



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

Coordinated with the Quality Assurance Office

Minutes № 9, „21“ „August“, 2017 year

Head of the office

Diana Mchedlishvili, Associate Professor, Doctor

Reviewed at the Faculty Board

Minutes № 24, „23“ „August“, 2017 year

Dean of the Faculty

Ramazan Akbas, Doctor

Approved by the Academic Board

Minutes № 9, „24“ „August“, 2017 year

Rector

Ilyas Çiloğlu, Professor, Doctor

Master's Educational Program

International Relations and Politics

Tbilisi

2017 Year



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

Direction: 07 Social Sciences

Field / Specialty: 0705 International relations

Name of the Educational Programme: International Relations and Politics / საერთაშორისო ურთიერთობები და პოლიტიკა

Faculty: Social Sciences

Programme Coordinator(s): Assoc. Prof. Dr Ivanna Machitidze;

Contact information: Telephone number: +995 32 259 50 05/06/07 (ext. 121)

E-mail: imachitidze@ibsu.edu.ge

Education Cycle: Master's (second cycle of higher education)

Type of the Programme: Academic

Awarded Qualification: სოციალური მეცნიერებების მაგისტრი საერთაშორისო ურთიერთობებში
Master of Social Sciences in International Relations

Code of Qualification: 0705

Language of Education: English

Credit Value of the Programme: 120 ECTS credits

Structure of the Programme: The programme consists of 120 credits, which are distributed as follows:

- Obligatory courses of specialty - 50 credits;
- Elective courses of specialty - 40 credits;
- Master's Thesis - 30 credits.

Among 40 credits assigned to the elective courses of specialization, the student shall have the right to use 8 credits in the form of free credits.



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

Programme Admission Precondition:

- a. Students' admission to Master's Program shall take place in accordance with the legislation of Georgia - on the basis of the Unified Post-Graduate Exam (in cases stipulated by the legislation, without passing the Unified Post-Graduate Exams).
 - b. A person holding a Bachelor's or equivalent Academic Degree may become Student of the Master's Program.
 - c. Applicants willing to pursue studies at the present program must successfully pass the following exams: the English language exam (confirming the language knowledge at the B2 level) and field-specific exam organized by the University.
- Successfully passing the English language exam is the precondition for writing internal field-specific exam. At the English language exam student may receive the following evaluation: "Pass" (applicant demonstrates the B2 level knowledge of the English language) or "Fail" (applicant fails to satisfy the B2 level knowledge).
 - In case of successfully passing the English language exam, applicant is required to take internal field-specific exam which is assessed through the maximum of 100 points. If applicant fails to obtain minimum the point of 61 out of 100, s/he is to be excluded of the competition (the maximum of 20 applicants will be selected upon passing two exams).
 - Individuals, who have earned their Bachelor's Degree as a result of completing educational programme where the official language of instruction is English, or individuals in possession of valid international certificate (TOEFL IBT, IELTS and FCE) confirming the knowledge of English language at B2 level, shall be exempt from the English language exam.

Purpose of the Programme:

The purpose of the Master's Programme is to prepare highly qualified specialists, who will be able to conduct appropriate scientific research in the field of international relations. To this end, the programme has three objectives. First, the programme aims at equipping students with thorough knowledge of international relations theory and history including the key aspects of the field such as war, peace, security, foreign policy, etc. Second objective is to train students in research methodology applied in the field of international relations and politics. The programme aims at ensuring that students develop and/or enhance their skills in both qualitative and quantitative research methods. Moreover, the programme's goal is to allow students understand the philosophy of international relations and politics through confronting them with the current debates about the issues related to epistemology and ontology of international relations and politics. Finally, the third objective is to allow students freely and confidently specialise in the sub-field of their own choice through providing a wide range of elective courses covering the most important sub-fields of international relations and politics including but not limited to European politics, political theory, international law, energy security, international organizations, etc.



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

The objectives of the programme make it possible to prepare specialists of international relations and politics who will be competitive on an international labour market considering the contemporary requirements, which is in full compliance with the mission of the International Black Sea University. The goals of the programme aims at increasing employability of its graduates and/or increasing their competitiveness to further their studies at the doctoral level.

Learning Outcome:

After completion of the program, the graduate will have developed the following general and field-specific competencies:

| | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|
| Knowledge and Understanding | Advanced and systemic empirical and theoretical knowledge of international relations, which allows for understanding the problematique of the field | Student has: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Deep knowledge of International Relations theories, including classic schools as well as current trends and paradigms; ✓ Comprehensive knowledge of the historical events that led to the contemporary world order; ✓ Thorough awareness of the role of historiography and historicism in understanding international relations as an academic discipline; ✓ Thorough knowledge about the theory and causes of war, contemporary security challenges, etc.; ✓ Deep knowledge of foreign policy of Georgia, official priorities and challenges; ✓ Comprehension of the influence of the international system on the foreign policy of a small state and vice versa. ✓ Comprehensive understanding of the controversies in the philosophy of social science ✓ Clear awareness of alternatives to causal explanation and importance of interpretative and other approaches in social sciences ✓ Comprehensive knowledge of qualitative and quantitative research methodologies, their specific features, advantages and disadvantages; ✓ Full awareness of most important qualitative and quantitative research techniques, sampling strategies and data analysis methods. |
| Applying knowledge | Ability to act in a new, unpredictable and multidisciplinary environment; ability to search for new, original methods of solution for complex problems, amongst | Can: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Find new, original ways to solve complex problems, including the application of the relevant theoretical approaches to the empirical data; ✓ Prepare papers related to international relations theory in order to present at local and international conferences; ✓ Work out well-argued recommendations and/or solutions to the problems related to Georgian foreign policy; |



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--|
| | them, using the most recent methods and approaches. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Prepare a research project incorporating theoretical explanations and/or interpretations of Georgian foreign policy behaviour and present the paper at local or international conferences; ✓ Incorporate philosophical paradigms and concepts in their own research projects; ✓ Independently decide whether to use causal inference, interpretation, structural or functional explanation in their research projects; |
| Making judgments | Ability to make judgments on the basis of critical analysis of complex and incomplete information (including recent research findings); ability to synthesize innovatively based on recent data. | <p>Can:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Analyze national and international security challenges as well as challenges for peace and stability in concrete region and in the whole international system. ✓ Critically analyze key events in the history of international relations and make their conceptualization; ✓ Read, understand and interpret original academic texts related to international relations theory and formulate argument-based conclusions using an appropriate theoretical framework; ✓ Critically analyze and synthesize theoretical as well as empirical information including research data through an appropriate theoretical lens by identifying gaps and alternative interpretations of the incomplete information; ✓ Analyse and evaluate options of foreign policy paths a small state can pursue at a given period in a given environment; ✓ Critically evaluate research produced in social science in terms of the epistemology of the respective authors; ✓ Critically evaluate the quality of a given research paper depending on the philosophical stance of the author and epistemological and methodological approaches applied in the paper; ✓ Understand and critically assess results of empirical social research. |
| Communication skills | Ability to communicate own judgments, arguments and research methods to academic and professional community, with due consideration of the academic integrity standards. | <p>Can:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Communicate with scholars and practitioners of International Relations in a clear, concise and professional manner, explicitly state their opinion during discussions, working and board meetings by using their own judgments, argumentation and research methods, taking into consideration the standards of academic honesty; ✓ Utilize informational and communication technologies appropriate to the international standards, work with electronic documents, time-tables and databases; ✓ Present complex information and original analysis both orally and in writing; ✓ Present research findings in accordance with the academic writing standards. |



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | |
|------------------------|---|---|
| Learning skills | Ability to independently manage the learning process, to understand the specificities of the learning process and make strategic plans at a higher level. | Can: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Independently determine their research interests, preferences to particular theoretical school/schools; ✓ Identify a need for further studies in Georgia and/or abroad; ✓ Detect the gaps in understanding international relations as an academic discipline from historical perspective and need for researching these problems. |
| Values | Ability to evaluate own and others' attitude towards values and contribute to the establishment of new ones. | Has: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Awareness of the moral dilemmas of the International Relations as a discipline as well as a policy realm and form their ethical values in accordance to the contemporary norms and standards of the field. ✓ Normative insights on how the international actors should and should not behave; ✓ Clear understanding of normative controversies of various aspects of war; ✓ Recognition of the importance of unbiased approach to analysing conflicts even if the student is connected to one or more conflicting parties ✓ Recognition and tolerance towards the diversity of opinion and approaches to studying social phenomena ✓ Recognition of the importance of the ethical issues and ethical research ✓ Awareness of moral controversies social researchers face while doing their job; ✓ Commitment to act in the best interests of the research participants even if it causes conflict of interests with employer or the institution who has commissioned the study. |

Learning Outcome Map

| Course / Module / Internship / Research Component | Criteria of Competencies |
|---|--------------------------|
|---|--------------------------|



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | Knowledge and Understanding | Applying Knowledge | Making Judgments | Communication Skills | Learning Skills | Values |
|--|-----------------------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------------|-----------------|--------|
| I. Obligatory Courses | | | | | | |
| History of Diplomacy | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Theory of International Relations and Politics | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| War and Peace in International Relations | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Qualitative Research Methods | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Philosophy of Social Sciences | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Quantitative Research Methods | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Foreign Policy of Contemporary Georgia | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| II. Elective Courses | | | | | | |
| EU in International Relations | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Contemporary International Law | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Terrorism Studies | X | X | X | X | X | X |



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Caucasus/Black Sea Region and Regional Security | X | X | X | X | X | - |
| Energy Politics in Caucasus and Central Asia | X | X | X | X | X | - |
| Problems of Security and Regional Conflicts | X | X | X | X | X | - |
| Role of International Organizations in International Relations | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| International Security | X | X | X | X | X | - |
| US Foreign Policy since 1900 | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Transition in Post-Communist Eastern Europe and Former Soviet Union | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Political Economy of International Relations | X | X | X | X | - | - |
| New Security Challenges | X | X | X | X | X | - |
| Theory of Politics | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| World Politics | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Comparative Governance and Politics | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| III. Obligatory Research Component | | | | | | |
| Master Thesis | X | X | X | X | X | X |



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

Methods of Attainment of Learning Outcomes:

Format of learning and teaching methods include: lectures, seminars, individual and group works, practical activities, home assignments, presentations etc.

Following Methods of learning and teaching will be applied during the study process:

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| <p>Lecture</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • presentation • demonstration • induction • deduction • analysis • synthesis • case study • teaching through electronic sources |
| <p>Group work</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • discussion/debate • presentation • working with a course-book • demonstration • brain-storming • case study • simulation • role plays and situational games • project • induction • deduction • analysis • synthesis • teaching through electronic sources |
| <p>Practice / lab work</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demonstration • task solving • problem solving • group work • individual work • working with a course-book • induction |



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • analysis • synthesis • teaching through electronic sources |
| Seminar | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • presentation • discussion/debate • brain-storming • induction • deduction • analysis • synthesis • teaching through electronic sources |
| Independent work | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • working with a course-book • induction • deduction • analysis • synthesis • problem-based teaching • case study • preparing a presentation • preparing a project • doing homework • learning through electronic sources |

- **Case study** – Professor and students together discuss particular cases and attempt to make a comprehensive analysis of the case.
- **Action Based Learning** - Supervisor and students choose key words and students are supposed to find literature and write an essay around this key words. Later supervisor will analyse the essay and advises student on how to improve his/her writing;
- **Continuum** - The continuum activity is a method that encourages students to express positions on controversial issues. It is very useful to assess student knowledge before a lesson or to assess student understanding after a lesson. Because the method involves physical movement of students, it often stimulates even quiet students to speak out.
- **Role Play** - Role-playing is an activity in which students assume the role of another person and act it out. In a role play, students are usually given an open-ended situation in which they must make a decision, resolve a conflict, or act out the conclusion to an unfinished story. Role-playing is designed to promote



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

student empathy and understanding of others. By acting out the role of another individual it is easier to see others' points of view, including how other people think and feel. Role-playing can give students the opportunity to learn behavior appropriate for various situations. Role-playing is also useful for developing critical thinking, decision making, and assertiveness skills.

- **Fish Bowl Tag Discussion** - it is a teaching method designed to engage students in carefully-constructed discussion and requires effective listening skills. It works well in many types of classrooms, including classes that include students with a wide range of skills and experiences because it draws on personal knowledge and opinions.
- **Lecture Method** - A lecture is an oral presentation of information by the instructor. It is the method of relaying factual information which includes principles, concepts, ideas and all theoretical knowledge about a given topic. In a lecture the instructor tells, explains, describes or relates whatever information the trainees are required to learn through listening and understanding. It is therefore teacher-centered. This method is useful for presenting an organized body of new information to the learner. To be effective in promoting learning, the lecture must involve some discussions and, question and answer period to allow trainees to be involved actively.
- **Verbal Method** – Explaining new material verbally during which professor applies different teaching methods according to the topic explained;
- **Working on a Book** - A method in which the instructor assigns reading to books, periodicals, project or research papers or exercises for the practice;
- **The Demonstration Method** - A method of instruction where the instructor by actually performing an operation or doing a job shows the students what to do, how to do it, and through explanations brings out why, where, and when it is done.
- **Discussion/Debates** – One of the most widespread methods of interactive teaching. Discussion increases students involvement and participation throughout the class. Discussion may end with debates which is not limited with professor's questions. This method develops students' argumentation skills.
- **Collaborative work** – involves students' work in groups which work together to fulfill the given task. Group members may individually do their part of task and then share it with group members. Depending on the task, the functions of the students in the group may be divided. This strategy provides active involvement of all students in the educational process.
- **Induction, deduction, analysis and synthesis** – inductive method deals with generalizations based on concrete examples, deduction – with generalizations leading to concrete examples. Analysis helps us to split the material as a whole into meaningful pieces, in this way a complex problem is simplified and each part of it studied in detail. Synthesis, vice versa, by grouping certain issues, we make up a whole. It helps to see the problem as a whole, a unity.



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

Student Knowledge Evaluation System:

The goal of evaluation is to determine student's education results qualitatively in relation to academic program goals and parameters.

Student may be assessed orally and/or in a written way. A student's knowledge and skills are assessed through 100 points grading system. It consists of midterm and final evaluations, sum of which makes up 100 points.

Grading system allows:

- a) five types of positive grades:
 - 1) (A) Excellent – 91-100 points of assessment;
 - 2) (B) Very good – 81-90 points of maximal assessment;
 - 3) (C) Good - 71-80 points of maximal assessment;
 - 4) (D) Satisfactory - 61-70 points of maximal assessment;
 - 5) (E) Enough - 51-60 points of maximal assessment;
- b) two types of negative grades:
 - 1) (FX) Fail – 41-50 points of maximal assessment, meaning that a student requires some more work before passing and is given a chance to sit an additional examination after independent work;
 - 2) (F) Fail – 40 points and less of maximal assessment, meaning that the work of a student isn't acceptable and he/she has to study the subject anew.

For the midterm and final evaluations minimal passing grade is set. The final evaluation minimal passing grade must not exceed 60% of final evaluation grade.

Midterm and final evaluation grade distribution, their minimal competence levels and assessment criteria are described in the corresponding syllabus.

A credit can be awarded only after the attainment of learning outcomes, envisaged by the course syllabus and following requirements:

- a) Obtaining minimal competence levels set for midterm and final evaluations;
- b) Obtaining minimum 51 points out of 100 points of final grade.

A student is allowed to take an additional (make-up) exam in case he/she scored 41-50 points of final grade or minimum 51 points, but did not obtain minimal competence level set for final evaluation.



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

Assessment format:

- Objective testing (multiple choice, matching, gap filling, etc.)
- oral assessment with a rubric
- essay (assessed with a rubric)
- presentation (assessed with a rubric)
- analytical and informative reports (assessed with a rubric)
- group/individual project (assessed with a rubric)
- midterm and final exam.

Among assessment components, taking into consideration the nature of the course, are: correctness, exactness, completeness, adequacy of theoretical foundation and examples, relevance of applied terminology, degree of participation in discussion, and the logic of arguments.

MA Theses will be evaluated in the following terms:

- Excellent (*summa cum laude*)** – 91-100 points, excellent work
- Very good (*magna cum laude*)** – 81-90 points, result, which is above all the requirements in every way
- Good (*cum laude*)** – 71-80 points, result, which is above the requirements
- Satisfactory (*bene*)** – 61-70 points, result, which satisfies all the requirements in every way
- Enough (*rite*)** – 51-60 points, result, which despite the shortcomings, still satisfies the requirements
- Insufficient can be revised (*insufficenter*)** – 41-50 points, result, which because of the significant shortcomings, does not satisfy the requirements
- Unsatisfactory (*sub omni canone*)** – 40 points or less, result, which does not satisfy the requirements at all

If student is assessed by “summa cum laude”, “magna cum laude”, “cum laude”, “bene”, “rite” - s/he is awarded the MA degree, if student is assessed by, “insufficenter” – the student has a right to improve and re-defend the same thesis, if student is assessed by “sub omni canone” – the student has no right to re-defend the same thesis.



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

Master Thesis will be evaluated according to the following criteria:

The programme envisages two types of MA theses: 1) thesis based on primary sources (the student conducts field-work); 2) thesis based on secondary sources (the student does not conduct field-work).

1) Criteria for evaluating field-work based theses:

a. Criteria for written evaluation of field-work based MA theses:

| Component | General guiding principles | Weight of the component in the final evaluation |
|--|--|---|
| Title and research topic | 5 points – the title fully expresses the research topic through keywords, the topic of the research represents a significant challenge for the studying and development of international relations; 4-3 – the title clearly expresses the research topic, the topic of the research concerns a significant problem of the field; 2-1 – the title incompletely expresses the research topic, which concerns a well-researched theme of the field; 0 – assignment not submitted. | 5 points |
| Research question and hypothesis or a research goal | 10-9 points – research goal/question and hypothesis are clearly constructed; variables are clearly identified and their conceptualization and/or operationalization is comprehensively undertaken; research objects are specified; 8-7 – research goal/question and hypothesis are clearly constructed but minor flaws are noticeable; variables are not completely clearly identified and their conceptualization and/or operationalization raise questions; research objects are specified; 6-4 – research goal/question and hypothesis are vague; variables are not clearly identified and the attempt at their conceptualization and/or operationalization is incomplete; research objects are not specified; 3-1 – research goal/question and hypothesis are not identifiable; variables are not identified and research objects are not specified; 0 – assignment not submitted. | 10 points |
| Literature review | 25-23 points – the paper cites relevant academic literature, the author completely understands the academic debates on a given topic and critically analyses used materials; | 25 points |



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|-----------|
| | <p>22-19 – the paper cites relevant academic literature, the author almost completely understands the academic debates on a given topic and stands out with critical analysis;</p> <p>18-15 – the paper cites academic literature as well as other types of literature, which is irrelevant for literature review, the author demonstrates good knowledge of the academic debates on a given topic and critical analysis needs to be refined;</p> <p>14-11 – the paper cites academic literature but at the same time by citing non-academic texts the author fails to demonstrate the knowledge of the academic debates on a given topic, flaws in critical analysis are noticeable;</p> <p>10-7 – the paper mostly cites non-academic literature but some academic texts are also cited, the author fails to demonstrate the knowledge of the academic debates, the used materials are simply summed up and critical analysis is absent;</p> <p>6-4 – the paper is completely based on non-academic literature, because of which the author fails to demonstrate any knowledge of academic debates, critical analysis is absent;</p> <p>3-1 – the paper cites unreliable sources, the author fails to demonstrate any knowledge of academic debates, critical analysis is absent;</p> <p>0 – assignment not submitted.</p> | |
| Research methodology | <p>25-23 points – the paper uses optimal research methods closely related to the goal of the research, the author fully understands the advantages and disadvantages of the methods used, data analysis techniques are fully explained and do not raise any questions;</p> <p>22-19 – the paper uses optimal research methods closely related to the goal of the research, the author fully understands the advantages and disadvantages of the methods used, however, data analysis techniques are not fully explained and raise some questions;</p> <p>18-15 – the paper uses relevant but not optimal research methods, the author fully understands the advantages and disadvantages of the methods used, however, data analysis techniques are not fully explained and raise some questions;</p> <p>14-11 – the paper uses relevant but not optimal research methods, the author does not fully understand the advantages and disadvantages of the methods used, data analysis techniques are not fully explained and raise some questions;</p> <p>10-7 – the paper uses irrelevant research methods, the author does not fully understand the advantages and disadvantages of the methods used, data analysis techniques are not explained;</p> <p>6-4 – the data-collection methods used in the research is unclear, data analysis techniques are not explained;</p> <p>3-1 – the paper almost does not use a concrete methodological framework for data collection and analysis;</p> <p>0 – assignment not submitted.</p> | 25 points |
| Data analysis / argumentation | <p>25-23 points – data is analysed in line with the methodological framework applied for data collection, the author critically analyses sources and uses logical, well-argued inference to support a certain position;</p> | 25 points |



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | |
|-------------------|---|----------|
| | <p>22-19 – data is analysed in line with the methodological framework applied for data collection, however, the critical analysis of sources as well as use of logical and argued inference to support a certain position includes some drawbacks;</p> <p>18-15 – data is analysed in line with the methodological framework applied for data collection but critical analysis includes significant weaknesses, logical and argued inference to support a certain position also includes some drawbacks;</p> <p>14-11 – data is analysed in line with the methodological framework applied for data collection but critical analysis of sources as well as use of logical and argued inference to support a certain position includes significant drawbacks;</p> <p>10-7 – data is not analysed according to the methodological framework applied for data collection, critical analysis and logical reasoning is deficient, argumentation includes some drawbacks;</p> <p>6-4 – data is not analysed according to the methodological framework applied for data collection, critical analysis and logical reasoning is deficient, argumentation includes some drawbacks;</p> <p>3-1 – data is not analysed according to the methodological framework applied for data collection, critical analysis and logical reasoning are absent;</p> <p>0 – assignment not submitted.</p> | |
| Conclusion | <p>5 points – the author effectively and succinctly sums up the major arguments expressed in the paper and clearly demonstrates the originality of the work as well as its contribution to the development of the field;</p> <p>4-3 – the author effectively and succinctly sums up the major arguments expressed in the paper; however, the originality of the work as well as its contribution to the development of the field remain unclear;</p> <p>2-1 – the author is not able to effectively and succinctly sums up the major arguments expressed in the paper and the originality of the work as well as its contribution to the development of the field remain unclear;</p> <p>0 – assignment not submitted.</p> | 5 points |
| Style | <p>5 points – the work is fully in line with the principles of academic writing, the text is coherent structurally and stilistically, there are few grammar mistakes;</p> <p>4-3 – the work is fully in line with the principles of academic writing, the text is almost coherent structurally and stilistically, there are a few grammar mistakes;</p> <p>2-1 – the work is not in line with the principles of academic writing, the structure and style are not coherent, there are abundant grammar mistakes;</p> <p>0 – assignment not submitted.</p> | 5 points |

b. Evaluation criteria for the defence of field-work based MA theses:



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| Component | General guiding principles | Weight of the component in the final evaluation |
|--|--|---|
| Title and research topic | 5 points – the title fully expresses the research topic through keywords, the topic of the research represents a significant challenge for the studying and development of international relations; 4-3 – the title clearly expresses the research topic, the topic of the research concerns a significant problem of the field; 2-1 – the title incompletely expresses the research topic, which concerns a well-researched theme of the field; 0 – assignment not submitted. | 5 points |
| Research question and hypothesis or a research goal | 10-9 points – research goal/question and hypothesis are clearly constructed; variables are clearly identified and their conceptualization and/or operationalization is comprehensively undertaken; research objects are specified; 8-7 – research goal/question and hypothesis are clearly constructed but minor flaws are noticeable; variables are not completely clearly identified and their conceptualization and/or operationalization raise questions; research objects are specified; 6-4 – research goal/question and hypothesis are vague; variables are not clearly identified and the attempt at their conceptualization and/or operationalization is incomplete; research objects are not specified; 3-1 – research goal/question and hypothesis are not identifiable; variables are not identified and research objects are not specified; 0 – assignment not submitted. | 10 points |
| Literature review | 15-14 points – the paper cites relevant academic literature, the author completely understands the academic debates on a given topic and critically analyses used materials; 13-12 – the paper cites relevant academic literature, the author almost completely understands the academic debates on a given topic and stands out with critical analysis; 11-10 – the paper cites academic literature as well as other types of literature, which is irrelevant for literature review, the author demonstrates good knowledge of the academic debates on a given topic and critical analysis needs to be refined; 9-8 – the paper cites academic literature but at the same time by citing non-academic texts the author fails to demonstrate the knowledge of the academic debates on a given topic, flaws in critical analysis are noticeable; 7-6 – the paper mostly cites non-academic literature but some academic texts are also cited, the author fails to demonstrate the knowledge of the academic debates, the used materials are simply summed up and critical analysis is absent; | 15 points |



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|-----------|
| | <p>5-4 – the paper is completely based on non-academic literature, because of which the author fails to demonstrate any knowledge of academic debates, critical analysis is absent;</p> <p>3-1 – the paper cites unreliable sources, the author fails to demonstrate any knowledge of academic debates, critical analysis is absent;</p> <p>0 – assignment not submitted.</p> | |
| Research methodology | <p>20-19 points – the paper uses optimal research methods closely related to the goal of the research, the author fully understands the advantages and disadvantages of the methods used, data analysis techniques are fully explained and do not raise any questions;</p> <p>18-17 – the paper uses optimal research methods closely related to the goal of the research, the author fully understands the advantages and disadvantages of the methods used, however, data analysis techniques are not fully explained and raise some questions;</p> <p>16-15 – the paper uses relevant but not optimal research methods, the author fully understands the advantages and disadvantages of the methods used, however, data analysis techniques are not fully explained and raise some questions;</p> <p>14-11 – the paper uses relevant but not optimal research methods, the author does not fully understand the advantages and disadvantages of the methods used, data analysis techniques are not fully explained and raise some questions;</p> <p>10-7 – the paper uses irrelevant research methods, the author does not fully understand the advantages and disadvantages of the methods used, data analysis techniques are not explained;</p> <p>6-4 – the data-collection methods used in the research is unclear, data analysis techniques are not explained;</p> <p>3-1 – the paper almost does not use a concrete methodological framework for data collection and analysis;</p> <p>0 – assignment not submitted.</p> | 20 points |
| Data analysis / argumentation | <p>20-19 points – data is analysed in line with the methodological framework applied for data collection, the author critically analyses sources and uses logical, well-argued inference to support a certain position;</p> <p>18-17 – data is analysed in line with the methodological framework applied for data collection, however, the critical analysis of sources as well as use of logical and argued inference to support a certain position includes some drawbacks;</p> <p>16-15 – data is analysed in line with the methodological framework applied for data collection but critical analysis includes significant weaknesses, logical and argued inference to support a certain position also includes some drawbacks;</p> <p>14-11 – data is analysed in line with the methodological framework applied for data collection but critical analysis of sources as well as use of logical and argued inference to support a certain position includes significant drawbacks;</p> <p>10-7 – data is not analysed according to the methodological framework applied for data collection, critical analysis and logical reasoning is deficient, argumentation includes some drawbacks;</p> | 20 points |



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | |
|---|---|-----------|
| | 6-4 – data is not analysed according to the methodological framework applied for data collection, critical analysis and logical reasoning is deficient, argumentation includes some drawbacks; 3-1 – data is not analysed according to the methodological framework applied for data collection, critical analysis and logical reasoning are absent; 0 – assignment not submitted. | |
| Conclusion | 5 points – the author effectively and succinctly sums up the major arguments expressed in the paper and clearly demonstrates the originality of the work as well as its contribution to the development of the field; 4-3 – the author effectively and succinctly sums up the major arguments expressed in the paper; however, the originality of the work as well as its contribution to the development of the field remain unclear; 2-1 – the author is not able to effectively and succinctly sums up the major arguments expressed in the paper and the originality of the work as well as its contribution to the development of the field remain unclear; 0 – assignment not submitted. | 5 points |
| Style | 5 points – the work is fully in line with the principles of academic writing, the text is coherent structurally and stylistically, there are few grammar mistakes; 4-3 – the work is fully in line with the principles of academic writing, the text is almost coherent structurally and stylistically, there are a few grammar mistakes; 2-1 – the work is not in line with the principles of academic writing, the structure and style are not coherent, there are abundant grammar mistakes; 0 – assignment not submitted. | 5 points |
| Speech and contact with the audience | 5 points – the author speaks clearly and understandably, shows confidence and maintains contact with the audience; 4-3 – the author speaks in a concrete manner and does not use any vague claims, establishes contact with the audience but lacks confidence; 2-1 – the author frequently makes long pauses, repeats the same phrases and expressions and rarely establishes contact with the audience; 0 – assignment not submitted. | 5 points |
| Answers to questions | 15-13 points – the author fully answers every question and demonstrates complex understanding of the topic; 12-10 – the author fully answers most questions and demonstrates deep understanding of the topic; 9-6 – the author answers most questions incompletely or only a part of questions are answered fully and demonstrates satisfactory knowledge of the topic; 5-1 – the author incompletely answers almost all questions or manages to answer only a part of the questions and demonstrates dissatisfactory knowledge of the topic; 0 – assignment not submitted. | 15 points |

2. Evaluation criteria for the MA theses not based on field-work:



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

a. Criteria for written evaluation of the MA theses not based on field-work:

| Component | General guiding principles | Weight of the component in the final evaluation |
|--|--|---|
| Title and research topic | 5 points – the title fully expresses the research topic through keywords, the topic of the research represents a significant challenge for the studying and development of international relations; 4-3 – the title clearly expresses the research topic, the topic of the research concerns a significant problem of the field; 2-1 – the title incompletely expresses the research topic, which concerns a well-researched theme of the field; 0 – assignment not submitted. | 5 points |
| Research question and hypothesis or a research goal | 10-9 points – research goal/question and hypothesis are clearly constructed; variables are clearly identified and their conceptualization and/or operationalization is comprehensively undertaken; research objects are specified; 8-7 – research goal/question and hypothesis are clearly constructed but minor flaws are noticeable; variables are not completely clearly identified and their conceptualization and/or operationalization raise questions; research objects are specified; 6-4 – research goal/question and hypothesis are vague; variables are not clearly identified and the attempt at their conceptualization and/or operationalization is incomplete; research objects are not specified; 3-1 – research goal/question and hypothesis are not identifiable; variables are not identified and research objects are not specified; 0 – assignment not submitted. | 15 points |
| Literature review | 25-23 points – the paper cites relevant academic literature, the author completely understands the academic debates on a given topic and critically analyses used materials; the paper develops a comprehensive theoretical framework, which represents an excellent synthesis of the used literature and which is applied in explaining or interpreting the research phenomenon; 22-20 – the paper cites relevant academic literature, the author almost completely understands the academic debates on a given topic and stands out with critical analysis; the paper develops a solid theoretical framework, which represents an interesting synthesis of the used literature and which is applied in explaining or interpreting the research phenomenon; 19-17 – the paper cites academic literature as well as other types of literature, which is irrelevant for literature review, the author demonstrates good knowledge of the academic debates on a given topic and critical | 25 points |



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | |
|---|--|------------------|
| | <p>analysis needs to be refined; the theoretical framework developed in the paper has significant flaws but the authors manages to convincingly explain or interpret the research phenomenon; 16-13 – the paper cites academic literature but at the same time by citing non-academic texts the author fails to demonstrate the knowledge of the academic debates on a given topic, flaws in critical analysis are noticeable; the paper contains a weak attempt at developing a theoretical framework, which is incomplete; 12-9 – the paper mostly cites non-academic literature but some academic texts are also cited, the author fails to demonstrate the knowledge of the academic debates, the used materials are simply summed up and critical analysis is absent; the paper contains almost no attempt at developing a theoretical framework; 8-5 – the paper is completely based on non-academic literature, because of which the author fails to demonstrate any knowledge of academic debates, critical analysis is absent; the paper does not contain a theoretical framework; 4-1 – the paper cites unreliable sources, the author fails to demonstrate any knowledge of academic debates, critical analysis is absent; the paper does not contain a theoretical framework; 0 – assignment not submitted.</p> | |
| <p>Research methodology</p> | <p>15-13 points – the paper critically analyses the research methodology applied in secondary sources as well as the socio-political and historical context in which a particular text was created, the author provides alternative interpretations of the existing data; 12-10 points – the paper critically analyses the research methodology applied in secondary sources as well as the socio-political and historical context in which a particular text was created but minor flaws are noticeable, the author provides alternative interpretations of the existing data but lacks convincing arguments; 9-5 points – the paper critically analyses the research methodology applied in secondary sources as well as the socio-political and historical context in which a particular text was created but major flaws are obvious, the author provides alternative interpretations of the existing data but there are logical holes in reasoning; 4-1 points – the paper provides an attempt at critically analysing the research methodology applied in secondary sources as well as the socio-political and historical context in which a particular text was created, the author does not try to provide alternative interpretations of the existing data; 0 - assignment not submitted.</p> | <p>15 points</p> |
| <p>Data analysis / argumentation</p> | <p>25-23 points – data is analysed in line with the theoretical framework developed in literature review, the author critically analyses sources and uses logical, well-argued inference to support a certain position; 22-19 – data is analysed in line with the theoretical framework developed in literature review, however, the critical analysis of sources as well as use of logical and argued inference to support a certain position includes some drawbacks; 18-15 – data is analysed in line with the theoretical framework developed in literature review but critical analysis includes significant weaknesses, logical and argued inference to support a certain position also includes some drawbacks;</p> | <p>25 points</p> |



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | |
|-------------------|--|-----------|
| | <p>14-11 – data is analysed in line with the theoretical framework developed in literature review but critical analysis of sources as well as use of logical and argued inference to support a certain position includes significant drawbacks;</p> <p>10-7 – data is not analysed according to the theoretical framework developed in literature review, critical analysis and logical reasoning is deficient, argumentation includes some drawbacks;</p> <p>6-4 – data is not analysed according to the theoretical framework developed in literature review, critical analysis and logical reasoning is deficient, argumentation includes some drawbacks;</p> <p>3-1 – data is not analysed according to the theoretical framework developed in literature review, critical analysis and logical reasoning are absent;</p> <p>0 – assignment not submitted.</p> | |
| Conclusion | <p>5 points – the author effectively and succinctly sums up the major arguments expressed in the paper and clearly demonstrates the originality of the work as well as its contribution to the development of the field;</p> <p>4-3 – the author effectively and succinctly sums up the major arguments expressed in the paper; however, the originality of the work as well as its contribution to the development of the field remain unclear;</p> <p>2-1 – the author is not able to effectively and succinctly sums up the major arguments expressed in the paper and the originality of the work as well as its contribution to the development of the field remain unclear;</p> <p>0 – assignment not submitted.</p> | 10 points |
| Style | <p>5 points – the work is fully in line with the principles of academic writing, the text is coherent structurally and stilistically, there are few grammar mistakes;</p> <p>4-3 – the work is fully in line with the principles of academic writing, the text is almost coherent structurally and stilistically, there are a few grammar mistakes;</p> <p>2-1 – the work is not in line with the principles of academic writing, the structure and style are not coherent, there are abundant grammar mistakes;</p> <p>0 – assignment not submitted.</p> | 5 points |

b. Evaluation criteria for the defence of the MA theses not based on field-work:

| Component | General guiding principles | Weight of the component in the final evaluation |
|---------------------------------|--|---|
| Title and research topic | <p>5 points – the title fully expresses the research topic through keywords, the topic of the research represents a significant challenge for the studying and development of international relations;</p> <p>4-3 – the title clearly expresses the research topic, the topic of the research concerns a significant problem of the field;</p> <p>2-1 – the title incompletely expresses the research topic, which concerns a well-researched theme of the field;</p> <p>0 – assignment not submitted.</p> | 5 points |



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | |
|---|---|------------------|
| <p>Research question and hypothesis or a research goal</p> | <p>10-9 points – research goal/question and hypothesis are clearly constructed; variables are clearly identified and their conceptualization and/or operationalization is comprehensively undertaken; research objects are specified; 8-7 – research goal/question and hypothesis are clearly constructed but minor flaws are noticeable; variables are not completely clearly identified and their conceptualization and/or operationalization raise questions; research objects are specified; 6-4 – research goal/question and hypothesis are vague; variables are not clearly identified and the attempt at their conceptualization and/or operationalization is incomplete; research objects are not specified; 3-1 – research goal/question and hypothesis are not identifiable; variables are not identified and research objects are not specified; 0 – assignment not submitted.</p> | <p>10 points</p> |
| <p>Literature review</p> | <p>20-19 points – the paper cites relevant academic literature, the author completely understands the academic debates on a given topic and critically analyses used materials; the paper develops a comprehensive theoretical framework, which represents an excellent synthesis of the used literature and which is applied in explaining or interpreting the research phenomenon; 18-17 – the paper cites relevant academic literature, the author almost completely understands the academic debates on a given topic and stands out with critical analysis; the paper develops a solid theoretical framework, which represents an interesting synthesis of the used literature and which is applied in explaining or interpreting the research phenomenon; 16-15 – the paper cites academic literature as well as other types of literature, which is irrelevant for literature review, the author demonstrates good knowledge of the academic debates on a given topic and critical analysis needs to be refined; the theoretical framework developed in the paper has significant flaws but the authors manages to convincingly explain or interpret the research phenomenon; 14-11 – the paper cites academic literature but at the same time by citing non-academic texts the author fails to demonstrate the knowledge of the academic debates on a given topic, flaws in critical analysis are noticeable; the paper contains a weak attempt at developing a theoretical framework, which is incomplete; 10-7 – the paper mostly cites non-academic literature but some academic texts are also cited, the author fails to demonstrate the knowledge of the academic debates, the used materials are simply summed up and critical analysis is absent; the paper contains almost no attempt at developing a theoretical framework; 6-4 – the paper is completely based on non-academic literature, because of which the author fails to demonstrate any knowledge of academic debates, critical analysis is absent; the paper does not contain a theoretical framework; 3-1 – the paper cites unreliable sources, the author fails to demonstrate any knowledge of academic debates, critical analysis is absent; the paper does not contain a theoretical framework; 0 – assignment not submitted.</p> | <p>20 points</p> |



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | |
|---|---|------------------|
| <p>Research methodology</p> | <p>10-9 points – the paper critically analyses the research methodology applied in secondary sources as well as the socio-political and historical context in which a particular text was created, the author provides alternative interpretations of the existing data; 8-7 points – the paper critically analyses the research methodology applied in secondary sources as well as the socio-political and historical context in which a particular text was created but minor flaws are noticeable, the author provides alternative interpretations of the existing data but lacks convincing arguments; 6-4 points – the paper critically analyses the research methodology applied in secondary sources as well as the socio-political and historical context in which a particular text was created but major flaws are obvious, the author provides alternative interpretations of the existing data but there are logical holes in reasoning; 3-1 points – the paper provides an attempt at critically analysing the research methodology applied in secondary sources as well as the socio-political and historical context in which a particular text was created, the author does not try to provide alternative interpretations of the existing data; 0 - assignment not submitted.</p> | <p>10 points</p> |
| <p>Data analysis / argumentation</p> | <p>25-23 points – data is analysed in line with the theoretical framework developed in literature review, the author critically analyses sources and uses logical, well-argued inference to support a certain position; 22-19 – data is analysed in line with the theoretical framework developed in literature review, however, the critical analysis of sources as well as use of logical and argued inference to support a certain position includes some drawbacks; 18-15 – data is analysed in line with the theoretical framework developed in literature review but critical analysis includes significant weaknesses, logical and argued inference to support a certain position also includes some drawbacks; 14-11 – data is analysed in line with the theoretical framework developed in literature review but critical analysis of sources as well as use of logical and argued inference to support a certain position includes significant drawbacks; 10-7 – data is not analysed according to the theoretical framework developed in literature review, critical analysis and logical reasoning is deficient, argumentation includes some drawbacks; 6-4 – data is not analysed according to the theoretical framework developed in literature review, critical analysis and logical reasoning is deficient, argumentation includes some drawbacks; 3-1 – data is not analysed according to the theoretical framework developed in literature review, critical analysis and logical reasoning are absent; 0 – assignment not submitted.</p> | <p>25 points</p> |
| <p>Conclusion</p> | <p>5 points – the author effectively and succinctly sums up the major arguments expressed in the paper and clearly demonstrates the originality of the work as well as its contribution to the development of the field; 4-3 – the author effectively and succinctly sums up the major arguments expressed in the paper; however, the originality of the work as well as its contribution to the development of the field remain unclear;</p> | <p>5 points</p> |



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | |
|---|---|-----------|
| | 2-1 – the author is not able to effectively and succinctly sums up the major arguments expressed in the paper and the originality of the work as well as its contribution to the development of the field remain unclear; 0 – assignment not submitted. | |
| Style | 5 points – the work is fully in line with the principles of academic writing, the text is coherent structurally and stilistically, there are few grammar mistakes; 4-3 – the work is fully in line with the principles of academic writing, the text is almost coherent structurally and stilistically, there are a few grammar mistakes; 2-1 – the work is not in line with the principles of academic writing, the structure and style are not coherent, there are abundant grammar mistakes; 0 – assignment not submitted. | 5 points |
| Speech and contact with the audience | 5 points – the author speaks clearly and understandably, shows confidence and maintains contact with the audience; 4-3 – the author speaks in a concrete manner and does not use any vague claims, establishes contact with the audience but lacks confidence; 2-1 – the author frequently makes long pauses, repeats the same phrases and expressions and rarely establishes contact with the audience; 0 – assignment not submitted. | 5 points |
| Answers to questions | 15-13 points – the author fully answers every question and demonstrates complex understanding of the topic; 12-10 – the author fully answers most questions and demonstrates deep understanding of the topic; 9-6 – the author answers most questions incompletely or only a part of questions are answered fully and demonstrates satisfactory knowledge of the topic; 5-1 – the author incompletely answers almost all questions or manages to answer only a part of the questions and demonstrates dissatisfactory knowledge of the topic; 0 – assignment not submitted. | 15 points |

Specificities of the Organization of the Teaching Process: MA Programme in International Relations and Politics is designed as 120 ECTS and consists of core as well as elective components/courses.

8 ECTS are assigned to four of the core courses and 6 ECTS are assigned to three of the core courses. All elective courses are assigned 8 ECTS. Courses on the MA programme are aimed to focus mainly on independent learning and research incomparison to BA studies.

The elective courses of the programme provide opportunity for students to plan/create their individual study programme in accordance with their preferences and interests. This will increase their competitiveness on the labor market and contribute to their professional carrier building. Of the 40 ECTS of elective courses students are free to earn 8 ECTS as free credits.



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

MA Thesis is scheduled for the fourth semester of the studies and is designed as a 30 ECTS course.

Field of Employment: MA students of International Relations and Politics will be able to work as university lecturers, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, State structures responsible for foreign policy and national security issues, namely, Office of National Security Council, Ministry of Defense, foreign relations departments of various Ministries, NGOs working on international relations and national security issues, research centers, etc.

Besides, MA graduate can continue studies in Ph.D. program to increase his/her competence and qualification.

Information Concerning Material Resources Necessary for the Implementation of the programme:

Material resources (infrastructure)

IBSU's infrastructure and material resources completely meet international standards:

- Students' security is protected 24/7 at IBSU;
- The campus has its own canteen, computer rooms, medical room, playgrounds for various sports, etc.;
- During the 2015-2016 academic year the Faculty of Social Sciences had up to 20 classrooms at its disposal;
- Every classroom is equipped with a computer, projector, loudspeakers and the Internet;
- The university has large and small conference halls, which allows students to get actively involved in extracurricular activities such as public lectures, conferences, seminars and trainings;
- The new campus of the university opened in August 2016 after which IBSU acquired up to 50 more classrooms;
- The university has student information database (SIS) in which every student has their own individual account. The database allows students to register, choose desirable courses, view grades, order transcripts electronically and evaluate lecturers;
- The university additionally has a student portal (SMART), which allows students to access materials used by lecturers during teaching process. Students have individual accounts accessed by e-mail and password;
- Under the auspices of the Faculty of Social Sciences, there is an IBSU Center for Political Research and Black Sea Region Geopolitical Research Center, which conduct research on current issues in the region and additionally serve to advance the knowledge and research skills of students. Students are involved in research projects of these centers and with the guidance of the qualified instructors contribute to the development of the organizations;
- The Faculty of Social Sciences published an academic journal "Journal of Social Science", which provides an opportunity for graduate students to publish their academic works.

Library



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

International Black Sea University pays special attention to the library and development of the relevant material-technical base in order to meet international standards:

- IBSU’s library resources include a rich catalogue of books and articles. According to the data of the autumn semester of the 2015-2016 academic year the IBSU library stacks up to 23,000 items;
- The university ensures that students are able to access obligatory literature in a printed or electronic form;
- The library has an electronic catalogue, which allows students independently search for the desired literature;
- The library also offers access to EBSCO and JSTOR databases;

The library is equipped with computers.

Information Concerning Human Resources Necessary for the Implementation of the programme:

| Course name | Name and surname | Qualifications |
|---|-------------------|--|
| History of Diplomacy | Amiran Kavadze | Assoc. Prof. Dr. / Master of Politology / PhD in Biology |
| Theory of International Relations and Politics | Nino Kereselidze | Assoc. Prof. Dr. / PhD in International Relations |
| War and Peace in International Relations | Andrew Hargreaves | Invited Lecturer / PhD in War Studies |
| Qualitative Research Methods | Tsisana Khundadze | Invited Lecturer, PhD in Psychology |
| Philosophy of Social Sciences | Tamar Kiknadze | Invited Lecturer / PhD in Political Science |
| Quantitative Research Methods | Davit Sichinava | Invited Lecturer / PhD in Human Geography |
| Foreign Policy of Contemporary Georgia | Amiran Kavadze | Assoc. Prof. / Master of Politology / PhD in Biology |
| | | |
| EU in International Relations | Amiran Kavadze | Assoc. Prof. Dr. / Master of Politology / PhD in Biology |
| Contemporary International Law | Niko Tatulashvili | Invited Lecturer / PhD in Law |
| Terrorism Studies | Nika Chitadze | Prof.Dr. / PhD in Geography |
| Caucasus/Black Sea Region and Regional Security | Amiran Kavadze | Assoc. Prof.Dr. / Master of Politology / PhD in Biology |
| Energy Politics in Caucasus and Central Asia | Vakhtang Maisaia | Invited Lecturer / PhD in Political Science |
| Problems of Security and Regional Conflicts | Nika Chitadze | Prof.Dr. / PhD in Geography |



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------|---|
| Role of International Organizations in International Relations | Nika Chitadze | Prof.Dr. / PhD in Geography |
| International Security | Vakhtang Maisaia | Invited Lecturer / PhD in Political Science |
| US Foreign Policy since 1900 | Giorgi Mchedlishvili | Assoc. Prof.Dr. / PhD in History |
| Transition in Post-Communist Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union | Ivanna Machitidze | Assoc. Prof.Dr. / PhD in Political Science |
| Political Economy of International Relations | Tatiana Papiashvili | Prof.Dr. / PhD in Economy |
| New Security Challenges | Amiran Kavadze | Assoc. Prof.Dr. / Master of Politology / PhD in Biology |
| World Politics | Ivanna Machitidze | Assoc. Prof.Dr. / PhD in Political Science |
| Theory of Politics | Giorgi Mchedlishvili | Assoc. Prof.Dr. / PhD in History |
| Comparative Governance and Politics | Ivanna Machitidze | Assoc. Prof.Dr. / PhD in Political Science |
| | | |
| MA Thesis | Any lecturer with a PhD degree | PhD, Assoc. Prof. Dr. / Prof.Dr. |



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

Information Concerning Human Resources Necessary for the Implementation of the programme:

Study Plan

| # | Course / Module / Internship / Research Component | Status | Credit number | Distribution of credits per courses and semesters | | | | Distribution of hours | | | | | | Number of hours per week | | | |
|----------|---|-------------------|---------------|---|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|------------|-------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| | | | | I s.y. | | II s.y. | | Contact hours | | | | | Independent work | Total number of hours | Lecture / Consultations | Seminar / Practical work / Midterm exam(s) | Total number of hours per week |
| | | | | I Semester | II Semester | III Semester | IV Semester | Lecture / Consultations | Seminar / Practical work | Midterm exam(s) | Final exam | Total number of contact hours | | | | | |
| I | Obligatory courses | Obligatory | 50 | 22 | 22 | 6 | 0 | 203 | 98 | 14 | 14 | 329 | 921 | 1250 | 14 | 7 | 21 |
| 1 | History of Diplomacy | | 8 | 8 | | | | 29 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 47 | 153 | 200 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 2 | Theory of International Relations and Politics | | 8 | 8 | | | | 29 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 47 | 153 | 200 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 3 | Qualitative Research Methods | | 6 | 6 | | | | 29 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 47 | 103 | 150 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 4 | Philosophy of Social Sciences | | 8 | | 8 | | | 29 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 47 | 153 | 200 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 5 | War and Peace in International Relations | | 8 | | 8 | | | 29 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 47 | 153 | 200 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 6 | Quantitative Research Methods | | 6 | | 6 | | | 29 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 47 | 103 | 150 | 2 | 1 | 3 |



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---|-----------------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-------------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| 7 | Foreign Policy of Contemporary Georgia | | 6 | | | 6 | | 29 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 47 | 103 | 150 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| II | Elective courses | Elective | 40 | 8 | 8 | 24 | 0 | 145 | 70 | 10 | 10 | 235 | 765 | 1000 | 10 | 5 | 15 |
| 1 | EU in International Relations | | 8 | | | | | 29 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 47 | 153 | 200 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 2 | Contemporary International Law | | 8 | | | | | 29 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 47 | 153 | 200 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 3 | Terrorism Studies | | 8 | | | | | 29 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 47 | 153 | 200 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 4 | Caucasus/Black Sea Region and Regional Security | | 8 | | | | | 29 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 47 | 153 | 200 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 5 | Energy Politics in Caucasus and Central Asia | | 8 | | | | | 29 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 47 | 153 | 200 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 6 | Problems of Security and Regional Conflicts | | 8 | | | | | 29 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 47 | 153 | 200 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 7 | Role of International Organizations in International Relations | | 8 | | | | | 29 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 47 | 153 | 200 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 8 | International Security | | 8 | | | | | 29 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 47 | 153 | 200 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 9 | US Foreign Policy since 1900 | | 8 | | | | | 29 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 47 | 153 | 200 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 10 | Transition in Post-Communist Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union | | 8 | | | | | 29 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 47 | 153 | 200 | 2 | 1 | 3 |



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|--|-------------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 11 | Political Economy of International Relations | | 8 | | | | | 29 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 47 | 153 | 200 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 12 | New Security Challenges | | 8 | | | | | 29 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 47 | 153 | 200 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 13 | World Politics | | 8 | | | | | 29 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 47 | 153 | 200 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 14 | Theory of Politics | | 8 | | | | | 29 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 47 | 153 | 200 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 15 | Comparative Governance and Politics | | 8 | | | | | 29 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 47 | 153 | 200 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| IV | Obligatory Research Component | Obligatory | 30 | | | | 30 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 31 | 719 | 750 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| | Master Thesis | | 30 | | | | 30 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 31 | 719 | 750 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Total | | | 120 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 378 | 168 | 24 | 25 | 595 | 2405 | 3000 | 24 | 14 | 38 |

Note: Out of the 40 ECTS allocated for specialty elective component, students are able to use 8 ECTS as free components credits.

Additional Table for Study Plan

| № | Study Courses/ Practice/ Reserch Component | Code | Semester | Prerequisites | Lecturer | Obligatory Literature |
|----------|--|------|----------|---------------|----------|-----------------------|
| I | Obligatory Component | | I-III | | | |



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|------------------|---|-----|---|---|
| 1 | History of Diplomacy | 600131 IRP507 | I | N/A | Amiran Kavadze / Assoc. Prof. / Master of Politology / PhD in Biology | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Andrew J. Williams, Amelia Hadfield, J. Simon Rofe. International History and International Relations. New York. 2012. • Andrew Monaghan. A ‘New Cold War’? Abusing History, Misunderstanding Russia. Chatham House. Russia and Eurasia Programme. May 2015. https://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/files/chathamhouse/field/field_document/20150522ColdWarRussiaMonaghan.pdf • George F. Kennan. The Sources of Soviet Conduct. Foreign Affairs, July 1947. https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/russian-federation/1947-07-01/sources-soviet-conduct • George Kennan, “The Long Telegram”. http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/coldwar/documents/episode-1/kennan.htm • Gruner, Wolf D., Was There a Reformed Balance of Power System or Cooperative Great Power Hegemony? American Historical Review 97:3 (1992). • International Relations since 1945: A Global History. John W. Young, John Kent. Oxford University Press. 2013. • Jeremy Black. A History of Diplomacy. Reaktion Books. 2011. • John Baylis and Steve Smith, “The Globalization of World Politics”, 2005. • Keir A. Lieber. The New History of World War I and What It Means for International Relations Theory, International Security Fall 2007, Vol. 32, No. 2 • Paul W. Schroeder, Did the Vienna Settlement Rest on a Balance of Power? American Historical Review 97:3 (1992). • Pauline Kerr and Geoffrey Wiseman. “Diplomacy in a Globalizing World” Oxford University Press. 2013. • Robert Jervis, A Political Science Perspective on the Balance of Power and the Concert. American Historical Review 97:3 (1992). • Stephen M. Walt. Condemned to repeat it. Why Washington's foreign policymakers desperately need to study up on their history. Foreign |
|---|----------------------|------------------|---|-----|---|---|



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | <p>Policy. March 10, 2014. http://foreignpolicy.com/2014/03/10/condemned-to-repeat-it/</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Guardian. The New Cold War: are we going back to the bad old days? http://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/nov/19/new-cold-war-back-to-bad-old-days-russia-west-putin-ukraine• Winston Churchill. The “Iron Curtain” speech. http://history1900s.about.com/od/churchillwinston/a/Iron-Curtain.htm |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|------------------|---|-----|---|--|
| 2 | Theory of International Relations and Politics | 450019 IRP517 | I | N/A | Nino Kereselidze / Associate Professor / PhD in International Relations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kenneth Waltz “Realist Thought and Neorealist Theory.” Journal of International Affairs, Vol. 44, Spring 1990, pp. 21-37. • Kenneth N. Waltz, “Structural Realism after the Cold War,” International Security, Vol. 25, No. 1 (Summer 2000). • Hans Morgenthau and the Iraq war: Realism versus neo-conservatism, John Mearsheimer, Open Democracy. • Keohane, Robert O. and Lisa L. Martin. 1995. "The Promise of Institutional Theory." International Security 20/1(Summer), 39–51. • John J. Mearsheimer, "A Realist Reply," International Security, Vol. 20, No. 1 (Summer 1995), pp. 82-93. • International Relations Theory. 5th edition. Paul R. Viotti & Mark V. Kauppi. Longman. 2012. • Women, the State and War. Joyce P. Kaufman& Kristen P. Williams. 2007 • Security: A New Framework for Analysis. Barry Buzan, Ole Wæver, Jaap de Wilde. 1998. Chapter 7 • Walt, Stephen, M., “The Renaissance of Security Studies”, International Studies Quarterly, vol. 35, 1991 pp.211-239 available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/2600471 • Weaver, Ole, “Securitization and Desecuritization”, in Lipschutz, Ronnie D. (ed.), On Security, Columbia University Press (New York: 1995) ch.3 available: http://www.ciaonet.org/book/lipschutz/lipschutz13.html • Olav F. Knudsen, “Post-Copenhagen Security Studies: Desecuritizing Securitization” Security Dialogue, 2001 vol.32 available at: http://sdi.sagepub.com/content/32/3/355.short • Bargaining, Enforcement, and International Cooperation. James D. Fearon. International Organization/ Volume 52/ Issue 02/ Spring1998, pp. 269-305. • Signaling Versus the Balance of Power and Interests: An Empirical Test of a Crisis Bargaining Model. James D. Fearon. Journal of Conflict Resolution June 1994 vol. 38 no 2. 236-269. |
|---|--|------------------|---|-----|---|--|



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Janice Bially Mattern, “Why `Soft Power' Isn't So Soft: Representational Force and the Sociolinguistic Construction of Attraction in World Politics”, Millennium Journal of International Studies, 2005 vol.33 pp.583-612• Art, Robert, “To What Ends Military Power”, International Security, vol.4 no.4, 1980.• Pape, Robert, A., “When Duty Calls: a Pragmatic Standard of Humanitarian Intervention”, International Security, vol.37, no. 1, 2012 pp.41-80 available at: http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/abs/10.1162/ISEC_a_00088 |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|------------------|---|-----|---|--|
| 3 | Qualitative Research Methods | 460012 INT111 | I | N/A | Tsisana Khundadze/ Invited Lecturer, PhD in Psychology | <p>Norman Blaikie. 2004. <i>Designing Social Research</i>. 4th Edition. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.</p> <p>Flick, Uwe (2006): <i>An Introduction to Qualitative Research</i>. London: Sage</p> <p>Bruce Berg. 2001. <i>Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences</i>. Allyn and Bacon.</p> <p>David Silverman. 2004. <i>Qualitative Research: Theory Method and Practice</i>. 2nd edition. SAGE publications.</p> <p>Steven J. Taylor, Robert Bogdan, Marjorie DeVault. 2016. <i>Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods: A Guidebook and Resource</i>, 4th Edition. Wiley.</p> <p>W. Lawrence Neuman. 2003. <i>Social Research Methods. Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches</i>. Fifth Edition. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.</p> <p>Robert S. Weiss. 1994. <i>Learning from Strangers: The Art and Method of Qualitative Interview Studies</i>. The Free Press.</p> <p>Gerring, John (2004) "What Is a Case Study and What Is it Good for?", <i>American Politca SenRviw</i> , Vol. 98, No. 2 (May 2004)</p> <p>Carl Ratner, <i>Subjectivity and Objectivity in Qualitative Methodology</i>, <i>Forum Qualitative Social Research</i>, Volume 3, No. 3, Art. 16, Sept 2002</p> <p>Kimberly A. Neuendorf. 2002. <i>The Content Analysis: Guidebook</i>. SAGE publications.</p> <p>Klaus Krippendorff. 2004. <i>Content Analysis: An Introduction To Its Methodology</i>. 2nd addition. SAGE publications.</p> |
|---|------------------------------|------------------|---|-----|---|--|



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|------------------|----|-----|---|---|
| 4 | Philosophy of Social Sciences | 450067 IRP001 | II | N/A | Tamar Kiknadze/ Invited Lecturer, PhD in Political Science | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alison Wylie, “Reasoning about Ourselves: Feminist Methodology in the Social Sciences” // Readings in the Philosophy of Social Science, ed. by Michael Martin and Lee C. McIntyre (The MIT Press, 1994), pp. 611-624 • Durkheim, Emile, “Social Facts” // Readings in the Philosophy of Social Science, ed. by Michael Martin and Lee C. McIntyre (The MIT Press, 1994), pp. 433-440 • Elster, John, “The Nature and Scope of Rational-Choice Explanation” // Readings in the Philosophy of Social Science, ed. by Michael Martin and Lee C. McIntyre (The MIT Press, 1994), pp. 311-322 • Elster, Jon, “Functional Explanation: In Social Science” // Readings in the Philosophy of Social Science, ed. by Michael Martin and Lee C. McIntyre (The MIT Press, 1994), pp. 403-414 • Fay, Brian and Moon, J. Donald, “What Would an Adequate Philosophy of Science Look Like?” // Readings in the Philosophy of Social Science, ed. by Michael Martin and Lee C. McIntyre (The MIT Press, 1994), pp. 21-35 • Foucault, Michel, “On Power” // Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings, 1977-1984 (Ed. Lawrence Kritzman, Routledge, 1990), pp. 96-109 • Geertz, Clifford, “Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture” // Readings in the Philosophy of Social Science, ed. by Michael Martin and Lee C. McIntyre (The MIT Press, 1994), pp. 213-232 • Giddens, Anthony, “Structuralism, Post-Structuralism and the Production of Culture” // Social Theory Today, ed. by Anthony Giddens and Jonathan Turner (Stanford University Press, 1987), pp. 195-223 • Habermas, Jurgen, “Appendix: Knowledge and Human Interests. A general Perspective” // Jurgen Habermas, Knowledge and Human Interests (Beacon Press, 1972), pp. 301-317 • Hayek, F. A., “The Theory of Complex Phenomena” // Readings in the Philosophy of Social Science, ed. by Michael Martin and Lee C. McIntyre (The MIT Press, 1994), pp. 55-70 • Hempel, C. G and Oppenheim, Paul, “The Deductive-Nomological Model of Scientific Explanation” // Scientific Enquiries. Readings in the Philosophy of Science, ed. by Robert Klee (NY and Oxford, Oxford University Press), pp. 163-180 • Hempel, Carl G., “The Function of General Laws in History” // Readings in the Philosophy of Social Science, ed. by Michael Martin and Lee C. McIntyre (The MIT Press, 1994), pp. 43-54 • Linda Alcoff, “The Problem of Speaking for Others” // Cultural Critique, No 20, 1991-92, pp. 5-32 • Little, Daniel, “2. Causal Analyses” // Daniel Little, Varieties of Social Explanation (Westview Press, Boulder, Co., 1991), pp. 13-38 |
|---|-------------------------------|------------------|----|-----|---|---|



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little, Daniel, “3. Rational Choice Theory” // Daniel Little, Varieties of Social Explanation (Westview Press, Boulder, Co., 1991), pp. 39-58 • Little, Daniel, “3. Rational Choice Theory” // Daniel Little, Varieties of Social Explanation (Westview Press, Boulder, Co., 1991), pp. 59-66 • Little, Daniel, “5. Functional and Structural Explanation. Functionalism” // Daniel Little, Varieties of Social Explanation (Westview Press, 1991), pp. 91-101 • Little, Daniel, “5. Functional and Structural Explanation. Structuralism” // Daniel Little, Varieties of Social Explanation (Westview Press, 1991), pp. 102-112 • Little, Daniel, “9. Methodological Individualism” // Daniel Little, Varieties of Social Explanation (Westview Press, 1991), pp. 183-201 • Lukes, Steven, “Some Problems about Rationality” // Readings in the Philosophy of Social Science, ed. by Michael Martin and Lee C. McIntyre (The MIT Press, 1994), pp. 285-298 • Quine, W. V., “Two Dogmas of Empiricism”, “Posits and Reality” // Scientific Enquiries. Readings in the Philosophy of Science, ed. by Robert Klee (NY and Oxford, Oxford University Press), pp. 72-82 • Taylor, Charles, “Interpretation and the Sciences of Man” // Readings in the Philosophy of Social Science, ed. by Michael Martin and Lee C. McIntyre (The MIT Press, 1994), pp. 181-212 • Weber, Max, “„Objectivity“ in Social Science and Social Policy” // Readings in the Philosophy of Social Science, ed. by Michael Martin and Lee C. McIntyre (The MIT Press, 1994), pp. 535-546 |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|------------------|----|-----|---|--|
| 5 | War and Peace in International Relations | 450063 IRP197 | II | N/A | Andrew Hargreaves / Invited Lecturer / PhD in War Studies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beckett, Ian, F. W., “Victory, counter-insurgency and Iraq”, in Ångström, Jan & Duyvesteyn, Isabelle (2007) (eds.) <i>Understanding Victory and Defeat in Contemporary War</i> (London: Routledge). • Bellamy, Alex J. (2008) “The Responsibility to Protect and the Problem of Military Intervention”, <i>International Affairs</i> 84(4): 615–639. • Betts, Richard K., (ed.), <i>Conflict after the Cold War</i> • Boniface, Pascal. “What Justifies Regime Change?” <i>Washington Quarterly</i>, 26.3 (2003): 61–71. • Brown, Michael (1996) <i>The International Dimensions of Internal Conflict</i>. Cambridge MIT Press. Chapter 17, p. 571-601. • Chaliand, Gerald (ed.) (1994) <i>The Art of War in World History</i>, University of California Press. • Clausewitz, Carl von (1997) <i>On War</i>, Wordsworth Classics of World Literature. Book I, chapter I (“What is War?”) • Collier, Paul and Nicholas Sambanis (2005) <i>Understanding Civil War</i>, Vols.1 and 2, World Bank, Washington D.C. • Copeland, Dale C. (2001) <i>The Origins of Major Wars</i>. Cornell. • Dorn, Walter A. and Matloff, Jonathan (2000) ‘Preventing the Bloodbath: Could the UN have Predicted and Prevented the Rwandan Genocide?’, <i>Journal of Conflict Studies</i>, Vol.XX, No.1, 9-52 • Doughty, Robert et al., <i>Warfare in the Western World, Vol. II</i> • Feaver, Peter. D, (1996) <i>The Civil-Military Problematique: Huntington, Janowitz, and the Question of Civilian Control</i>, <i>Armed Forces & Society</i> 1996 23: 149 • Fortna, Virginia Page, (2004) ‘Does Peacekeeping Keep Peace? International Intervention and the Duration of Peace After Civil War’, <i>International Studies Quarterly</i>, 48, 269-292 • Freedman, Lawrence, (ed.), <i>War</i> • Hultman, Lisa (2013) “UN Peace Operations and Protection of Civilians: Cheap Talk or Norm Implementation?” <i>Journal of Peace Research</i> 50(1): 59-73. • Kalyvas, Stathis (2001) “‘New’ and ‘Old’ Civil Wars: A Valid Distinction?”, <i>World Politics</i> 54(1): 99-118. |
|---|--|------------------|----|-----|---|--|



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kiras, James (2013) ‘Irregular warfare: Terrorism and Insurgency’, in John Baylis, James Wirtz and Colin S. Gray, <i>Strategy in the Contemporary World</i>, Oxford University Press. • Kiras, James D. (2015) “Unintended Acceleration”: The Problematique of Civil-Military Relations of Special Operations Forces, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/284693489 • Levy, Jack & William Thompson (2010). <i>Causes of War</i>. Oxford: Wiley and Blackwell. • Mattern, Janice Bially, “Why ‘Soft Power’ Isn’t So Soft: Representational Force and the Sociolinguistic Construction of Attraction in World Politics”, <i>Millennium Journal of International Studies</i>, 2005 Vol.33, 583-612 • Manwaring, Max (2012) <i>The Complexity of Modern Asymmetric Warfare</i>, (University of Oklahoma Press) • Melander, Erik; Magnus Öberg & Jonathan Hall (2009) “Are ‘New Wars’ More Atrocious? Battle Intensity, Genocide and Forced Migration Before and After the End of the Cold War”, <i>European Journal of International Relations</i> 15(3): 505-536. • Mueller, John, (2009) ‘War has almost ceased to exist: An assessment’, <i>Political Science Quarterly</i>, 124(2) • Nathanson, Stephen (2010), <i>Terrorism and the Ethics of War</i>, Cambridge University Press • Nye, Joseph, <i>Understanding International Conflicts</i>, • Nye, J. S. (2004). Soft power and American foreign policy. <i>Political Science Quarterly</i>, 119(2), 255-270. • Pape, Robert, A., “When Duty Calls: a Pragmatic Standard of Humanitarian Intervention”, <i>International Security</i>, vol.37, no. 1, 2012 pp.41-80 available at: http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/abs/10.1162/ISEC_a_00088 • Price, Richard and Nina Tannenwald, “Norms and Deterrence: The Nuclear and Chemical Weapons Taboos”, in Katzenstein, Peter J., (ed.) <i>The Culture of National Security: norms and identity in world politics</i>, Columbia University Press (New York: 1996) • Rothman, S. B. (2011). Revising the soft power concept: What are the means and mechanisms of soft power? <i>Journal of Political Power</i>, 4(1), 49-64. |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sarkees, Meredith Reid, Frank Whelon Wayman & J. David Singer (2003) “Inter-State, Intra-State, and Extra-State Wars: A Comprehensive Look at Their Distribution over Time, 1816–1997”, <i>International Studies Quarterly</i> 47(1): 49-70. • Sion, Liora, "Too Sweet and Innocent for War"? Dutch Peacekeepers and the Use of Violence, <i>Armed Forces and Society</i>, 32, 3, April 2006, 454-474 • Stein, Janice Gross (2013) ‘Threat Perception in International Relations’, in Leonie Huddy, David O. Sears and Jack S. Levy (eds.), <i>The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology</i>, (Oxford University Press) • Urban, Mark (2015) <i>The Edge – Is the Military Dominance of the West Coming to an End?</i>, (Little, Brown: London) • Vasquez, John (2009) <i>The War Puzzle Revisited</i>. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1-2 (“Conceptualizing War” and “Types of War”) • Walzer, Michael, <i>Arguing about War</i>, Yale University Press (New Haven and London: 2004) |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|------------------|----|-----|--|---|
| 6 | Quantitative Research Methods | 450066 IRP002 | II | N/A | Davit Sichinava, Invited Lecturer, PhD in Human Geography | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barry Cooper, Judith Glaesser, Roger Gomm, Martyn Hammersley. 2012. <i>Challenging the Qualitative Quantitative Divide: Explorations in Case-focused Causal Analysis</i>. Continuum: London and New York. • Bryman, A. <i>Social Research Methods</i>. 4th Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press. • Converse, Jean M.; Presser, Stanley. 1986. <i>Survey Questions : Handcrafting the Standardized Questionnaire</i>. Sage. • DeVaus, D. (2002), <i>Surveys in Social Research</i>, 5th Edition, London: Routledge. • Dietz, T. and Kalof, L. 2009. <i>Introduction to Social Statistics: The Logic of Statistical Reasoning</i>. Malden and Oxford: Willey-Blackwell. • Gerring, J. 2012. <i>Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework</i>. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. • Heley, J.F. 2009. <i>Statistics: A Tool for Social Research</i>. Wadsworth Cengage Learning: Belmont. • Kellstedt, P.M., and G.D. Whitten. 2013. <i>Political Science Research</i>. (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. • L. Lyberg et al (eds), 1997. <i>Survey Measurement and Process Quality</i>. New York: Wiley. • Stephen Few, 2012. <i>Show Me the Numbers: Designing Tables and Graphs to Enlighten</i>. • Stephen Van Evera. 1997. <i>Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science</i>. Cornell University Press. Accessible online: http://bookzz.org/ireader/1110767 • Wright, D.B. and London, K. 2009. <i>First (and Second) Steps in Statistics</i>. 2nd edition. London: SAGE. |
|---|-------------------------------|------------------|----|-----|--|---|



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|-----|-----|--|--|
| 7 | Foreign Policy of Contemporary Georgia | | III | N/A | Amiran Kavadze, Assoc. Prof. / Master of Politology / Phd of Biology | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stephen Jones. Georgia: A Political History Since Independence. I.B.Tauris Publishers. 2015 • Kornely Kakachia & Michael Cecire (eds), Georgian Foreign Policy: the quest for sustainable security. Konrad Adenauer Stiftung. 2013 • Carol Weaver, The Politics of the Black Sea Reagion. Ashgate. 2013. • Dmitri Trenin. The Georgian-Russian Crisis: Objectives, Strategies, and Outcomes. Carnegie Moscow Center. October 13, 2006. http://carnegie.ru/2006/10/13/georgian-russian-crisis-objectives-strategies-and-outcomes/auav • Bruce Jackson, Charles King, Dmitri Trenin, Mark Medis. Crisis in Georgia: Frozen Conflicts and U.S.-Russian Relations. Carnegie Moscow Center. October, 2006 http://carnegie.ru/2006/10/11/crisis-in-georgia-frozen-conflicts-and-u.s.-russian-relations/hdbk • Georgia and Russia: Clashing over Abkhazia. International Crisis Group. Europe Report N°193 5 Jun 2008. • Ronald Asmus. A Little War That Shook the World: Georgia, Russia and the Future of the West. 2010. • IVAN KRASTEY. Russia and the Georgia war: the great-power trap. Council on Foreign Relations. 20 August 2008. http://www.ecfr.eu/article/commentary_ivan_krastev_on_georgia • S. Neil MacFarlane. Two Years of the Dream. Georgian Foreign Policy during the Transition. Chatham House. Russia and Eurasia Programme. 2015. • S. Neil MacFarlane, Georgia: National Security Concept versus National Security. Chatham House. Russia and Eurasia Programme Paper, REP PP 2012/01. Center for Social Sciences, Tbilisi and University of Oxford. August 2012. • Kavadze, A., & Kavadze T.,. Securitization of Georgia under the Saakashvili Rule. IBSU. 2015. Journal of Social Sciences. Volume 4, Issue 1. • Kavadze, A., & Kavadze, T. NATO Expansion to the East: Georgia’s Way to NATO Membership, Perspectives and Challenges. IBSU. 2014. Journal of Social Sciences, V 3, No: 2, 21-27. • Kavadze, A., Ukleba, M., & Katamadze, V. Georgia’s Path to the Multilateral Trading System. Tbilisi, Forma Press. 2003. • Nika Chitadze. European integration as one of the main foreign policy and national security priorities of Georgia. 2014. V3, No2, 29-38. • EU’s failure in Georgia. European Council on Foreign Relations. http://www.ecfr.eu/article/commentary_popescu_euobserver_georiga/print • Foreign Policy Strategy of Georgia. http://www.polity.ge/georgia/politika/1068-saqartvelos-sagareo-strategia-xxx |
|---|--|--|-----|-----|--|--|



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | | | | | |
|-----------|---|------------------|-------|-----|---|---|
| | | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cornell, Svante E. Georgia after the Rose Revolution: Geopolitical Predicament and Implications for U.S. Policy. February, 2007. http://oai.dtic.mil/oai/oai?verb=getRecord&metadataPrefix=html&identifier=ADA464082 • United States-Georgia Charter on Strategic Partnership. http://www.state.gov/p/eur/rls/or/121029.htm • THOMAS DE WAAL. Iran in the Caucasus: A Long Haul. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. 8 April, 2015. http://carnegie.ru/eurasiaoutlook/?fa=5971 • Bayram Balci. Strengths and Constraints of Turkish Policy in the South Caucasus. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. JUNE 18, 2014 http://carnegieendowment.org/2014/06/18/strengths-and-constraints-of-turkish-policy-in-south-caucasus/he0a • Putin’s Visit to Turkey: Who Will Pay for the “Breakthrough in Bilateral Relations”? Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. 8 December 2014. http://carnegie.ru/eurasiaoutlook/?fa=57424 • State Strategy:Engagement through Cooperation. http://www.smr.gov.ge/docs/doc211.pdf • Action Plan for Engagement. • Modalities for Conducting Activities in the Occupied Territories of Georgia • Law on Occupied Territories. • Brief of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Available here • The Bucharest Summit Declaration. 2008. http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_8443.htm • The Wales Summit Declaration. 2014. http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_112964.htm • Brief of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Available here • Guide to the AA/DCFTA. |
| II | Specialty Elective Component | | I-III | | | |
| 1 | European Union in International Relations | 600125 IRP501 | I-III | N/A | Amiran Kavadze, Invited Lecturer / Master of Politology / Phd of Biology | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John McCormick . 2011. European Union Politics. Palgrave Macmillan. • Ian Bache , Simon Bulmer , Stephen George ,Owen Parker . 2015. Politics in the European Union . Oxford University Press; 4 edition. • John McCormick, Jonathan Olsen. 2013. The European Union: Politics and Policies. Westview Press; Fifth Edition, Fifth Edition. |



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|------------------|-------|-----|---|---|
| 2 | Contemporary International Law | 600191 IRP510 | I-III | N/A | Niko Tatulashvili, Invited Lecturer / PhD in Law | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Malcolm N. Shaw, International Law, Cambridge 2008. |
|---|--------------------------------|------------------|-------|-----|---|---|



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|------------------|-------|-----|--|---|
| 3 | Theory of Politics | 460005 IRP701 | I-III | N/A | Giorgi Mchedlishvili / Assoc. Prof. / Doctor of History | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Isaiah Berlin, 'Does Political Theory Still Exist?,' <i>Philosophy, Politics and Society</i>, ed. P. Laslett and W.G. • William Connolly, 'Essentially Contested Concepts in Politics,' in <i>The Terms of Political Discourse</i> • Leo Strauss, 'What is Political Philosophy?,' 'Persecution and the Art of Writing,' repr. in <i>What is Political Philosophy?</i> • Hannah Arendt, 'What is Authority?,' in Arendt, <i>Between Past and Future</i> • J. Raz, 'Introduction' to Raz (ed.) <i>Authority</i> • John Simmons, <i>Moral Principles and Political Obligations; Justification and Legitimacy</i> • Robert Dahl, <i>Democracy and its Critics</i> • Bernard Manin, <i>The Principles of Representative Government</i> • Adam Przeworski, 'A Minimalist Conception of Democracy: A Defense,' in I. Shapiro and C. Hacker-Cordon (eds) <i>Democracy's Value</i> • J.A. Schumpeter, <i>Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy</i>, Part IV • Jon Elster, ed., <i>Democracy and Constitutionalism</i> • John Rawls, <i>A Theory of Justice and Political Liberalism</i> • Joseph Raz, <i>The Authority of Law and Ethics and the Public Domain. ch. 17</i> • Isaiah Berlin, <i>Four Essays on Liberty</i> • Joseph Raz, <i>The Morality of Freedom</i> • Jeremy Waldron, ed.. <i>Rights</i>, esp. Introduction • David Miller, <i>National Responsibility and Global Justice</i> • Michael Walzer, <i>Just and Unjust Wars</i> • Benedict Anderson. <i>Imagined Communities</i> • Ernest Gellner, <i>Nations and Nationalism</i> • Will Kymlicka, <i>Multicultural Citizenship</i> • Michel Foucault, 'Power, Right, Truth,' in P. Pettit and R. Goodin (eds) <i>A Companion to Political Philosophy</i> • Steven Lukes, ed., <i>Power</i> • Carr, Edward Hallett, <i>What is History?</i> • Chapter 2, "General Knowledge and Particular Facts", in King, Gary; Keohane, Robert; and Verba, Sidney, <i>Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research</i>. |
|---|--------------------|------------------|-------|-----|--|---|



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|------------------|-------|-----|---|--|
| 4 | Terrorism Studies | 450030 IRP511 | I-III | N/A | Nika Chitadze, Prof / Academic Doctor of Geography | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brigitte L. Nacos. Terrorism and Counterterrorism. Understanding Threats and Responses in the Post-9/11 World. Second edition. New-York-2009. • Jonathan R. White. January 1, 2011. Terrorism and Homeland Security. Cengage Learning; 7 edition. • Al-Qaeda’s Response to the Arab Spring. Donald Holbro. Perspectives on Terrorism. Vol 6, No 6 (2012). • What ISIS Really Wants? Graeme Wood. TheAtlantic. Issue March, 2015. Available http://www.theatlantic.com/features/archive/2015/02/what-isis-really-wants/384980/ • Isis vs Islamic State vsIsilvsDaesh: What do the different names mean – and why does it matter? The Guardian. 23 September, 2014. |
| 5 | Regional Security of Caucasus/Black Sea Regions | 450031 IRP512 | I-III | N/A | Vakhtang Maisaia / Invited Lecturer / PhD in Political Science | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Security of the Caspian Sea Region. Edited by Gennady Chufrin. Oxford University Press. 2001; • Eugene B. Rumer and Jeffrey Simon.“Toward a Euro-Atlantic Strategy for the Black Sea Region”. National Defense University Press. Washington D.C. April, 2006 • Russo-Georgian Conflict: Causes, Consequences and Prospects. Volume I. Georgian Institute of Public Affairs. Tbilisi, 2009. • Kornely Kakachia and Michael Cecire. Georgian Foreign Policy. The Quest for Sustainable Security. Tbilisi, 2013 • Nika Chitadze. NATO’s Role in South Caucasus Regional Security. Published by American University for Humanities. 104 pages. Tbilisi, 2007 ISBN 978-99940-69-82- |
| 6 | Energy Politics in Caucasus and Central Asia | 450032 IRP513 | I-III | N/A | Vakhtang Maisaia / Invited Lecturer / PhD in Political Science | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Security of the Caspian Sea Region. Edited by Gennady Chufrin. Oxford University Press. 2001; (გამოყენებული იქნება სალექციო კურსის შესაბამისი თავები) • Nika Chitadze. The Role and Place of South Caucasus and Georgia on the crossroads of Europe and Asia. Conference Proceedings. Regional Cooperation possibilities and prospects for the future in the South Caucasus. Organized by: Center for Eurasian Studies (Turkey), and Konrad Adenauer Stiftung. December 9th 2014. Ankara, Turkey. • Eric R. Eissler. Turkey’s energy infrastructure Security Challenge: Protecting Pipelines and Bolstering International Security Cooperation. Georgian Foundation for Strategic and International Studies. Tbilisi, 2013. |



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | | | | | |
|----|--|-------------------|-------|-----|--|---|
| 7 | Role of International Organizations in International Relations | 450037 INT025 | I-III | N/A | Nika Chitadze, Prof / Academic Doctor of Geography | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ed. Thomas G. Weiss & Rorden Wilkinson. International Organization and Global Governance Paperback – November 2, 2013. |
| 8 | Problems of Security and Regional Conflicts | 600197 IRP 516 | I-III | N/A | Vakhtang Maisaia, Invited Lecturer / Doctor of Political Science | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Darby, J. & R. MacGinty, 2008. <i>Contemporary Peacemaking: Conflict, Peace Processes and Post-War Reconstruction</i>. New York: Palgrave MacMillan. Fortna, VP., 2008. <i>Does Peacekeeping Work: Shaping Belligerents' Choices after Civil War</i>. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Walter, BF., 2002. <i>Committing to Peace: The Successful Settlement of Civil Wars</i>. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press. Thakur, Ramesh & Thomas G. Weiss (2009), “R2P: From Idea to Norm—and Action?”, <i>Global Responsibility to Protect</i> 1(1): 22-53. Bellamy, Alex J. (2008) “The Responsibility to Protect and the Problem of Military Intervention”, <i>International Affairs</i> 84(4): 615–639. Hultman, Lisa (2013) “UN Peace Operations and Protection of Civilians: Cheap Talk or Norm Implementation?” <i>Journal of Peace Research</i> 50(1): 59-73 |
| 9 | World Politics | 704057 INT321 | II | - | Ivanna Machitidze, Assoc. Prof. / Doctor of Political Science | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> World Politics: Trend and Transformation, 2014 – 2015. Charles Kegley, Shannon Blanton. Cengage Learning. 2014. World Politics: The Menu for Choice. David Kinsella, Bruce Russett, Harvey Starr. 2012. |
| 10 | US Foreign Policy since 1900 | 450070 IRP104 | I-III | - | Giorgi Mchedlishvili / Assoc. Prof. / Doctor of History | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Walter Russell Mead, <i>Special Providence American Foreign Policy and How It Changed the World</i>, Routledge, 2009; Bruce W. Jentleson, <i>American Foreign Policy – The Dynamics of Choice in the 21st Century</i>, Duke University, 2004; Stephen Sestanovich, <i>Maximalist</i>, New York, 2014 |



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | | | | | |
|----|---|------------------|-------|---|--|--|
| 11 | Transition in Post-Communist Eastern Europe and Former Soviet Union | 470071 IRP105 | I-III | - | Ivanna Machitidze/ Assoc. Prof., PhD in Political Science | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allison, R., 1998. "The network of new security policy relations in Eurasia," in Allison, R. and C. Bluth (eds), <i>Security Dilemmas in Russia and Eurasia</i>. London: Royal Institute of International Affairs. pp. 12-29 Allison, R. (2006), 'Russia in Europe or Russia and Europe?', in Allison, R., M. Light and S. White, <i>Putin's Russia and the Enlarged Europe</i>, pp. 160-180. Bluth, C., 1998. "The post-Soviet space and Europe," in Allison, R. and C. Bluth (eds), <i>Security Dilemmas in Russia and Eurasia</i>. London: Royal Institute of International Affairs. pp. 323-342. Brown, A., 2001. "Introduction" in Archie Brown (ed.) <i>Contemporary Russian politics: a reader</i>. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 455-458. Bunce, Valerie (1995), Should Transitologists be Grounded?" <i>Slavic Review</i>, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 111-27. Bunce, V., 2001. "Should transitologists be grounded?" in Archie Brown (ed.) <i>Contemporary Russian politics: a reader</i>. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Brown, A., 2009. <i>The rise and fall of communism</i>. New York: HarperCollins e-books. Carothers, Thomas (2002), "The End of the Transition Paradigm," <i>Journal of Democracy</i>, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 6-20. Coase, Ronald H. (1992), "The Institutional Structure of Production," <i>American Economic Review</i>, vol. 82, no. 4, pp. 713-19. Coase, Ronald H. (1998), "The New Institutional Economics," <i>American Economic Review</i>, vol. 88, no. 2, pp. 72-74. Hosking, Hedlund, Stefan (2009), "Authoritarian Market Economy: A 'Russian' Economic Model," http://www.east.uu.se/docs_publicationer/AR114SH.pdf. Fish, Steven, "Postcommunist Subversion: Social Science and Democratization in East Europe and Eurasia," <i>Slavic Review</i>, vol. 58, no. 4, pp. 794-823. Gelman, V., 2001. "Regime transition, uncertainty and prospects for democratization: the politics of Russia's regions in comparative perspective." in Archie Brown (ed.) <i>Contemporary Russian politics: a reader</i>. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 499-510. Kennedy, M. D. (2002). <i>Cultural Formations of Postcommunism: Emancipation, Transition, Nation and War</i>. <i>University of Minnesota Press</i>. Kennedy, M. D. (2014, December). https://www.academia.edu. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/5225610/_2014_Essays_on_Transition_Culture_beyond_Cultural_Formations_of_Postcommunism_. |
|----|---|------------------|-------|---|--|--|



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hedlund, Stefan (2009), “Authoritarian Market Economy: A ‘Russian’ Economic Model,” http://www.east.uu.se/docs_publicationer/AR114SH.pdf. • Gegeshidze, Archil. Georgia’s Political Transformation: Democracy in Zigzag. South Caucasus – 20 Years if Independence. Freidrich Ebert Stiftung. 2011. Pp. 25 40. • Getty, J.A., 1987. <i>The origins of the great purges: the Soviet Communist Party reconsidered</i>.Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 1-9. • Greenspan, Alan. Remarks at the Woodrow Wilson Award Dinner of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, New York. June 10, 1997. https://www.federalreserve.gov/boarddocs/speeches/1997/19970610.htm • King, C. and N. Melvin (1999/2000), “Diaspora Politics: Ethnic Linkages, Foreign Policy and Security in Eurasia.” <i>International Security</i>, 24, 3.pp. 106-138. • Krastev, I.(2011), ‘Paradoxes of the New Authoritarianism’, <i>Journal of Democracy</i> 22:2, pp. 5-16. • Kavadze, Amiran; Nizhnikau, Hregor and Kavadze, Tina. Understanding (lack of) change in post-soviet countries: from democratic transition to rule persistence. IBSU. Journal of Social Sciences. Volume 4, Issue 2, 2015. Pp. 33-41. • Landes, David S. (1990), “Why are We So Rich and They So Poor?,” <i>American Economic Review</i>, vol. 80, no. 2, pp. 1-13. • Landes, David (2000), “Culture makes almost all the Difference,” in: Lawrence E. Harrison and Samuel P. Huntington (eds.), <i>Culture Matters: How Values Shape Human Progress</i>, New York: Basic Books, pp. 2-13. • Landes, David (2000), “Culture makes almost all the Difference,” in: Lawrence E. Harrison and Samuel P. Huntington (eds.), <i>Culture Matters: How Values Shape Human Progress</i>, New York: Basic Books, pp. 2-13. • Marvin, Taylor. Shock Therapy: What we can learn from Poland. Prospect. Journal of International Affairs. November 11. 2010. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ https://prospectjournal.org/2010/11/11/shock-therapy-what-we-can-learn-from-poland/ • North, Douglass C. (1991), “Institutions,” <i>Journal of Economic Perspectives</i>, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 97-112. • North, Douglass C. (1995), “Economic Performance through Time,” <i>American Economic Review</i>, vol. 84, no. 3, pp. 359-68. |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Olson, Mancur (1996), “Big Bills Left on the Sidewalk: Why Some Nations are Rich and Others Poor,” <i>Journal of Economic Perspectives</i>, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 3-24. • Olson, Mancur (2000), <i>Power and Prosperity: Outgrowing Communist and Capitalist Dictatorships</i>, New York: Basic Books, pp. 173-87. • South Caucasus – 20 Years if Independence. Freidrich Ebert Stiftung. 2011. • Harrison, Lawrence E. (2000), “Why Culture Matters,” in: Lawrence E. Harrison and Samuel P. Huntington (eds.), <i>Culture Matters: How Values Shape Human Progress</i>, New York: Basic Books, pp. xvii-xxxiv. • Hosking, Geoffrey. 1990. <i>A history of the Soviet Union</i>. London: FontanaPress. pp. 449-489. • Jackson, N. (2003), <i>Russian Foreign Policy and the CIS: Theories, Debates and Actions</i>. • Jones, S. (2015). <i>Georgia. A Political History Since Independence</i>. London - New York: I. B. Tauris. • Papava, V. (2005). <i>Necroeconomics: The Political Economy of Post-Communist Capitalism (Lessons from Georgia)</i>. New York, Lincoln, Shanghai: Universe, Inc. 2005. • Roland, Gérard (2000), <i>Transition and Economics: Politics, Markets, and Firms</i>, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 327-46. • Roland, Gérard (2000), <i>Transition and Economics: Politics, Markets, and Firms</i>, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 327-46. • Roland, Gérard (2000), <i>Transition and Economics: Politics, Markets, and Firms</i>, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 327-46. • Rupnik, Jacques (1999), “The Postcommunist Divide,” <i>Journal of Democracy</i>, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 57-62. • Sachs, Jeffrey (1990, January 13). What is to be Done? <i>The Economist</i>, January 13 . • Sachs, Jeffrey “Why Russia Failed to Stabilize,” in <i>Russian Economic Reform at Risk</i>, edited by Anders Aslund (London: Pinter, 1995). • Sachs, Jeffrey. What I did in Russia. March 14th, 2012. http://jeffsachs.org/2012/03/what-i-did-in-russia/ • Sachs, Jeffrey and Pistor, Katharina. <i>The Rule Of Law And Economic Reform In Russia</i> (Westview Press, 1997). • Sakwa, R. (2011), “Russia’s identity: between the ‘domestic’ and the ‘international’”, <i>Europe Asia Studies</i>, 68(6), pp. 957-975. |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schmitter, P.C. and T.L. Karl, 2001. “From an iron curtain to a paper curtain: grounding transitologists or students of polstcommunism?” in Archie Brown (ed.) <i>Contemporary Russian politics: a reader</i>. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 481-491. Schmitter, Philippe C. with Terry Lynn, Karl (1994), “The Conceptual Travels of Transitologists and Consolidologists: How Far to the East Should They Attempt to Go?” <i>Slavic Review</i>, vol. 53, no. 1, pp. 173-85. Service, R., 2003. <i>Russia: experiment with a people</i>. London: Macmillan. pp. 77-92. Service, R., 2009. <i>The Penguin history of modern Russia: from Tsarism to the twenty-first century</i>. London: Penguin. pp. 467-484; 485-508. Smith, Adam (2000), <i>The Wealth of Nations</i>, New York: The Modern Library, pp. 3-18. Silitski, V. (2010), “Survival of the fittest”: Domestic and International Dimensions of the Authoritarian Reaction in the Former Soviet Union Following the Coloured Revolutions’ <i>Communist and Post-Communist Studies</i>, 43 (4), pp. 339-350. Suny, R.G. (2006) “Reading Russia and the Soviet Union in the twentieth century: how the ‘West’ wrote its history of the USSR,” in Suny, R.G. (ed.) <i>The Cambridge History of Russia: Volume III – The Twentieth Century</i>. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <i>The New Eastern Europe: Ukraine, Belarus Moldova</i>”, edited by Daniel Hamilton and Gerhard Mangott. 55-76. Center for Transatlantic Relations/Austrian Institute for International Affairs. 2007. Trenin, D. (2001), <i>The End of Eurasia: Russia and the Border between Geopolitics and Globalization</i>. Tukvadze, Avtandil, Jaoshvil, Georgi and Tukvadze, Rati. “Transformation of the Political System in Georgia Today”. <i>Central Asia and the Caucasus</i>. No. 2(38). 2006. Pp. 90-98. Williamson, Oliver E. (2000), “The New Institutional Economics: Taking Stock, Looking Ahead,” <i>Journal of Economic Literature</i>, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 595-613. Yavlinsky G. (2002), “Going Backwards,” in <i>Democracy after Communism</i>, Diamond L, Plattner M F (edt), The John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore and London, pp. 254-261. |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | | | | | |
|----|--|------------------|-------|---|---|---|
| 12 | Political Economy of International Relations | 450064 IRP196 | I-III | - | Tatiana Papiashvili / Prof. / Doctor of Economy | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gilpin R. (2001). Global Political Economy: Understanding the International Order. Princeton University Press. • Gilpin R. (1987). The Political Economy of International Relations. Princeton University Press. |
|----|--|------------------|-------|---|---|---|



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | | | | | |
|----|-------------------------|------------------|-------|---|--|--|
| 13 | New Security Challenges | 470072 IRP106 | I-III | - | Amiran Kavadze/ Assoc. Prof., MA in Politology/ PhD in Biology | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Security Strategy of the USA, February, 2015, https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/2015_national_security_strategy.pdf • National Security Concept of Georgia, http://www.isn.ethz.ch/Digital-Library/Publications/Detail/?lng=en&id=156940 • Richard Hooker, The Grand Strategy, INSS Strategic Monograph, Washington, D.C., 2014, pp. 19-35 • Graeme Wood, What is the Islamic State? http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2015/03/what-isis-really-wants/384980/ • F. Gregory Gause, ISIS and the New Middle East Cold War, http://www.brookings.edu/blogs/markaz/posts/2014/08/25-isis-new-middle-east-cold-war • Jeffrey D. Sachs, West must change Middle East policy to halt this new blowback terrorism, http://www.nation.co.ke/oped/Opinion/West-must-change-Middle-East-policy-to-halt-terrorism/-/440808/2969868/-/pjn5kc/-/index.html • Attacks in Paris, http://www.nytimes.com/news-event/attacks-in-paris • Michel Chossudovsky, The Paris Terrorist Attacks, “9/11 French-Style”, “Le 11 septembre à la française”, http://www.globalresearch.ca/the-paris-terrorist-attacks-911-french-style-le-11-septembre-a-la-francaise/5488896 • Vanda Felbab-Brown, Blood and hope in Afghanistan, http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2015/05/26-isis-taliban-afghanistan-felbabbrown • COMISAF Initial Assessment (Unclassified), http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/09/21/AR2009092100110.html • Catherine Dale , War in Afghanistan: Campaign Progress, Political Strategy, and Issues for Congress, CRS, 2014, pp. 1-25. • Jeremy Bender, Russia's New Military Doctrine Shows Putin's Geopolitical Ambitions, http://www.businessinsider.com/russia-has-a-new-military-doctrine-2015-1 • Edward Lucas, The New Cold War: Putin's Russia and the Threat to the West, May/June 2008 Issue, Published by the Council on Foreign Relations |
|----|-------------------------|------------------|-------|---|--|--|



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primoz Manfreda, What is currently happening in Syria? http://middleeast.about.com/od/syria/tp/Current-Situation-In-Syria.htm • Syria: The Current Situation and Possible Solutions, Heinrich Böll Stiftung, pp. 7-11 • Shahram Chubin, The Politics of Iran's Nuclear Program, The United States Institute of Peace, 2015 • Shahram Chubin, Iran's Nuclear Ambitions, Washington, D.C., 2006, pp. 44-64 • Gordon Chang, North Korea's Scary New Nuke Missiles Could Threaten the West Coast, http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2015/10/15/north-korea-s-scary-new-nuke-missiles.html • Matthew C. Waxman, Cyber Attacks as “Force” under UN Charter Article 2 (4), International Law and the Changing Character of War, Volume 87, 2011, Naval War College, pages: 43-59. • Michael N. Schmitt, Cyber Operations and the Jus in Bello: Key Issues, International Law and the Changing Character of War, Volume 87, 2011, Naval War College, pages: 89-113. • Jason Samenow, Why climate change shouldn't be named the 'top' threat to national security, 2015, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/capital-weather-gang/wp/2015/11/17/why-climate-change-shouldnt-be-named-the-top-threat-to-national-security/ • Chris Warmoll, Threat of interstate conflict brings war room issues to the boardroom, 2015, http://www.financialdirector.co.uk/financial-director/feature/2394071/threat-of-interstate-conflict-brings-war-room-issues-to-the-boardroom • The Future Character of Conflict, 2015, https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/486301/20151210-Archived_DCDC_FCOC.pdf • <i>Francesco Cecon</i>, <i>International Security and “Failed States”: A Cause for Concern?</i> <i>University of Warwick</i>, 2014 |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | | | | | |
|----|------------------------|------------------|-------|---|---|---|
| 14 | International Security | 450069 IRP103 | I-III | - | Vakhtang Maisaia / Invited Lecturer / PhD in Political Science | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robert Ondrejcsak “Introduction to Security Studies”, Centre for European and North Atlantic Affairs (CENAA), Bratislava, 2014 – electronic version • Robert J. Art and Robert Jervis “International Politics: Enduring Concepts and Contemporary Issues”, eighth edition, Pearson International Edition, New York, 2007 • Radoslav Ivancik-Voitech Jurcak “Peace Operations Of International Crisis Management”, monograph, University of Business and Enterprise in Ostrowiec Swietokrzyski, Poland, 2013 • Foreign Affairs: “Putin’s Russia – Down But Not Out” Volume 95, Number 3, May/June 2016 • Stephen McGlinchey “International Relations”, E-International Relations Publishing, Bristol, England, 2017 – electronic version • Barry Buzan, Ole Waever “The European Security Order Recast: Scenarios for the Post-Soviet –Cold War Era”, Centre for Peace and Conflict Research, Copenhagen, 1990 • John Baylis, Colin Gray “Strategy in the Contemporary World”, second edition, Oxford University Press, 2007 |
|----|------------------------|------------------|-------|---|---|---|



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | | | | | |
|----|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------|---|--|---|
| 15 | Comparative Governance and Politics | 450077 IRP101 | I-III | - | Ivanna Machitidze, Assoc. Prof. PhD in Political Science | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alan Jacobs, 1991, “Autocracy: Groups, Organizations, Nations, and Players”, <i>Transactional Analysis Journal</i>, vol. 21, 4: pp. 199-206 • Allen Hicken, Heather Stoll, 2012, “Are All Presidents Created Equal? Presidential Powers and the Shadow of Presidential Elections”, <i>Comparative Political Studies</i>, vol. 46, 3: pp. 291-319 • Andrew Murray Faure, 1994, “Some Methodological Problems in Comparative Politics” <i>Journal of Theoretical Politics</i>, vol. 6, 3: pp. 307-322 • Aníbal Pérez-Liñán, 2005,, “Democratization and Constitutional Crises in Presidential Regimes Toward Congressional Supremacy?” <i>Comparative Political Studies</i>, vol. 38, 1: pp. 51-74 • Blomgren, Magnus and Rozenbergi Olivier 2012, <i>Parliamentary Roles in Modern Legislatures, Routledge</i> • Christopher D Raymond, Michael Huelshoff, Marc R Rosenblum, 2015, “Electoral systems, ethnic cleavages and experience with democracy” <i>International Political Science Review</i>, vol. 37, 4: pp. 550-566. • David Doyle, 2011, “The Legitimacy of Political Institutions :Explaining Contemporary Populism in Latin America” <i>Comparative Political Studies</i>, vol. 44, 11: pp. 1447-1473 • Development and State of the Art” <i>Administration & Society</i>, vol. 32, 5: pp. 499-528 • Dutt, V.P. 2011, “India and China: The Past and the Future” <i>International Studies</i>, 47(2-4) 403 –412 • Erica Frantz and Andrea Kendall-Taylor, 2014 “A dictator’s toolkit: Understanding how co-optation affects repression” <i>Journal of Peace Research</i>, vol. 51, 3: pp. 332-346 • Erk, Jan and Koning, Edward. 2009, “New Structuralism and Institutional Change: Federalism Between Centralization and Decentralization”, <i>Comparative Political Studies</i>, vol. 43, 3: pp. 353-378 • Gerardo L. Munck Richard Snyder, 2007, “Debating the Direction of Comparative Politics An Analysis of Leading Journals” <i>Comparative Political Studies</i>, vol. 40, 1: pp. 5-31. |
|----|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------|---|--|---|



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grigorii V. Golosov.2003. “Electoral Systems and Party Formation in Russia A Cross-Regional Analysis” <i>Comparative Political Studies</i>, vol. 36, 8: pp. 912-935. • Hill, Annetteç 2013, “Introduction to Civic Cultures” <i>Television & New Media</i> 14(1) 3–4 • Hong Jong Lee and Yong So Park, 2004, “The Nation-State at the Crossroads”, <i>International Area Review</i>, Volume 7, Number 2. • Jan Teorell Catharina Lindstedt, 2009,” Measuring Electoral Systems” <i>Political Research Quarterly</i>, vol. 63, 2: pp. 434-448 • Joachim K. Blatter, 2001, “Debordering the World of States:Towards a Multi-Level System in Europe and a Multi-Polity System in North America? Insights from Border Regions”, <i>European Journal of International Relations</i>, vol. 7, 2: pp. 175-209. • John Lambert, 1991. “Europe: The Nation-State Dies Hard” <i>Capital & Class</i>, vol. 15, 1: pp. 9-24 • John, Peter, Fieldhouse, Edward and Liui Hanhua, 2011, “How Civic is the Civic Culture? Explaining Community Participation Using the 2005 English Citizenship Survey”, <i>Political Studies</i>, vol. 59, 2: pp. 230-252. • Jos C. N. Raadschelders.2000 “Administrative History of the United States • Karl Fields, Patrick O’Neil and Don Sher. 2006. <i>Cases in Comparative Politics</i>. 2nd Ed. New York: W.W. Norton & Co. • Kidwell, Kirk S., 2008, “Politics, Performativity, Autopoiesis: Toward a Discourse Systems Theory of Political Culture”, <i>Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies</i>, vol. 9, 4: pp. 533-558. • Kreppel, Amie. “Understanding the European Parliament from a Federalist Perspective: The Legislatures of the USA and EU Compared” in Martin Schain and Anand Menon (Eds.) <u>Comparative Federalism: The European Union and the United States</u>, Oxford University Press, 2006. • Kuhn, Raymond. 2013, “Mirror, mirror ...’: Performance and presidential politics in contemporary France”, <i>French Cultural Studies</i>, vol. 24, 3: pp. 293-305. |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------------------------|--|----|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LaPalombara, Joseph. 2007, "Reflections on Political Parties and Political Development, Four Decades Later", <i>Party Politics</i>, vol. 13, 2: pp. 141-154. • LeDuc, Lawrence, Richard Niemi and Pippa Norris. 2010. 'Introduction: Building and Sustaining Democracy.' In <i>Comparing Democracies 3</i> London: Sage. Chapter available online at www.pippanorris.com • Leiv Marsteintredet, 2013, "Explaining variation of executive instability in presidential regimes: Presidential interruptions in Latin America", <i>International Political Science Review</i>, vol. 35, 2: pp. 173-194. • Mark Chou, 2011, "When Democracies Fail" <i>Political Studies Review</i>, vol. 9, 3: pp. 344-356. • <u>Ora John Reuter Thomas F. Remington, "Dominant Party Regimes and the Commitment Problem: The Case of United Russia" <i>Comparative Political Studies</i>, vol. 42, 4: pp. 501-526.</u> • Palencia, Mario Moya, 1974, "Federalism and Administrative Decentralization", <i>International Review of Administrative Sciences</i>, vol. 40, 1: pp. 15-22. • Palmer, Monte. 2006. <i>Comparative Politics</i>. Wadsworth:Thomson. • R. G. Mulgan, 1968, "Defining 'Democracy' <i>Political Science</i>, vol. 20, 2: pp. 3-9. • Richard Heffernan, 2003, "Prime Ministerial Predominance? Core Executive Politics in the UK", <i>British Journal of Politics and International Relations</i>, Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 347-372 • Shane Martin, Thomas Saalfeld, and Kaare W. Strøm 2014, <i>The Oxford Handbook of Legislative Studies</i> Oxford Oxford University Press • Whiteley, Paul. 2014, "Does regulation make political parties more popular? A multi-level analysis of party support in Europe", <i>International Political Science Review</i>, vol. 35, 3: pp. 376-399. |
| III | Obligatory Research Component | | IV | | | |



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|------------------|----|--|-----------------------|--|
| 1 | Master Thesis | 600135 INT308 | IV | Obligatory teaching component of the program | Individual Supervisor | Upon the Recommendation of the Thesis supervisor |
|---|---------------|------------------|----|--|-----------------------|--|