

Assessment Criteria Exam (*Sensorveiledning*)  
SFS 20119 International Relations and Comparative Politics

*Background information:*

The exam text is a home exam. Students received the exam text on October 3<sup>rd</sup> and have had the opportunity to send questions and drafts to the lecturer after that date through e-mails. In addition, students had two additional opportunities (17<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup> Oct.) to ask general questions related to the exam followed by individual feedbacks (20 – 30 min.) on drafts and questions of research.

*Notes on the exam text:*

The exam question is two-fold. The first part seeks to evaluate whether and how the student understands basic elements of the realist school of thought in juxtaposing these with other theoretical approaches. In particular, the student is requested to address certain aspects that are at the heart of classical realism, namely, the normative differentiation between morality and ethical considerations related to the ‘public’ and ‘private’ sphere. The second part allows the student to pick a case study among four different themes – all of which have been covered in the lectures: i) states, nature and politics (Climate change and E-waste in Africa); ii) war and conflict (Syria); women, peace, and security as well as female citizenship (SR 1325, civil rights women in Middle East), and IPE (regulation and de-regulation of world economy after 1944).

Although the exam is constituted of two parts, the analysis of the two parts are envisaged to be related to each other. In other words: ability to present, argue and discuss theoretical aspects in light of the case is rewarded by higher mark. Importantly, the student is not required to enter into a philosophical discussion on ‘moral’ and ‘ethics’. These can be widely defined according to topic, theoretical school or question of research.

*Evaluation of knowledge on theoretical approaches: suggested criteria*

One way of evaluating knowledge pertaining to the art of argumentation in an academic text is the ability to differentiate analytically between two different but overlapping sorts of skills. First, presentation of empirical facts, historical data, background information on the one hand. Secondly, discussion/analysis of these facts and empirical data in the form of –for instance– arguments for or against a theoretical perspective or a particular point of view which relates to the question of research.

	Presentation ( <i>redegjørelse</i> )	Discussion / analysis ( <i>drøfting</i> )
‘Morality in the public sphere’		
‘Morality in the private sphere’		
Classical realism		
Neo-realist approaches		
Classical liberalism		
Other liberal approaches: International Society; Human Right		

International Political Economy		
Social constructivism & Feminist approaches		
Radical / Critical Theories		
Other?		

*Evaluation of other aspects related to essay: suggested criteria*

Question of research: Relevant? / Stated? / Clear?		
Definition of central concepts:		
Outline and framework for the essay ( <i>Disposisjon</i> ): Ability to explicitly state different parts of the essay. Eg. Introduction, question of research, definition of concepts, presentation of facts, discussion of arguments.		
Elaboration on context for choice of topic: political, historical, personal, etc...		
Ability to <b>present</b> case with use of theoretical perspectives.		
Ability to <b>discuss</b> case with use of theoretical perspectives / level of analysis.		
Use of levels of analysis: Domestic groups / National / Regional / International		
Use of academic literature:		
Use of other relevant literature:		
Use of references: Students are recommended to use a reference style from The Citation Compass: <a href="http://kildekompasset.no/english">http://kildekompasset.no/english</a>	Intext-citation	List of reference
Conclusion: Ability to draw conclusive remarks / reflect on topic addressed		