

# PLS 458/558: International Organization

Nazarbayev University

Fall 2020

T, 10:30 AM–1:15 PM (via Zoom)

**Instructor:** Dr. Bimal Adhikari

**Email:** [bimal.adhikari@nu.edu.kz](mailto:bimal.adhikari@nu.edu.kz)

**Office Location:** 8.502

**Office Hours:** TR, 2:30 PM - 4:00 PM (via Zoom)

## Course Description and Objectives

This course focuses on research in the area of international cooperation and international institutions. We will focus on how international organizations (IOs) “institutionalize” cooperation at the international level, including their creation, internal dynamics, and complicated relationship with state behavior in areas such as security, political economy, environment, and human rights. The first half of the course will focus on the theories of international cooperation (or lack thereof) and address questions such as: how do we define IOs; why do states create and join IOs; when and which issues are taken to IOs; what mechanisms can IOs use to influence state behavior; and do they achieve their stated goals. The second half of the course examines major IOs such as the United Nations, the International Monetary Fund, and the World Bank. The course will also briefly cover the influence of international non-governmental entities on state behavior. We conclude the course with a brief discussion on the future of international cooperation. This is an upper-level course; therefore, a reasonable knowledge of quantitative methods is expected, but nothing beyond elementary statistics (i.e., PLS 211) is required.

By the end of the course, the student will be able to (1) understand why sovereign states often surrender some authority to international institutions; (2) demonstrate the ability to develop a research question and answer it using appropriate source; (3) synthesize chunks of the literature and present its overall gaps; (4) effectively communicate scientific ideas and the information in an appropriate format; (5) listen to and be tolerant of different views.

## Readings

Most readings for this course are from academic journals that can be obtained from the [NU's library portal](#). Please familiarize yourself with system since this will be a key source of scholarly works during the course of the semester. Readings that are not available via the library will be posted on Moodle.

## Course Requirements

### 1. Exam (20%)

Students will be given a set of questions for which undergraduates will craft one 2,000-2,500 words response (excluding bibliography), and graduate students will answer two questions of the same length each. (Each response will be worth 10% for graduate students.) Your essays should demonstrate

that you grasp the basic arguments of the readings and are able to synthesize and critique the social scientific literature we have gone over. Further, your response should demonstrate that you can apply these arguments to new situations. No outside reading is required; however, students are expected to use as many required and recommended readings as possible in their responses. Exam questions will be made available at least a week before the deadline. A rubric will be provided.

## 2. **Response Papers** (2 \* 10 = 20%)

Students are expected to write two response papers (1,000-1,250 words) on the week's required reading (each worth 10%). The professor will assign students the weeks that they will write papers on by August 25, 2020. This assignment serves two purposes (1) keeps you engaged in developing your reading, writing, and analytical skills, which requires regular and rigorous practice; and (2) ensures that you come to class prepared, meaning that you have read the assigned readings. The professor will assign the weeks by the end of Week 1. Response papers are to be submitted by 10:00 AM via Moodle (Turnitin) on Monday of the chosen weeks. You will be marked off at ten percentage points for the first 24 hours late and an additional 20 percentage points for the subsequent 24 hours late. After 48 hours, your papers will not be graded. I will keep the submission links open for excused late submissions, please do not consider that as a free pass to submit assignments past the due date. No make-up opportunity will be provided. Because I am unable to predict in advance how long each topic will take, the course schedule is only a rough guideline. However, the deadlines for the papers will remain firm.

Response papers should be based on a thorough reading of assigned and recommended literature as well as [additional scholarly sources](#). Students may not use scholarly sources that are not listed on the webpage above. Each paper should consist of (1) a summary of a chapter or article (200 - 250 words), and (2) a critical analysis of the reading with a clear overarching argument (800 - 1,000 words). In the first half of the paper, students should state the authors' central argument and explain how they develop and support it. Students should demonstrate, in their own words, concisely and coherently, that they fully understand the research question, causal mechanisms, research design, and findings. This section is about boiling down the author's reasoning. Avoid merely listing the topics covered in the reading. In the second half of the paper, students should identify any theoretical or empirical gaps within the selected scholarship. This part should be analytical rather than descriptive with a clearly stated thesis. The following are some of the questions that students are expected to address: is the theory internally consistent? Is it consistent with past literature and findings? What points do you find most (or least) convincing? What perplexes you about the material or the argument? What are the major shortcomings of the author's main argument? Are the assumptions and causal mechanisms elaborated clearly? Are the assumptions plausible? Are the concepts properly defined? How convincing is the research design? Do the dependent and independent variables adequately correspond to the theoretical concepts of interest? Can you think of a better measure of the variables? Are more reliable data available to test the hypotheses? Are there other possible explanations of the phenomenon of interest that need to be considered? Are there concerns with reverse causality? Are there concerns about the omitted variable bias? Do other assigned readings for the week help answer the questions left unanswered by the selected reading? Do the policy implications (if any) follow from the results? As a collection, what questions do the readings answer, and what problems do they leave unanswered?

Be sure that your critique is a coherent whole. As such, you do not necessarily have to answer all the questions mentioned above. These questions are intended to improve understanding of the

material and inspire discussion, so pick the ones that you think are most interesting that warrant further consideration. The instructor may ask the students to read aloud the questions or arguments from their response papers. Seminar participants are expected to provide answers to their queries or advance their arguments whenever possible. I will evaluate response papers based on the quality of the synopsis (2 points), the depth of your analysis/reflections (6 points), and the strength of the writing (2 points). As such, students are highly encouraged to consult with the Writing Center staff before turning in the final version. Sample papers will be made available via Moodle.

### 3. **Research Proposal & Presentation** (40 + 10 = 50%)

This course also requires students to write 5,000-6,500 words (excluding bibliography) empirical research proposal. This project aims to provide an outline of a potential research project you could do for an academic article or even a thesis. As such, each research proposal must include (1) a statement of the research question, (2) a review of the existing literature on the topic, (3) your theoretical argument, (4) hypothesis/hypotheses that flow from the argument, (5) a way to empirically evaluate your hypotheses, (6) a conclusion that states how your project adds to what we know already know about the topic. In other words, your paper must be original research, and not a general overview or a summary of existing literature. Therefore, your work must address the empirical puzzle you have observed in the literature or address any theoretical gaps in the existing literature.

The project can be on any international organization topic of your choosing. However, your paper must be broad in scope and should not be case-specific (i.e., “Should the World Bank fund a health post in Nur-Sultan?”). The tentative topic must be approved by the instructor. As such, students are required to consult with the instructor by September 1, 2020 regarding their research topic. Remember, this is a formal proposal for research. You will not do the actual data collection nor the data analysis (at least not for this class). However, you will have to demonstrate that what you propose would be a realistic problem that is amenable to empirical investigation. To ensure that you do not procrastinate in this process, you are required to post the following component of your research proposal on Moodle on the following dates:

- **September 8:** A research question (1 to 2 sentences is fine).
- **September 29:** An annotated bibliography with at least ten scholarly sources (800-1,200 words).
- **October 13:** A general statement of your theoretical argument and hypotheses (2,000-3,000 words) (5%; will be graded on a satisfactory/unsatisfactory basis).
- **November 3:** Draft research design proposal (5,000-6,500 words) (10%).
- **November 17 & 24:** Presentation of your research proposal (7.5%).
- **December 1:** Final research design project due by 5:00 PM (25%).

Failure to complete any of these steps will adversely affect your final grade; students may get a zero for the whole assignment (47.5%). I will read these components but will not grade all of them. I expect students to consult with me several times over the course of the semester to discuss this assignment. Students may not change the topic of the paper without the instructor’s permission after the submission of the theoretical argument and hypothesis. I will post a grading rubric on Moodle.

In the last two weeks of the semester, students will present their research to their colleagues. These presentations will follow the academic conference format. I will act as the chair while each paper will be assigned two fellow students who will serve as discussants. The discussant’s role is to comment

on each paper, offer useful criticism, and ask questions that the author of the paper might not have clarified in her/his presentation. Each presenter will have 10-12 minutes to present their paper. The use of PowerPoint is mandatory. The discussants will have up to 10 minutes to provide feedback and ask questions. Following the discussant's comments, others may ask questions and/or offer feedback to the presenter. This expectation will account for 10% of your grade; 7.5% for the presentation of your own work and 2.5% for your role as a discussant.

4. **Presentations** (2 \* 5 = 10%)

- i. **Recommended Readings (5%):** From week three onwards, students will present an outline of one of the recommended readings and offer discussion questions for the class. Your presentation must be between 8-10 minutes. The use of PowerPoint is mandatory. The slides will later be uploaded to Moodle so that your peers can use them for the final exam. As such, students are required to submit the slides before the class time the day of the presentation. There are two goals of these presentations (1) practice coming up with the main idea of articles and presenting that idea to others, and (2) practice presenting with a strict time limit so that you are better prepared to present your work at academic conferences. Each student will present in the weeks in which they will not be writing response papers. Both content and style of presentation will be evaluated.
- ii. **IO (5%):** From week three onwards, students will be presenting a specific international organization assigned by the instructor. Your presentation must be between 8-10 minutes. The use of PowerPoint is mandatory. Each presentation must cover the following areas: the IO's history, purpose, structure, membership, source of finance, decision-making process, and an overall assessment of its effectiveness in influencing state behavior. The primary source for information is the organization's web site. However, you are expected to consider other legitimate sources as you prepare for this assignment. Both content and style of presentation will be evaluated.

## Grading

### Grading Components

Exam :	20%
Response Papers (2 * 10) :	20%
Research Proposal & Presentation (40 + 10) :	50%
Recommended Readings & IO Presentation (2 * 5) :	10%

### Letter Grade Distribution

Final class grades will be assigned with the following grading scale:

>= 95	A	65.00 - 69.99	C
90.00 - 94.99	A-	60.00 - 64.99	C-
85.00 - 89.99	B+	55.00 - 59.99	D+
80.00 - 84.99	B	50.00 - 54.99	D
75.00 - 79.99	B-	<= 50.00	F
70.00 - 74.99	C+		

## Other Considerations

### Make-up Assignments

All enrolled students need to attend all seminar meetings. Students who know they will miss class, even if it is a School or University activity, must contact the instructor before the class. If this is not possible, the instructor must be contacted within 24 hours. Students must provide documentation for their absence.

If a student misses an assessment and does not find a way to contact the professor within this twenty-four-hour window (either personally or via a friend or family member), the student may receive a zero for the assessment. If circumstances are so dire as to keep the student from making contact during this twenty-four-hour-window, then the student must provide substantial documentation corroborating the situation (a simple *spravka* will not suffice) within three business days.

If an assessment is missed, instructors can give a zero. The instructor may also offer a more difficult version of the assessment; a make-up with a penalty; increase the value of a subsequent assessment; or some other option.

All assessments should be completed before the day final grades are due. In exceptional circumstances (for instance a long-term hospitalization) a grade of incomplete may be given. Such grades are given only with the approval of the instructor and Vice Dean for Academic Affairs.

### Grade Appeals

You may contest the grade on an exam up to five business days after it is returned. If you believe that there has been a grading error, submit a written description of the error you believe occurred with your work via official NU email. However, you are required to wait 24 hours after the assignment is returned to you before contacting me. Please also note that if you appeal a grade on an assignment and I decide to reexamine the assignment, the grade may increase, decrease, or remain the same. It will be treated as a new grade on the assignment, and all aspects of the assignment are open to reexamination. There will be no re-grading of re-graded assignment. For the final exam, students will have 48 hours to request re-grading of the assignment. Also, I do not envision any curves or extra-credit assignments in the course.

The grade you earn in the class is the grade you deserve. I will not tolerate any form of grade lawyering, which includes requests for the grade to be raised for no legitimate reason, flattery, insults, threats, etc. Students involved in such acts will be reported to the Vice Dean of Academic Affairs for an academic misconduct report (category B offense).

### Availability

Office hours are listed at the beginning of the syllabus, and I strongly recommend you to schedule meetings during the office hours. To smooth out the process, you are required to make an appointment at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. If you need to see me outside office hours, you must send me an email beforehand (at least 48 hours ahead), and I will be glad to make arrangements with you. All meetings will be held via Zoom. I aim to be responsive to email from students. However, please do not expect an answer to your question sooner than 24 hours after it is sent during weekdays, and 48 hours during weekends. I will also not answer emails that can be answered by looking at the syllabus.

Also, do not start your email “Hey Dr. Adhikari,” or “Hello,” or without a salutation. Instead, “Dear Dr. Adhikari,” or “Dear Professor Adhikari,” should be used for initial contact. I will not answer emails that use an improper salutation.

### **Written Assignment Formatting**

Your papers are professional products and should be formatted as such. Each paper should be a word document (no PDFs), double-spaced, in a normal font (Times New Roman, size 12), with standard 1” margins. Your citations must adhere to the [American Political Science Association Style Manual](#). Keep in mind the page limit does not include references. Failure to adhere to these formatting instructions will adversely affect your assignment grade.

Unless mentioned otherwise, assignments submitted after the passage of the deadline will not be accepted. I also do not accept e-mail submissions. Students are highly encouraged to consult with the Writing Center staffs before turning in the final version of any written assignments.

### **Academic Honesty**

Academic dishonesty of any sort will not be tolerated. Academic misconduct is defined broadly, to include a wide variety of behaviors that conflict with the values and mission of NU. Students should become familiar with the NU Student Code of Conduct and Disciplinary Procedures (Student Code), which is the official document outlining policies and procedures around academic misconduct at NU. Students are responsible for complying with NU policies, as well as those described in the syllabus for an individual class, whether the student has read them or not. When in doubt about plagiarism, paraphrasing, quoting, collaboration, or any other forms of academic dishonesty, feel free to consult the course instructor.

## Class Outline

The information contained in the course syllabus may change throughout the semester. All changes will be announced via Moodle. It is the responsibility of the student to take note of any changes. The “®” symbol denotes recommended readings.

### Part I: A Primer on International Organizations

#### Week 1 (August 18): Introduction

- Syllabus
- [How to Read Political Science: A Guide in Four Steps](#)
- [Three Templates for Introductions to Political Science](#)
- [Raul Pacheco-Vega's Resources Page](#)

® Knopf, Jeffrey W. 2006. “Doing a Literature Review.” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 39(1): 127-132.

#### Week 2 (August 25): International Organizations in World Politics

- Cogan, Jacob Katz, Ian Hurd, and Ian Johnstone, eds. 2016. *The Oxford Handbook of International Organizations*. Oxford University Press. Chapters 1-3.
- ® Martin, Lisa. 1992. “Interests, Power, and Multilateralism.” *International Organization* 46(4): 765-792.
- ® Koremenos, Barbara, Charles Lipson, and Duncan Snidal. 2001. “The Rational Design of International Institutions.” *International Organization* 55(4): 761-99.
- ® Hafner-Burton, Emilie M., Jana von Stein, and Erik Gartzke. 2008. “International Organizations Count.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 52(2): 175-188.
- ® Volgy, Thomas J., Elizabeth Fausett, Keith A. Grant, and Stuart Rodgers. 2008. “Identifying Formal Intergovernmental Organizations.” *Journal of Peace Research* 45(6): 837-850.

#### Week 3 (September 1): Theories of Compliance

- Simmons, Beth. 2010. “Treaty Compliance and Violation.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 13: 273-296.
- Marcoux, Christopher, and Johannes Urpelainen. 2013. “Non-compliance by Design: Moribund Hard Law in International Institutions.” *Review of International Organizations* 8(2): 163-191.
- Vreeland, James Raymond. 2008. “Political Institutions and Human Rights: Why Dictatorships Enter into the United Nations Convention Against Torture.” *International Organization* 62(1): 65-101.

- Freeman, Nathan W. 2013. “Domestic Institutions, Capacity Limitations, and Compliance Costs: Host Country Determinants of Investment Treaty Arbitrations, 1987–2007.” *International Interactions* 39: 54-78.
- Ⓜ Chayes, Abram, and Antonia Handler Chayes. 1993. “On Compliance.” *International Organization* 47(2):175-205.
- Ⓜ Downs, George, David Roake, and Peter Barsoom, 1996. “Is the Good News about Compliance Good News about Cooperation?” *International Organization* 50(3): 379-406.
- Ⓜ Fearon, James. 1998. “Bargaining, Enforcement, and International Cooperation.” *International Organization* 52(2): 269-305.
- Ⓜ Berliner, Daniel, and Aseem Prakash. 2015. ““Bluewashing” the Firm? Voluntary Regulations, Program Design, and Member Compliance with the United Nations Global Compact.” *Policy Studies Journal* 43(1): 115-138.

#### **Week 4 (September 8): The Nexus Between Domestic and International Institutions**

- Mansfield, Edward and Jon Pevehouse. 2006. “Democratization and International Organizations.” *International Organization* 60(1): 137-167.
- Matanock, Aila M. 2020. “How International Actors Help Enforce Domestic Deals.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 23: 357-383.
- Hill Jr., Daniel W. 2010. “Estimating the Effects of Human Rights Treaties on State Behavior.” *Journal of Politics* 72(4): 1161-1174.
- von Borzyskowski, Inken. 2019. “The Risks of Election Observation: International Condemnation and Post-Election Violence.” *International Studies Quarterly* 63 (3): 654-667.
- Ⓜ Kelley, Judith. 2007. “Who Keeps International Commitments and Why? The International Criminal Court and Bilateral Non-Surrender Agreements.” *American Political Science Review* 101(3): 573-589.
- Ⓜ Allee, Tod and Paul Huth. 2006. “Legitimizing Dispute Settlement: International Legal Rulings and Domestic Political Cover.” *American Political Science Review* 100(2): 219-234.
- Ⓜ Pevehouse, Jon. 2002. “Democracy from the Outside-In? International Organizations and Democratization.” *International Organization* 56(3): 515-549.
- Ⓜ Cao, Xun, and Aseem Prakash. 2012. “Trade Competition and Environmental Regulations: Domestic Political Constraints and Issue Visibility.” *Journal of Politics* 74(1): 66-82.

## **Part II: The United Nations System**

### **Week 5 (September 15): UN General Assembly**

- Mattes, Michaela, Brett Ashley Leeds, and Royce Carroll. 2015. “Leadership Turnover and Foreign Policy Change: Societal Interests, Domestic Institutions, and Voting in the United Nations.” *International Studies Quarterly* 59(2): 280-290.



- Brazys, Samuel, and Diana Panke. 2017. “Why Do States Change Positions in the United Nations General Assembly?.” *International Political Science Review* 38(1): 70-84.
- Adhikari, Bimal. 2019. “Power Politics and Foreign Aid Delivery Tactics.” *Social Science Quarterly* 100(5): 1523-1539.
- Brazys, Samuel, and Alexander Dukalskis. 2017. “Canary in the Coal Mine? China, the UNGA, and the Changing World Order.” *Review of International Studies* 43(4): 742-764.
- Ⓜ Reinalda, Bob. 2013. eds. *Routledge Handbook of International Organization*. Routledge. Chapter 4.
- Ⓜ Panke, Diana. 2014. “The UNGA – A Talking Shop? Exploring Rationales for the Repetition of Resolutions in Subsequent Negotiations.” *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 27(3): 442-458.
- Ⓜ Panke, Diana, Stefan Lang, and Anke Wiedemann. 2019. “Regional Organisations in the UNGA: Who is Most Active and Why?.” *Journal of International Relations and Development* 22(3): 744-785.
- Ⓜ Panke, Diana. 2014. “Absenteeism in the General Assembly of the United Nations: Why Some Member States Rarely Vote.” *International Politics* 51(6): 729-749.

#### **Week 6 (September 22): UN Security Council**

- Dreher, Axel, Matthew Gould, Matthew D. Rablen, and James Raymond Vreeland. 2014. “The Determinants of Election to the United Nations Security Council.” *Public Choice* 158(1-2): 51-83.
- Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce, and Alastair Smith. 2010. “The Pernicious Consequences of UN Security Council Membership.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 54(5): 667-686.
- Hwang, Wonjae, Amanda G. Sanford, and Junhan Lee. 2015 “Does Membership on the UN Security Council Influence Voting in the UN General Assembly?.” *International Interactions* 41(2): 256-278.
- Chapman, Terrence L., and Dan Reiter. 2004. “The United Nations Security Council and the Rally ‘Round the Flag Effect.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 48(6): 886-909.
- Ⓜ Voeten, Erik. 2005. “The Political Origins of the UN Security Council’s Ability to Legitimize the Use of Force.” *International Organization* 59(3): 527-557.
- Ⓜ Langmore, John, and Ramesh Thakur. 2016. “The Elected but Neglected Security Council Members.” *Washington Quarterly* 39(2): 99-114.
- Ⓜ Bashir, Omar S., and Darren J. Lim. 2013. “Misplaced Blame: Foreign Aid and the Consequences of UN Security Council Membership.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 57(3): 509-523.
- Ⓜ Binder, Martin, and Jonathan Golub. 2020. “Civil Conflict and Agenda-Setting Speed in the United Nations Security Council.” *International Studies Quarterly* 64(2): 419-430.

#### **Week 7 (September 29): UN Commission on Human Rights / UN Human Rights Council**

- Squatrito, Theresa, Magnus Lundgren, and Thomas Sommerer. 2019. “Shaming by International Organizations: Mapping Condemnatory Speech Acts Across 27 International Organizations, 1980–2015.” *Cooperation and Conflict* 45(3): 356-377.
- Ausderan, Jacob. 2014. “How Naming and Shaming Affects Human Rights Perceptions in the Shamed Country.” *Journal of Peace Research* 51(1): 81-95.
- Vadlamannati, Krishna Chaitanya, Nicole Janz, and Øyvind Isachsen Berntsen. 2018. “Human Rights Shaming and FDI: Effects of the UN Human Rights Commission and Council.” *World Development* 104: 222–237.
- DiBlasi, Lora. Forthcoming. “From Shame to New Name: How Naming and Shaming Creates Pro-Government Militias.” *International Studies Quarterly*.
- Ⓜ Hug, Simon. 2016. “Dealing with Human Rights in International Organizations.” *Journal of Human Rights* 15(1): 21-39.
- Ⓜ Terman, Rochelle, and Erik Voeten. 2018. “The Relational Politics of Shame: Evidence from the Universal Periodic Review.” *Review of International Organizations* 13(1): 1-23
- Ⓜ Krain, Matthew. 2012. “*J'accuse!* Does Naming and Shaming Perpetrators Reduce the Severity of Genocides or Politicides?.” *International Studies Quarterly* 56(3): 574-589.
- Ⓜ Hug, Simon, and Richard Lukàcs. 2014. “Preferences or Blocs? Voting in the United Nations Human Rights Council.” *Review of International Organizations* 9(1): 83-106.

#### Week 8 (October 6): Fall Break

### Part III: International Economic Organizations

#### Week 9 (October 13): International Monetary Fund

- Dreher, Axel, Jan-Egbert Sturm, and James Raymond Vreeland. 2015. “Politics and IMF Conditionality.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(1): 120-148.
- Dreher, Axel, Jan-Egbert Sturm, and James Raymond Vreeland. 2009. “Global Horse Trading: IMF Loans For Votes in the United Nations Security Council.” *European Economic Review* 53(7): 742-757.
- Detraz, Nicole, and Dursun Peksen. 2016. “The Effect of IMF Programs on Women’s Economic and Political Rights.” *International Interactions* 42(1): 81-105.
- Woo, Byungwon, and Amanda Murdie. 2017. “International Organizations and Naming and Shaming: Does the International Monetary Fund Care About the Human Rights Reputation of its Client?.” *Political Studies* 65(4): 767-785.
- Ⓜ Caraway, Teri L., Stephanie J. Rickard, and Mark S. Anner. 2012. “International Negotiations and Domestic Politics: The Case of IMF Labor Market Conditionality.” *International Organization* 66(1): 27-61.

- Ⓜ Nelson, Stephen C., and Geoffrey Wallace. 2017. "Are IMF Lending Programs Good or Bad for Democracy?." *Review of International Organizations* 12(4): 523-558.
- Ⓜ Stubbs, Thomas H., Alexander E. Kentikelenis, and Lawrence P. King. 2016. "Catalyzing Aid? the IMF and Donor Behavior in Aid Allocation." *World Development* 78: 511-528.
- Ⓜ Rickard, Stephanie J., and Teri L. Caraway. 2019. "International Demands for Austerity: Examining the Impact of the IMF on the Public Sector." *Review of International Organizations* 14(1): 35-57.

#### **Week 10 (October 20): World Bank**

- Blanton, Robert G., Shannon Lindsey Blanton, and Dursun Peksen. 2015. "The Impact of IMF and World Bank Programs on Labor Rights." *Political Research Quarterly* 68(2): 324-336.
- Kersting, Erasmus K., and Christopher Kilby. 2016. "With a Little Help from My Friends: Global Electioneering and World Bank Lending." *Journal of Development Economics* 121: 153-165.
- Carnegie, Allison, and Cyrus Samii. 2019. "International Institutions and Political Liberalization: Evidence from the World Bank Loans Program." *British Journal of Political Science* 49(4): 1357-1379.
- Ravallion, Martin. 2016. "The World Bank: Why It Is Still Needed and Why It Still Disappoints." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 30(1): 77-94.
- Ⓜ Morrison, Kevin M. 2013. "Membership No Longer Has Its Privileges: The Declining Informal Influence of Board Members on IDA Lending." *Review of International Organizations* 8(2): 291-312.
- Ⓜ Dreher, Axel, and Jan-Egbert Sturm. 2012. "Do the IMF and the World Bank Influence Voting in the UN General Assembly?." *Public Choice* 151(1-2): 363-397.
- Ⓜ Kilby, Christopher. 2009. "The Political Economy of Conditionality: An Empirical Analysis of World Bank Loan Disbursements." *Journal of Development Economics* 89(1): 51-61.
- Ⓜ Clark, Richard, and Lindsay R. Dolan. Forthcoming. "Pleasing the Principal: US Influence in World Bank Policymaking." *American Journal of Political Science*.

### **Part IV: International NGOs**

#### **Week 11 (October 27): INGOs and State Behavior**

- Murdie, Amanda Marie, and Jakub Kakietek. 2012. "Do Development INGOs Really Work? The Impact of International Development NGOs on Human Capital and Economic Growth." *Journal of Sustainable Society* 1(1): 1-10.
- Campbell, Susanna, Matthew Digioseppe, and Amanda Murdie. 2019. "International Development NGOs and Bureaucratic Capacity: Facilitator or Destroyer?." *Political Research Quarterly* 72(1): 3-18.

- Murdie, Amanda, and Dursun Peksen. 2014. “The Impact of Human Rights INGO Shaming on Humanitarian Interventions.” *Journal of Politics* 76(1): 215-228.
- Dupuy, Kendra, James Ron, and Aseem Prakash. 2016. “Hands Off My Regime! Governments’ Restrictions on Foreign Aid to Non-Governmental Organizations in Poor and Middle-Income Countries.” *World Development* 84: 299-311.
- Ⓜ Dupuy, Kendra, and Aseem Prakash. Forthcoming. “Why Restrictive NGO Foreign Funding Laws Reduce Voter Turnout in Africa’s National Elections.” *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*.
- Ⓜ Murdie, Amanda, and Dursun Peksen. 2015. “Women’s Rights INGO Shaming and the Government Respect for Women’s Rights.” *Review of International Organizations* 10(1): 1-22.
- Ⓜ Hendrix, Cullen S., and Wendy H. Wong. 2014. “Knowing Your Audience: How the Structure of International Relations and Organizational Choices Affect Amnesty International’s Advocacy.” *Review of International Organizations* 9(1): 29-58.
- Ⓜ Murdie, Amanda, and Tavishi Bhasin. 2011. “Aiding and Abetting: Human Rights INGOs and Domestic Protest.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 55(2): 163-191.

## **Part V: The Future of International Organizations**

### **Week 12 (November 3): The Future of International Organizations**

- Bearce, David H., and Brandy J. Jolliff Scott. 2019. “Popular Non-support for International Organizations: How Extensive and What Does This Represent?.” *Review of International Organizations* 14(2): 187-216.
- von Borzyskowski, I., and Felicity Vabulas. 2019. “Hello, Goodbye: When do States Withdraw from International Organizations?.” *Review of International Organizations* 14 (2): 335–366.
- Broz, J. Lawrence, Zhiwen Zhang, and Gaoyang Wang. 2020. “Explaining Foreign Support for China’s Global Economic Leadership.” *International Organization* 74(3): 417-452.
- Vreeland, James Raymond. 2019. “Corrupting International Organizations.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 22: 205-222.
- Ⓜ Tallberg, Jonas, and Michael Zürn. 2019. “The Legitimacy and Legitimation of International Organizations: Introduction and Framework.” *Review of International Organizations* 14: 581–606.
- Ⓜ Hooghe, Liesbet, Tobias Lenz, and Gary Marks. 2019. “Contested World Order: The Delegitimation of International Governance.” *Review of International Organizations* 14(4): 731-743.
- Ⓜ Copelovitch, Mark, and Jon C. W. Pevehouse. 2019. “International Organizations in a New Era of Populist Nationalism.” *Review of International Organizations* 14: 169–186.
- Ⓜ Manulak, Michael W. 2020. “A Bird in the Hand: Temporal Focal Points and Change in International Institutions.” *Review of International Organizations* 15(1): 1-27.

**Week 13 (November 10): Exam**

**Week 14 (November 17): Mini Conference I**

- Miller, Beth, Jon Pevehouse, Ron Rogowski, Dustin Tingley, and Rick Wilson. 2013. "How to Be a Peer Reviewer: A Guide for Recent and Soon-to-be PhDs." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 46(1): 120-123.

**Week 15 (November 24) : Mini Conference II**

DRAFT