# The World We Make

*Instructor guide*

Created by Yoav Duman | Class edition 2

Use this five-episode inquiry to teach constructivist explanations alongside material pressures and institutional incentives. Students work with dated records, test small models, write twelve short explanations, and revisit their initial prediction. The grading workspace brings their writing and relevant decisions together for manual assessment.

## Plan the assignment

Allow an estimated 60–90 minutes for independent work and 15–20 minutes for discussion if assigned. For two sittings, use Episodes 1–3 for the Cold War case and Episodes 4–5 for the landmine campaign and transfer. Pause after Episode 3.

The game supplies orientation and concept help. Introduce ideas, relational identity, interests, norms, and the distinction between consequences and appropriateness before or during play. Students should be able to explain a causal connection in ordinary language; vocabulary alone does not demonstrate it.

## Learning goals

- Explain why material capabilities acquire different meanings within relationships, and how ideas about security can shape the aims actors pursue.
- Distinguish who actors understand themselves to be from the aims they value. Trace how interaction and practice can reproduce or change identities, expectations and interests.
- Identify whose shared expectation makes conduct appropriate, and distinguish conduct understood as a duty from compliance for expected costs, rewards or penalties.
- Investigate how advocates, states, affected communities and institutions promote or contest norms, while examining unequal influence, authorized commitment and implementation.
- Compare ideas, identity and norm explanations with material pressures and institutional incentives using dated evidence, a serious rival and a changed-condition transfer case.

## What remains required

For Class, record twelve explanations and a separate E09-based P01 revisit, each at least 15 words. A 25-word target helps pace shorter answers. Students may take more space when a question needs several pieces of evidence.

# Run the five episodes

### One  Geneva

Students record their first prediction before opening E01. Then they inspect E01–E03, deliver a public finding to both desks and record P02. Ask how a declared role could affect expectations while disagreement remains.

### Two  Inspection and practice

Students classify systems, establish reciprocal access, and use E04–E06. They enact an encounter, deliver its receipt to the US desk, then return for the second encounter. Compare both before P04. Recognition of an inspector's role and information about compliance are distinct effects.

### Three  Explaining change

Students compare E07–E10 and D01, build a three-record mechanism board, and revisit P01 with a specific detail from E09. Private minutes can complicate a public claim. E09 stays in the research archive.

### Four  The ban campaign

Students examine E11–E15 and test a coalition before P08–P10. Ask who can commit a government and who influences the agenda. Compare the seven-staff-week package under budgets of six and seven. These costs are model assumptions.

### Five  Inference and transfer

Students examine E16 and D03, distinguishing the UN roll call and its denominator from 122 opening signatures at Ottawa. Ask what matched state records would show. In P12, apply a mechanism to a changed condition.

### Keep navigation from taking over

Ask students to use the current mission and Notebook rather than repeatedly searching the district. Long workshop dialogs can require substantial scrolling on a phone. Allow a larger screen or breaks where possible. Do not use the game's activity counter as time on task; dialog reading is not fully counted.

# Collect and grade submissions

## Collect the Class PDF

Assign For Class. Students enter their name, complete the assignment, and use Print / Save PDF to submit to Canvas. If you use batch grading, also ask for the separate assessment-data JSON. The progress JSON is for restoring work.

## Open the grading workspace

Open Instructor desk, enter 5907, and choose Open instructor grading workspace. The code is a convenience setting, not secure authentication. Import student files together. The workspace supports up to 100 runs; use separate backed-up batches for larger cohorts. Do not import the full game HTML as a student save.

## Read consistently

Use One question across students to calibrate judgments and reduce repeated source lookup. Use All questions for one student to follow the whole argument. Each response includes the prompt, relevant records, teacher guidance, and modeled context where relevant. P01 places initial and later accounts together. Expand earlier versions when the development of an answer matters.

Select a manual score from 0 to 3. The editable comment buttons provide starting points for feedback; tailor them to the actual reasoning. No score is generated automatically. The twelve questions are equally weighted for a total of 36. Before all current answers are scored, the workspace shows a subtotal rather than a finished grade.

## Return feedback and keep a backup

Select a student and download the feedback HTML; print it to PDF if desired. Export the class CSV for your records and download the grading backup JSON after a grading session. The CSV is a summary, not an automatic LMS import. The grading backup includes imported runs and your feedback; the student resumable save is a different file.

Names, responses and grades remain in this browser. The grader does not upload them to a server. Browser clearing or storage limits can remove local work, so keep the backup in your normal protected course storage. Restore grading backup replaces the current grading workspace after confirmation.

## Handle resubmissions

A matching name and run-start time updates an existing run; an older file is skipped. A newly started game is a separate run. Changed responses or relevant decisions mark earlier scores as needing review. Click a score after rereading to validate it; editing a comment alone does not validate an old score.

# Use the rubric fairly

Apply this suggested common scale in relation to each prompt's demands. The interface stores one holistic score per question. P01 includes the initial prediction and evidence-based revisit; do not penalize an initial hypothesis merely because later records challenge it.

### 3 Strong

Explains a clear mechanism, uses the relevant record or enacted choice precisely, and addresses the relevant limit, rival or conditional test the prompt asks for.

### 2 Meets expectations

Answers the central question with a defensible causal connection and relevant support. Minor imprecision does not undermine the explanation.

### 1 Developing

Identifies a relevant idea but the mechanism, evidence link or requested comparison remains incomplete or unclear.

### 0 Not demonstrated

No assessable response, an irrelevant answer, or a central conceptual error that prevents the requested reasoning from being demonstrated.

### Use review notes as prompts to inspect

Missing answers, unrecorded drafts, identical responses, highly repetitive wording and decisions changed after writing are review notes. They are not automatic penalties or plagiarism findings. A student may submit a legitimate unchanged claim with new support; unchanged prose alone is not evidence of substantive revision.

### Protect disagreement

Reward a supported explanation even when it challenges a constructivist account or the model's costs. Material pressures, information, changing aims and duties can coexist. Require a credible rival rather than a caricature. Do not grade agreement with a humanitarian policy position or equate cooperation with internalized norms.

### Accommodations

Assessed Class fields support typing, dictation, and reuse within the same answer. When a student needs an accommodation, preserve the same reasoning task and use your usual course process. Have students record revised drafts before exporting the final PDF.

# Question specific assessment cues

### P01  Your first prediction

An initial causal expectation, preserved for later comparison. No prior knowledge of constructivism is required.

### P02  Who are we to each other

Names a particular self/other role or relationship and explains how it could shape an expectation. Distinguishes an identity claim from a material capability or an interest; does not assume the other audience accepts the role.

### P03  The same visitor, a new role

Explains how reciprocal recognition constitutes a bounded inspector role, while distinguishing that role from information about compliance. Can identify an appropriate duty without assuming shared friendship, internalization or transformed security interests.

### P04  Keep or revise after practice

Uses the player's enacted sequence to explain a changed or reproduced expectation, rather than equating cooperation with a new identity. Keeps or revises the original prediction with Reykjavík as a limit; accepts stable interests, monitoring incentives or combined explanations.

### P05  Can an idea change an aim

Explains an idea → understanding of security → valued aim connection, not merely a change of rhetoric. Uses public/private comparison and a specific limit from E09; economic need, audience management and changed aims may coexist. Does not treat identity and interests as synonyms.

### P06  Recognition and rights

Links a specific right or restriction to internationally recognized standing, rather than equating sovereignty with material control alone. Keeps the settlement's legal provisions distinct from citizens' varied identities and political projects.

# Later questions and discussion

### P07  A test that could change your mind

Grounds a proposed discriminating observation in the missile-removal measure and states how rival explanations would interpret it differently. Distinguishes changed aims from new information or cheaper means to stable aims; allows combined causes and measurement limits.

### P08  Whose protection becomes a duty

Explains a norm claim about whose protection governments should consider and identifies documented political agency behind it. Distinguishes a shared or contested expectation from personal sympathy, the existence of harm, a reward or an already binding universal rule.

### P09  From concern to commitment

Names an organized action and a concrete route to an authorized state commitment. Explains the expectation being promoted without assuming NGOs can ratify treaties or persuasion automatically binds a state; institutions, strategic interests and incentives may contribute.

### P10  Defend a tradeoff

Defends a concrete tradeoff against a credible objection, including an objection to the model’s assumed costs. Preserves authority, affected-community influence and implementation constraints; neither humanitarian language nor a favored route automatically proves duty or effectiveness.

### P11  Support is not a motive

Distinguishes resolution support, signatures and party status, then gives the inferential reason counts do not distinguish an internalized expectation from compliance for incentives. Does not reduce a norm to law or equate one supportive act with internalization.

### P12  Transfer the explanation

Gives a conditional observation that updates the relative plausibility of two mechanisms, such as a role or norm obligation and an incentive account. Where relevant, examines unequal power, excluded residents and who can challenge reports. Preserves uncertainty, possible hidden benefits and combined causes; neither cooperation nor hostility is inevitable.

# Debrief and preparation

## Discuss the evidence

- Which record changed your account most? Explain the change in the mechanism, not only your confidence.
- How could the same inspection reduce uncertainty and constitute a recognized role? What evidence would distinguish those effects?
- When can an idea change what an actor wants, rather than supply a cheaper means to an unchanged aim?
- Who could place civilian protection on the agenda, who could commit a government, and who remained excluded?
- What would make the norm account more plausible than an incentive account in the changed-condition case? What would remain uncertain?

## Source boundaries

Historical cards are sourced paraphrases; reconstructed guides and workshop responses are authored teaching material. The source companion retains links and each card's limits. The selected archive cannot establish the total causes of the Cold War's end or the landmine ban. The game's map compresses different places and dates into a walkable research district.

The landmine scenes stop at their displayed historical dates. Do not infer current treaty membership or compliance. The UN legal-history overview contains an entry-into-force typo; the game's source note correctly gives 1 March 1999, with the UN Treaty Collection as the reference. Votes, signatures, ratification and entry into force must remain separate.

## Copy into the assignment

Start For Class and enter your name. Record P01–P12 and the E09-based revisit, at least 15 words each. Use the cited records or modeled decisions to support your explanations. Complete all requirements, save the Class PDF, and upload it to Canvas. Keep a progress JSON for your own backup. Submit assessment-data JSON only if assigned.

## Technical scope

The teaching pack includes a standalone game. Linked external sources require internet access. Keep a portable progress JSON before changing devices and open the same mode to restore it.

Activity and materials. Open For Class online