations,' International Organization, 52 (4), 687-727. E-Journals

Seminar Topics:
1. Theory, methodology and the growth of IR as a discipline;
2. The interplay between international and intellectual history for the theoretical and disciplinary evolution of IR;
3. Science and progress in theorisation of IR;
4. Hegemonic and marginalised voices in the development of IR theory.

Strongly recommended readings:


Special issue of the *European Journal of International Relations* 19(3), September 2013, 'The end of IR theory?' **E-Journals**

'Routetable: International Relations as a social science' Millennium 43(1), September 2014. See also further responses in Millennium 43(3), June 2015. **E-Journals**

---

**Week 3. Classical Realism and Neo-Realism: Contentions and Debates**

**Essential readings:** Textbook:

Lebow, Richard Ned, ‘Classical Realism’ [TEXT]

Mearsheimer, John J., ‘Structural Realism’ [TEXT]

**Key works (please read at least ONE of the following):**

Waltz, Kenneth, ‘Realist thought and neorealist theory,’ *Journal of International Affairs*, 44(1), 1990, pp.21-37. **E-Journals**


**Debate (please read at least ONE of the following):**


**Seminar topics:**

1. What are the major differences between classical realism and structural realism?
2. What do Realist theories have to say about the following?
   - Anarchy
State and the system of states
Power and balance of power
National interest
Structure of the international system and
Human nature

3. Hans Morgenthau once famously claimed that ‘… a foreign policy guided by universal moral principles … is under contemporary conditions … a policy of national suicide’. What does this tell us about the moral justification of Realism?

4. Why and how has Realism always been a dominant IR theory in the studies of global politics?

5. Considering Tickner’s critique, in what sense can we argue that Realism provides ‘timeless wisdom’?

Strongly recommended readings:


Nye, Joseph S. *The paradox of American power: why the world’s only superpower can’t go it alone*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. E183.7 NYE


---

**Week 4. Liberalism and Neoliberal institutionalism: global order and the issue of institutions**

**Essential readings:**

**Textbook:**


Sterling-Folker, Jennifer, ‘Neoliberalism’ [TEXT].

and

Key works (please read at least ONE of the following):


Debate (please read at least ONE of the following):


Seminar topics:

1. What are the main Liberal critiques of Realist theories?
2. What do all liberal approaches have in common? Do they offer more compelling explanations of state's behaviour in international relations?
3. How does Liberal international theory conceptualise the relationship between justice and order in global politics?
4. Is the ‘Democratic peace’ theory fundamentally flawed?

Strongly recommended readings:


Baldwin, David (ed.), Neorealism and Neoliberalism: The Contemporary Debate, New York: Columbia
Week 5. The ‘English School’ and Its Critics

Essential readings:

Textbook:
Dunne, Tim, ‘The English School’ [Text].

Key works (please read at least ONE of the following):

Debate:

Seminar Topics:

1. How is the ‘English School’ theory different from Realist theories?
2. Discuss the ideas of ‘international system’, ‘international society’, ‘world society’ and ‘an anarchical society’.
3. What are the three traditions of international thought identified by Martin Wight? How are they different in terms of their worldviews?
4. What are the major contributions that the ‘English School’ has made to the study of International Relations? What may be problematic about its story of the ‘expansion of international society’?
5. In what sense is the English School ‘underexploited’ in the theorisation of IR?

Strongly recommended readings:

Alderson, Kai and Andrew Hurrell (eds.), Hedley Bull on International Society, London: Macmillan. JZ1310 HED
Dunne, Tim, ‘International Society --Theoretical Promises Fulfilled?’, Cooperation and Conflict, 30:2, 125-54. E-Journals
Evans, Tony and Peter Wilson, ‘Regime theory and the English school of international relations: A comparison’, Millennium, 21(3) Serial JX1.M5

Jackson, Robert H., ‘From Colonialism to Theology: Encounters with Martin Wight’s International Thought’, *International Affairs*, 84:2, 351–364. [E-Journals](#)

James, Alan, ‘System or Society’, *Review of International Studies*, 19:3, 269-88. [E-Journals](#)


---

**Week 6. Reading week**

---

**Week 7. The Constructivist Turn in IR Theory**

**Essential readings:**

**Textbook:**
Fierke, K.M., ‘Constructivism’ [Text].

**Key works (please read at least ONE of the following):**


**Debate:**


**Seminar topics:**

1. ‘Constructivism is not itself a theory of international relations, the way balance-of-power theory is, for example, but a theoretically informed approach to the study of international relations.’ (John Gerard Ruggie) Discuss.

2. In which way are the Constructivist conceptions of global politics different from those of Realists and Liberals? How do we distinguish Constructivist theories from other kinds of theories?
3. What are the constructivist challenges according to Kratochwil, Ruggie and others?
4. What do you think explains the Constructivist turn in IR theorization?
5. What do Constructivists have to say about norms, identity and culture in international relations?

Strongly recommended readings:


Week 8: Marxism and Critical Theory

**Essential readings:**

**Textbook:**
Roach, Steven, 'Critical Theory'
Rupert, Mark, 'Marxism' [Text]

**Key work:**
Cox, Robert W. ‘Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory’, *Millennium* June 1981 vol. 10 no. 2 126-155. [available on Blackboard]

**Debate (please read at least ONE of the following):**

Before the seminar, please also watch the following video by David Harvey: “Visualising Capital” available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=83Yx6RBvoFc

**Seminar topics:**

1. ‘Marxism and critical theory is fundamentally different from both the liberal and the realist traditions’. Discuss
2. What do you think are the most important insights that Marxism provides in understanding contemporary international relations?
3. How different is critical theory from ‘problem solving’ theories, and foundational theories from anti-foundational theories?
4. ‘The point is not to explain the world but to change it (Robert Cox).’ Discuss.

**Strongly recommended readings:**

Gills, B. K., 'Historical materialism and international relations theory,' *Millennium*, 16(2), 1987, pp. 265-272. Serial JX1.M5
Tickner, J. Ann, ‘You just don’t understand: Troubled engagements between feminists and IR theorists,'
Week 9. Poststructuralism

Essential readings

Textbook:
Campbell, David, ‘Poststructuralism’ [TEXT].

Key Works:

Debate:

Watch Prof. Iver Neumann on Foucault’s ‘Governmentality’ https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UBpI7PwJzU

Seminar Topics:

1. Identify the essential elements of poststructuralism as an approach to IR.
2. What are the main challenges post-structuralism poses for ‘traditional’ IR theory?
3. What are the limits and problems of poststructuralist approaches?

Strongly recommended reading:
Doty, Roxanne Lynn, Imperial Encounters: The Politics of Representation in North-South Relations, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996. JZ1251 DOT
Smith, Steve, and Patricia Owens, ‘Alternative approaches to international theory’ John Baylis and Steven Smith, The Globalization of World Politics. An Introduction to International Relations, 3rd edition JZ1305 GLO
Week 10. Postcolonialism and Global IR theory

Essential reading:

Textbook:
Grovgoui, Siba N. 'Postcolonialism' [Text]

Key Works (please read at least ONE of the following):


Debate (please read at least ONE of the following):


Seminar Topics:
1. Why is post-colonialism hard to reduce to a single IR theory?
2. How can we articulate the debates about post-coloniality, post-colonialism and the possibility of Global IR theory in relation to those on the post-Western order?
3. What are the politics of post-colonialism?

Strongly recommended reading:


'Special Issue: Why is there no non-Western IR theory?' International Relations of the Asia-Pacific, 2007, Vol. 7(3). **E-Journals**
Week 11. Feminism

Essential reading:

Textbook:
Tickner, J. Ann and Laura Sjoberg ‘Feminism’ [Text]

Key Works (please read at least ONE of the following):


Debate (please read at least ONE of the following):


Seminar Topics:
1. Identify the essential elements of Feminist IR theory and assess the strengths and weaknesses of this approach to international relations.
2. Does ‘Feminism’ present a theory of IR or does it ‘merely’ add a gender perspective to existing accounts?

Strongly recommended reading:
Cohn, Carol, ‘Sex and death in the rational world of defense intellectuals,’ Signs, 12(4), 1987, pp.678-718.


Locher, Birgit, and Elisabeth Prügl, ‘Feminism and constructivism: Worlds apart or sharing the middle ground?’ International Studies Quarterly, 45(1), 2001, pp.111-129. Serial JX1.I58 + Electronic journals


Smith, Steve, and Patricia Owens, ‘Alternative approaches to international theory’ John Baylis and Steven Smith, The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations, 3rd edition JZ1305 GLO


Week 12. Reading Week
Further readings:

The existing literature on IR theories is vast. The speed with which it is being produced is accelerating. This list is produced to give you a glimpse of what is there in the field, particularly in relation to the topics discussed at our seminars. Simply going through this list will give you a sense of the discourse, debates, contentions, contestations and controversies in IR. You are encouraged to explore specific topics of your interest with the help of this list.

Weeks 1+2


Lyons, Gene M. 'The study of international relations in Great Britain: Further connections,' World Politics, 38(4), 1986, pp.626-645. EJournals

Navari, Cornelia, 'Varieties of history in international thought,' European Journal of International Relations, 1(3), 1995, 409-418. EJournals


'Forum: Pluralism in IR,' International Studies Perspectives 16(1), 2015. EJournals

'Forum: The struggle over the identity of IR: What is at stake in the disciplinary debate within and beyond academia?’ International Relations 29(2), 2015. EJournals

Weeks 3+4

Selected Realist Classics:


Claude, Jr., Inis L., Power and International Relations, NY: Random House, 1962. JX1395 CLA


Kennan, George F., Realities of American Foreign Policy, NY: W.W. Norton, 1966. E835 KEN

Other readings:
Barkdull, John, 'Waltz, Durkheim and international relations: The international system as an abnormal form,' American Political Science Review, 89(3), 1995, 669-680. E-Journals
Guzzini, Stefano, ‘The different worlds of realism in international relations,’ Millennium, 30(1), 2001, pp.111-121. E-Journals
Menon, Rajan, and Hendrik Spruyt, ‘The limits of neorealism: Understanding security in Central Asia,’

Nincic, Miroslav, Democracy and Foreign Policy: The Fallacy of Political Realism, NY: Columbia University


Osiander, Andreas, ‘Before Sovereignty: Society and Politics in Ancien Régime Europe,’ Review of
International Studies, 27 (Special Issue), 2001, pp.119-145. E-Journals


Rittberger, Volker, ed., with the assistance of Peter Mayer, Regime Theory and International Relations,

Rosenberg, Justin, ‘A non-realist theory of sovereignty? Giddens’ The Nation-State and Violence,’

Rosenberg, Justin, Secret origins of the state: The structural basis of raison d’etat,’ Review of International
Studies, 18(2), 1992, pp.131-159. E-Journals

Russett, Bruce M., Thomas Risse-Kappen, and John J. Mearsheimer, ‘Correspondence: Back to the future,

Schroeder, Paul, ‘Historical reality and neo-realist theory,’ in Michael E. Brown, Sean M. Lynn-Jones, and
Steven E. Miller, eds., The Perils of Anarchy: Contemporary Realism and International Security,

Schweller, Randall L., and David Priess, ‘A tale of two realisms: Expanding the institutions debate,’

Spegele, Roger D., ‘Political realism and the remembrance of relativism,’ Review of International Studies,
21(3), 1995, 211-236. E-Journals

Spruyt, Hendrik, ‘Institutional selection in international relations: State anarchy as order,’ International

Strang, David, ‘Anomaly and commonplace in European political expansion: Realist and institutionalist

Suzuki, Motoshi, ‘Economic interdependence, relative gains, and international cooperation: The case of

JX1308 WAL

Waltz, Kenneth, Theory of International Politics, Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1979, Chapter 6. JX1308
WAL

Wilson, Peter, ‘Radicalism for a conservative purpose: The peculiar realism of E.H. Carr,’ Millennium, 30(1),


Wohlfarth, William C., ‘Realism and the end of the cold war,’ in Michael E. Brown, Sean M. Lynn-Jones,
and Steven E, Miller, eds. The Perils of Anarchy: Contemporary Realism and International Security,
Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1995, pp.3-41, JX1391 PER;

Wolf, Klaus Dieter, ‘The new raison d’etat as a problem for democracy in world society,’ European

Yarbrough, Beth V., and Robert M. Yarbrough, ‘International institutions and the new economics of

Young, Oran R., ‘International regimes: Toward a new theory of institutions,’ World Politics, 39(1), 1986,
pp.104-122. E-Journals

Young, Oran R., ‘Political leadership and regime formation: On the development of institutions in

Week 5

Armstrong, David, ‘The evolution of international society,’ in John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens
JZ1305 GLO

Bull, Hedley, ‘The Twenty Year’s Crisis Thirty Years On’, International Journal, 24, 625-38. EJournals


Dunne, Tim, ‘Mythology or Methodology? Traditions in International Theory’, Review of International Studies, 19, 305-18. EJournals


Keene, Edward, Beyond the Anarchical Society: Grotius, Colonialism and Order in World Politics, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Not in Bristol library)

Linklater, Andrew and Hidemi Suganami, The English School of International Relations: A Contemporary Reassessment, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Not in Bristol library)


Sharp, Paul, ‘Herbert Butterfield, the English School and the Civilizing Virtues of Diplomacy’, International Affairs, 79:4, 855-78. EJournals


Vincent, John, ‘Race in International Relations’, International Affairs, 58:4, 658-70. EJournals


Watson, Adam, ‘Foreword’ to the Forum on the English School, Review of International Studies, 27:3, 467-70. EJournals

Wheeler, Nicholas, ‘Hedley Bull's pluralism of the Intellect and Solidarism of the Will', International Affairs, 72:1, 91-107. EJournals

---

**Week 7**

*Some constructivist classics:*


Other readings:


Week 8


Cox, Michael, ‘September 11 and US hegemony – Or will the 21st century be American too?’, International Studies Perspectives, 3(1), 2002, pp.53-70. E-Journals


Hobden, Stephen, and Rochard Wyn Jones, ‘Marxist Theories of International Relations’ John Baylis and Steven Smith, The Globalization of World Politics. An Introduction to International Relations, 3rd edition JZ1305 GLO


Other relevant readings:

Amin, Samir, 'Accumulation on a world scale: Thirty years later,' *Rethinking MARXISM*, 1(2), 1988, pp.54-75.


Gills, B.K., 'Historical materialism and international relations theory,' *Millennium*, 16(2), 1987, pp.265-272. Serial JX1.M5


Jameson, Frederick, 'Postmodernism, or the cultural logic of late capitalism,' *New Left Review*, 146, 1984, pp.53-92. Serial HX1.N4


---

**Week 9**


---

**Week 10**


Darby, Philip. *At the Edge of International Relations. Postcolonialism, Gender and Dependency*. Cambridge: Continuum, 1997. **JV151 ATT**


---

**Week 11**


'Feminists write international relations,' special issue of *Alternatives*, 18(1), 1993. **Serial HC59.7.A7**

Grant, Rebecca, and Kathleen Newland, eds. *Gender and International Relations*, Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1991. **HQ1236 GEN**


Serial JX1.M5

Serial JX1.M5

Serial JX1.M5

Newland, Kathleen, 'From transnational relations to international relations: Women in development and the international decade of women,' *Millennium*, 17(3), 1988, pp.507-516.  
Serial JX1.M5

Serial JX1.M5

Serial JX1.M5

Serial JZ6.5 E8

Serial JX1391 STEA

Serial JX1391 TIC

Serial JX1391 SYL

Serial JX1391 TIC

Serial JX1391 TIC

Serial JX1391 TIC

Serial JX1391 TIC

Serial JX1391 TIC

Serial JX1391 TIC
Appendix A
Instructions on how to submit essays electronically

1. Log in to Blackboard (https://www.ole.bris.ac.uk/) and select the Blackboard course for the unit you are submitting work for. If you cannot see it, please e-mail f.cooper@bristol.ac.uk with your username and ask to be added.

2. Click on the "Submit Work Here" option on the left hand menu and then find the correct assessment from the list.

3. Select ‘view/complete’ for the appropriate piece of work. It is your responsibility to ensure that you have selected both the correct unit and the correct piece of work.

4. The screen will display ‘single file upload’ and your name. Enter your candidate number as a submission title, and then select the file that you wish to upload by clicking the ‘browse’ button. Click on the ‘upload’ button at the bottom.

5. You will then be shown the essay to be submitted. Check that you have selected the correct essay and click the ‘Submit’ button. This step must be completed or the submission is not complete.

6. You will be informed of a successful submission. A digital receipt is displayed on screen and a copy sent to your email address for your records.

Important notes

- You are only allowed to submit one file to Blackboard (single file upload), so ensure that all parts of your work – references, bibliography etc. – are included in one single document and that you upload the correct version. You will not be able to change the file once you have uploaded.

- Blackboard will accept a variety of file formats, but the School can only accept work submitted in .rtf (Rich Text Format) or .doc/.docx (Word Document) format. If you use another word processing package, please ensure you save in a compatible format.

- By submitting your essay, you are confirming that you have read the regulations on plagiarism and confirm that the submission is not plagiarised. You also confirm that the word count stated on the essay is an accurate statement of essay length.

- If Blackboard is not working email your assessment to f.cooper@bristol.ac.uk with the unit code and title in the subject line.

How to confirm that your essay has been submitted

You will have received a digital receipt by email and if you click on the assessment again (steps 1-4), you will see the title and submission date of the essay you have submitted. If you click on submit, you will not be able to submit again. This table also displays the date of submission. If you click on the title of the essay, it will open in a new window and you can also see what time the essay was submitted.
Appendix B
Summary of Relevant School Regulations
(Further details are in the Postgraduate taught handbook, which takes precedence)

Attendance of Seminars
SPAIS takes attendance of and participation in seminars very seriously. Seminars form an essential part of your learning and you need to make sure you arrive on time, have done the required reading and participate fully. Attendance at all seminars is monitored, with absence only condoned in cases of illness or for other exceptional reasons.
If you are unable to attend a seminar you must inform your seminar tutor. You should also provide evidence to explain your absence, such as a self-certification and/or medical note, counselling letter or other official document. If you are ill or are experiencing some other kind of difficulty which is preventing you from attending seminars for a prolonged period, please contact the Postgraduate Office or the Graduate Administration Manager who can advise on how to proceed.

Requirements for credit points
To be awarded credit points for a taught unit, students must:
- Have a satisfactory attendance record.
- Pass the summative assessment

Where there are multiple summative assessments in a unit, students must achieve the pass mark for the weighted average of the assessments (i.e. in the mark for the unit overall). They do not need to pass each individual piece of assessment.
If any of these conditions are not met, then your ability to progress through your degree may be affected.

Presentation of written work
Coursework must be word-processed. As a guide, use a clear, easy-to-read font such as Arial or Times New Roman, in at least 11pt. You may double-space or single-space your essays as you prefer. Your tutor will let you know if they have a preference.
All pages should be numbered. Ensure that the essay question appears on the first page.

Students are required to complete and include a cover page for essay/summative submissions – the template cover page will be available via the online submission point for students to complete.
Candidate numbers are required on summative work in order to ensure that marking is anonymous. Note that your candidate number is not the same as your student number. This number can be viewed in StudentInfo (https://www.bris.ac.uk/studentinfo). You should regard this number as personal to you and not share it with anyone else. The number is used to ensure that the marking of a student’s work is done anonymously. Please ensure that you memorise your candidate number as you will need to write it on every assessment.

Assessment Length
Each piece of coursework must not exceed the stipulated maximum length for the assignment (the ‘word count’) listed in the unit guide. Summative work that exceeds the maximum length will be subject to penalties. The word count is absolute (there is no 10% leeway, as commonly rumoured). Five marks will be deducted for every 100 words or part thereof over the word limit. Thus, an essay that is 1 word over the word limit will be penalised 5 marks; an essay that is 101 words over the word limit will be penalised 10 marks, and so on.

The word count includes all text, tables, numbers, footnotes/endnotes, Harvard referencing in the body of the text and direct quotes. It excludes the cover page, bibliography, headers and appendices. However, appendices should only be used for reproducing documents, not additional text written by you.

Students are advised that any attempt to circumvent word count limits by changing essay format, e.g. by removing spaces in references, will be investigated. In these cases, penalties will be applied if the actual word count is exceeded and further disciplinary action may be taken.
Students should be aware that word count penalties will incur a mark reduction that may in turn impact their progress and/or overall qualification.

Referencing and Plagiarism
Students are required to reference the source materials used to inform their submitted work. Students are expected to use the Harvard referencing system as set out in the relevant section of the SPAIS Study Guide. Unless otherwise stated, essays must contain a bibliography. Students should consult the SPAIS Study Guide for full details (students can access this via the SPAIS MSc-Dip Admin Blackboard site).

Inadequate referencing in submitted work can run the risk of plagiarism. Plagiarism is the unacknowledged inclusion in a student’s work of material derived from the published or unpublished work of another. This constitutes plagiarism whether it is intentional or unintentional. “Work” includes internet sources as well as printed material.

Plagiarism is a serious academic offence and penalties will be applied in such cases, as is set out in the SPAIS Postgraduate taught handbook. See also the relevant section of the School Study Skills Guide for more information.

Please note that plagiarism may lead to penalties that may prevent students found guilty of such an offence from progressing in their programme of study.

Extensions
Extensions to coursework deadlines will only be granted in exceptional circumstances. If you want to request an extension, complete a Coursework Extension Request Form (available at Blackboard/SPAIS MSC/Dip Administration/forms) and submit the form with your evidence (e.g. medical certificate, death certificate, or hospital letter) to Faye Cooper in the Postgraduate Office, 11 Priory Road or f.cooper@bristol.ac.uk.

Extension requests will not be considered if there is no supporting evidence.
All extension requests should be submitted at least 72 hours prior to the assessment deadline. If the circumstance occurs after this point, then please either telephone or see the Graduate Administration Manager in person. In their absence you can contact Faye Cooper in the PG Office, again in person or by telephone.

Extensions can only be granted by the Graduate Administration Office. They cannot be granted by unit convenors or seminar tutors.

You will receive an email to confirm whether your extension request has been granted or not.

**Submitting Essays/Work for assessment**

Formative work: Where applicable, details on how to submit formative work for assessment will be contained in this unit guide.

Summative work: All summative submissions **must be submitted electronically via Blackboard.**

Electronic copies enable an efficient system of receipting, providing the student and the School with a record of exactly when an essay was submitted. It also enables the School to systematically check the length of submitted essays and to safeguard against plagiarism.

**Late Submissions**

Penalties are imposed for work submitted late without an approved extension. Any kind of computer/electronic failure is **not** accepted as a valid reason for an extension, so make sure you back up your work on another computer, memory stick or in the cloud (e.g. One Drive, Dropbox or another equivalent system). Also ensure that the clock on your computer is correct. The following schema of marks deduction for late/non-submission is applied to both formative work and summative work:

- Up to 24 hours late, or part thereof **Penalty of 10 marks**
- For each additional 24 hours late, or part thereof A further 5 marks deduction for each 24 hours, or part thereof
- Assessment submitted over one week late Treated as a non-submission: fail and mark of zero recorded. This will be noted on your transcript.

- The 24 hour period runs from the deadline for submission, and includes Saturdays, Sundays, bank holidays and university closure days.
- If an essay submitted less than one week late fails solely due to the imposition of a late penalty, then the mark will be capped at 50 and recorded as a second attempt.

*Students should be aware that late penalties will incur a mark reduction that may in turn impact their progress and/or overall qualification.*

**Marks and Feedback**

In addition to an overall mark, students will receive written feedback on their assessed work.

In accordance with the Faculty’s Regulations and Code of Practice for Taught programmes, marks and feedback are typically returned within fifteen working days of the relevant submission deadline, unless exceptional circumstances arise in which case students will be informed of the deadline for return. The process of marking and providing detailed feedback is a labour-intensive one, with most 4000 word essays taking at least 45 minutes to assess and comment upon. Summative work also needs to be checked for plagiarism and length and moderated by a second member of staff to ensure marking is fair and consistent.

If work is submitted late, then it may not be possible to return feedback within fifteen working days.

**Fails and Resits**

If you fail the unit overall, you will normally be required to resubmit or resit unless you do not meet the progression requirements for your programme. Your School Office will contact you if this is the case.
Appendix C

Level 7 Marking and Assessment Criteria (Postgraduate)
All MSc/Diploma marking in the School is out of 100 on the following scale and with the following classifications:

70 and above Distinction
60-69 Merit
50-59 Pass
Below 50 Fail

Work within each of the classifications is expected to demonstrate the following attributes. Please note that markers do not weight each of these attributes equally when finalising the mark. Markers may also take into account the extent to which achievement of unit-specific intended learning outcomes (see unit guide) has been demonstrated when assessing work and arriving at the mark.

70-100: DISTINCTION

Addresses the Question Set
The work is a highly appropriate response to the question or assignment task that has been set. Coverage and selection of content is exemplary. There is clear analysis of the question or topic. Clear ability to analyse and synthesize ideas is demonstrated. At the upper end of the distinction range (marks of 80+), work will be outstanding in (where appropriate) its incorporation and use of empirical evidence/theoretical frameworks/methodological approaches in addressing the question.

Contains coherent structure and argument
The assignment is internally consistent, extremely coherent, concise and well-structured. The introduction is well focused and provides a clear indication of the rationale, key literature base used and organisation of the work. The central argument/structure of the work has a clear and logical sequence of progression. The conclusion draws insights which are logically developed from the analysis. At the upper end of the distinction range (marks of 80+), work will be outstanding in the extent to which the structure facilitates the answer to the question.

Demonstrates understanding of key concepts and/or data
A detailed understanding of key concepts and/or data will be demonstrated. At the upper end of the distinction range (marks of 80+) sustained evidence of critical understanding of concepts and/or critical analysis of data will be demonstrated.

Supports argument with appropriate evidence
The assignment demonstrates that an excellent knowledge of the topic has been gained from careful research and wide ranging reading that goes well beyond the prescribed reading list. The selection, interpretation, comparison, evaluation, and integration of evidence and source material to support the argument is extremely effective. At the upper end of the distinction range (marks of 80+), work will indicate outstanding ability to deal with complexity, contradictions or gaps in the existing academic literature.

Demonstrates critical evaluation
Work at this level will indicate a detailed and critical understanding of central theoretical and/or methodological issues as appropriate. At the upper end of the distinction range (marks of 80+) work will show extensive evidence of coherence, creativity, originality and imagination in addressing the question or topic.

Writing, Background Reading, Referencing and Bibliographic format
The work is extremely well presented, with minimal grammatical or spelling errors. It is written in a fluent and engaging style that demonstrates sufficient background reading, with exemplary referencing and bibliographic formatting in accordance with the required conventions. At the upper end of the distinction range (marks of 80+), the work will be virtually error-free in these respects.
**60-69: MERIT**

**Addresses the Question Set**
The work is a very appropriate response to the set question or assignment task. The question is addressed comprehensively, and a convincing and coherent argument is maintained in doing so. There is very good coverage of content and some evidence of an ability to think critically in relation to the question or topic will be shown. Where appropriate, the work will illustrate good comprehension of the theoretical implications of the set question or assignment.

**Contains coherent structure and argument**
The structure of the assignment is sound. The introduction is relevant and provides the reader with a clear guide to the central argument and the overall structure of the work. The conclusion will highlight and reflect upon the key points of argument developed within the main body of the essay and relative to the set question or assignment.

**Demonstrates understanding of key concepts and/or data**
A sound understanding of relevant key concepts and/or date has been developed and demonstrated, with key related issues and debates identified and discussed.

**Supports argument with appropriate evidence**
Overall there is a very good selection and use of sources which are well integrated, interpreted and evaluated. The work will demonstrate the ability to be selective in the range of material used. Some independent reading and research that goes beyond the prescribed reading list will be demonstrated, although the range of evidence used will be more restricted in comparison with an assignment awarded a higher grade.

**Demonstrates critical evaluation**
The work will clearly demonstrate a capacity to synthesise and critically evaluate source materials and/or debates in relation to the set question or assignment rather than simply describe or summarise them.

**Writing, Background Reading, Referencing and Bibliographic format**
The work is clear and fluent and largely conforms to referencing and bibliographic conventions. It has been well edited and demonstrates sufficient background reading. Proof-reading has resulted in there being few grammatical or spelling errors.

---

**50-59: PASS**

**Addresses the Question Set**
The work is a reasonably appropriate response to the set question or assignment task. All aspects of the set question or topic have been addressed. The work will show some comprehension of the underlying theoretical/methodological implications of the question where appropriate, but there may be limitations in the understanding of how these issues relate to the question.

**Contains coherent structure and argument**
The assignment has been effectively structured, although more careful editing may have improved the overall coherence of argument. The introduction is well focused and provides a sense of the central argument and overall organisation. The conclusion provides a summary of the discussion, although may be primarily descriptive in nature and may fail to reflect upon or support the argument fully.

**Demonstrates understanding of key concepts and/or data**
A basic level of understanding of relevant key concepts and/or data has been demonstrated, though there may be some errors and/or gaps in the knowledge and understanding. Key related issues have been identified and discussed but without many significant insights being developed.

**Supports argument with appropriate evidence**
The argument will be supported by reference to and incorporation of some relevant evidence, but with scope for greater range and depth of evidence. The work will indicate a generally clear understanding of
appropriate evidence, but this may be presented in an uncritical/descriptive manner and/or insufficiently incorporated into the overall argument in response to the set question or assignment task.

**Demonstrates critical evaluation**
A good range of relevant content has been covered, and there is some attempt at analysis but a tendency to be descriptive rather than critical. Work in this classification may also exhibit a tendency to assert/state points of argument rather than argue on the basis of reasoning and evidence.

**Writing, Background Reading, Referencing and Bibliographic format**
The style of writing is appropriate and presents few comprehension difficulties for the reader. The assignment is not as fluently written as it might have been, and there may be scope for improvement in spelling and grammar. There is evidence of sufficient background reading. Referencing and bibliographic formatting generally conform to the conventions, but there may be scope for further improvement in accuracy and consistency in accordance with the required conventions.

**0-49 FAIL**

** Addresses the Question Set**
Although some attempt will have been made, the work largely fails to address and/or significantly misunderstands the set question or assignment task. At the lower end of the fail range (marks of 0-40) there is little or no understanding of the set question or assignment task in evidence.

**Contains coherent structure and argument**
The work does not contain a sufficiently structured argument, and may be ineffectively organised. The introduction may lack a clear rationale or statement of argument, and/or may lack a clear outline of the overall structure of the assignment. The conclusion may lack any indication of insights in relation to the set question or assignment task. At the lower end of the fail range (marks of 0-40) the structure of the work may be incoherent or illogical, and/or the work may lack a clearly developed argument.

**Demonstrates understanding of key concepts and/or data**
There is limited knowledge and understanding of key concepts and/or data, with significant errors and/or omissions in this respect. At the lower end of the fail range (marks of 0-40) there may be significant lack of awareness or understanding of key concepts and/or data.

**Supports argument with appropriate evidence**
Few key points of appropriate evidence are identified and/or there may be very little attempt at analysis of evidence, with the work tending towards excessive description. At the lower end of the fail range (marks of 0-40) evidence referred to and included in the work may not be relevant to the addressing the set question or assignment task.

**Demonstrates critical evaluation**
The approach is typified by a general lack of critical evaluation in relation to relevant literature and issues. Work that simply asserts rather than argues a case may also fall into this classification. The use of sources may be excessively derivative of existing work, with little or no indication of an ability to independently analyse relevant material. At the lower end of the fail range (marks of 0-40) there is little or no evidence of critical evaluation.

**Writing, Background Reading, Referencing and Bibliographic format**
The standard of writing presents difficulties for the reader, with frequent grammatical and spelling errors to a degree that inhibits communication. The range and depth of background reading may be insufficient. The approach to referencing and bibliographic formatting does not follow the required conventions to a sufficiently consistent level. At the lower end of the fail range (marks of 0-40) the use of language may present considerable comprehension difficulties for the reader. The assignment may not meet stipulations in terms of layout and/or length, and the approach to referencing may not meet expected conventions.