

# PLS 360: Foreign Policy Analysis

Nazarbayev University

Spring 2021

TR, 4:30–5:45 PM

**Professor:** Dr. Bimal Adhikari

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

**Office Hours:** T, 11:45 AM-2:45 PM

## Course Description and Objectives

This course's primary goal is to introduce students to various theories and concepts related to foreign policy analysis. This course will teach students to think analytically of foreign policy choices of different states through the lenses of theoretical and methodological tools. Students will learn about a host of foreign policy instruments that states have at their disposal, how they are employed, and their effectiveness in achieving foreign policy objectives. This is not a history or a current affairs course, although we will discuss them as examples when relevant. Several theoretical, as well as empirical pieces related to foreign policy analysis, will be used in this course; therefore, a reasonable knowledge of quantitative and quantitative methods is assumed, but nothing beyond elementary statistics (i.e., PLS 211) and basic research methodology (i.e., PLS 210) is required. By the end of the course, the student will be able to (1) identify different actors involved in foreign policy-making; (2) understand the factors that shape a state/leader's foreign policy position; (3) recognize the intricacies of foreign policy decision making, (4) master the concepts, theoretical approaches to explaining foreign policy decisions, outcomes, and effectiveness; (5) demonstrate the ability to develop a research question and answer it using appropriate source; (6) synthesize chunks of the literature and present its overall gaps; (7) effectively communicate scientific ideas and the information in an appropriate format; (8) listen to and be tolerant of different views.

## Readings

- Breuning, Marijke. 2007. *Foreign Policy Analysis: A Comparative Introduction*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hill, Christopher. 2003. *The Changing Politics of Foreign Policy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Smith, Steve, Amelia Hadfield, and Tim Dunne, eds. 2012. *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases*. Oxford University Press.
- You are expected to download other required readings. Most of them are available through the library website. Readings that are not in the library's holdings will be made available via Moodle.

## Course Requirements

### 1. Exams (25 + 20 = 45%)

There will be two exams worth 25% and 20%, respectively. The exams will consist of essay questions and/or short questions.

## 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%). 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 start of Week 2. 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. 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.

The 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. 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. **Quizzes** ( $3 * 5 = 15\%$ )

There will be three quizzes in total. The quizzes will be over the assigned readings for a given class

meeting and/or on the materials presented in previous lectures. Students will be given at least 48 hours to complete the assignment. The primary goal of the assignment is to keep students engaged with course readings and lecture notes. As such, the quizzes will be graded on a satisfactory/unsatisfactory basis, and late submissions will not be accepted unless students have a legitimate excuse.

4. **Debate** (10 + 5 + 5 = 20%)

Students will prepare for and participate in one debate during the course of the semester. Gaining a deeper and broader understanding of the topic requires extensive research. As such, *en route* to the debate, students will write a 1,000-1,250 word position paper (worth 10%). The paper must have at least five scholarly sources. The paper should include a brief introduction to your topic (relevance, where it fits within broad context of foreign policy, etc.), multiple perspectives on the issue, and your conclusions. The primary purpose of this assignment is to apply the social scientific process that governs the foreign policy decision making to other equally, if not more, important issues. As such, students are expected to extensively use the theories and concepts discussed in class. The instructor will assign the topic later in the semester. Position paper is due at 5:00 PM, April 08, 2021. You will be marked off 20 percentage points for the first 24 hours late and an additional 30 percentage points for the subsequent 24 hours late. After 48 hours, your papers will not be graded.

During the final week of the semester, students will upload a debate video on Moodle (worth 5%). The presentation must be based on the position paper and should be around 8-10 minutes. The video must be uploaded by 5:00 April 20, 2021. The next step of the assignment entails writing a 800-1,000 word synthesis paper (worth 5%). This assignment's objective is to have you carefully read your debate opponent's paper and remark on the aspects that overlap with your paper, the things that you learned, and the arguments that you disagree with. No scholarly citations are needed. The paper should be uploaded no later than 5:00 April 22, 2021. You will be marked off 20 percentage points for the first 24 hours late and an additional 30 percentage points for the subsequent 24 hours late. After 48 hours, your papers will not be graded.

## Grading

### Grading Components

Exams (25 + 20) :	45%
Response Papers (2 * 10) :	20%
Quizzes (3 * 5) :	15%
Debate (10 + 5 + 5) :	20%

### 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

Students who know they will miss an assignment, 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. Certificates attesting medical crisis must be provided no later than three days after the consultation with the doctor. Certificates submitted after this deadline will not be accepted.

If a student misses an assessment and does not find a way to contact the professor within the 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).

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 must 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 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 the re-graded assignment. For the final exam, students will have 48 hours to request the re-grading of the assignment. I do not scale or curve exams, and I do not envision any extra credit opportunities.

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

### **Written Assignment Formatting**

Your papers are professional products and should be formatted as such. All your written assignments must follow these guidelines. 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.

### **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), the official document that outlines policies and procedures around academic misconduct at NU. Students are responsible for complying with NU policies and 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 academic dishonesty, feel free to consult the course instructor.

All materials, including the syllabus, lecture notes, and other documents are copyrighted. Students are prohibited from sharing them without the express written permission of the professor. Violation of this policy will be treated as academic misconduct and will be reported to the Vice Dean for Academic Affairs.

### **Teaching**

Keeping in mind that some of you may face difficulty with the synchronous teaching method, I will be posting the lectures online by class time. I have tried my level best to reduce the size of the video clips without compromising the quality. I have also broken down the lectures into smaller parts. I hope doing so will help those of you with limited internet package or slower internet connection. I will also be posting the PDF version of the lectures.

## 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. Please note that “®” denotes recommended readings.

### Week 1 (January 11-15): Introduction

#### Tuesday

- Overview
- [How to Read Political Science](#)
- [Raul Pacheco-Vega's Resources Page](#)

#### Thursday

- Breuning, Chapter 1
- Smith, Hadfield, and Dunne, Chapters 1-3.

### Week 2 (January 18-22): Theories and Concepts I

#### Tuesday

- Lake, David A. 2011. “Why “isms” Are Evil: Theory, Epistemology, and Academic Sects as Impediments to Understanding and Progress.” *International Studies Quarterly* 55(2): 465–480.
- ® Smith, Hadfield, and Dunne, Chapter 6

#### Thursday

- Fukuyama, Francis. 1989. “The End of History?.” *The National Interest* 16: 3-18.
- Menand, Louis. 2018. “Francis Fukuyama Postpones the End of History” *The New Yorker*.
- Levitsky, Steven, and Lucan Way. 2002. “The Rise of Competitive Authoritarianism.” *Journal of Democracy* 13(2): 51-65.

### Week 3 (January 25-29): Theories and Concepts II

#### Tuesday

- Huntington, Samuel P. 1993. “The Clash of Civilizations?.” *Foreign Affairs* 72(3): 22–49.
- Wright, Robert. 2015. “The Clash of Civilizations that Isn’t.” *The New Yorker*.

#### Thursday

- Video: [The 9/11 Decade : The Clash of Civilizations?](#)

- Ⓡ Lacina, Bethany, and Charlotte Lee. 2013. “Culture Clash or Democratic Peace?: Result of a Survey Experiment on the Effect of Religious Culture and Regime Type on Foreign Policy Opinion Formation.” *Foreign Policy Analysis* 9(2): 143-170.

#### **Week 4 (February 1-5): Leaders and Advisers**

##### **Tuesday**

- Breuning, Chapters 2 & 3
  - Hermann, Margaret G. 1980. “Explaining Foreign Policy Behavior Using the Personal Characteristics of Political Leaders.” *International Studies Quarterly* 24(1): 7-46.
- Ⓡ Hill, Chapter 3
- Ⓡ Hermann, Margaret G., and Joe D. Hagan. 1998. “International Decision Making: Leadership Matters” *Foreign Policy* 110: 124-137.

##### **Thursday**

- Hill, Chapter 4
  - Breuning, Chapter 4
  - “I Am Part of the Resistance Inside the Trump Administration” *New York Times*, September 5, 2018
- Ⓡ Spilimbergo, Antonio. 2009. “Democracy and Foreign Education.” *American Economic Review* 99(1): 528-543.
- Ⓡ Bak, Daehee, and Glenn Palmer. 2010. “Testing the Biden Hypotheses: Leader Tenure, Age, and International Conflict.” *Foreign Policy Analysis* 6(3): 257-273.

#### **Week 5 (February 8-12): Domestic Factors**

##### **Tuesday**

- Hill, Chapter 9
  - Morgan, T. Clifton, and Kenneth N. Bickers. 1992. “Domestic Discontent and the External Use of Force.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 36(1): 25-52.
- Ⓡ Fearon, James D. 1994. “Domestic Political Audiences and the Escalation of International Disputes.” *American Political Science Review* 88(3): 577-592.
- Ⓡ Putnam, Robert D. 1988. “Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games.” *International Organization* 42(3): 427-460.

##### **Thursday**

- Weeks, Jessica L. 2012. “Strongmen and Straw Men: Authoritarian Regimes and the Initiation of International Conflict” *American Political Science Review* 106(2): 326-347.

- Ⓡ Weiss, Jessica C. 2013. "Authoritarian Signaling, Mass Audiences, and Nationalist Protest in China" *International Organization* 67: 1–35.
- Ⓡ Hildebrandt, Timothy, Courtney Hillbrecht, Peter Hold, and Jon Pevehouse. 2013. "The Domestic Politics of Humanitarian Intervention." *Foreign Policy Analysis* 9(3): 243–266.
- Ⓡ Barbara Geddes, Joseph Wright, and Erica Frantz. 2014. "Autocratic Breakdown and Regime Transitions: A New Data Set." *Perspectives on Politics* 12(2): 313–331.

### **Week 6 (February 15-19): International Factors**

#### **Tuesday**

- Breuning, Chapter 6
- Ⓡ Smith, Alastair. 1996. "Diversionary Foreign Policy in Democratic Systems." *International Studies Quarterly* 40(1): 133–153.
- Ⓡ Mitchell, Sara McLaughlin, and Brandon C. Prins. 2004. "Rivalry and Diversionary Uses of Force." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 48(6): 937–961.

#### **Thursday**

- Nye, Joseph S. 1990. "Soft Power." *Foreign Policy* 80: 153–171.
- Nye, Joseph S. 2004. "The Decline of America's Soft Power: Why Washington Should Worry." *Foreign Affairs* 83: 16–20.
- Nye, Joseph S. 2005. "The Rise of China's Soft Power." *Wall Street Journal Asia* 29: 6–8.
- Ⓡ Atkinson, Carol. 2010. "Does Soft Power Matter? A Comparative Analysis of Student Exchange Programs 1980–2006" *Foreign Policy Analysis* 6(1): 1–22.
- Ⓡ Datta, Monti Narayan. 2009. "The Decline of America's Soft Power in the United Nations" *International Studies Perspectives* 10:265-284.

### **Week 7 (February 22-26): Public Opinion and Foreign Policy**

#### **Tuesday**

- Smith, Hadfield, and Dunne, Chapter 9
- Powlick, Philip J. 1995. "The Sources of Public Opinion for American Foreign Policy Officials." *International Studies Quarterly* 39(4): 427–451.
- Ⓡ Robinson, Piers. 1999. "The CNN Effect: Can the News Media Drive Foreign Policy?." *Review of International Studies* 25(2): 301–309.
- Ⓡ Holsti, Ole R. 1992. "Public Opinion and Foreign Policy: Challenges to the Almond-Lippmann Consensus." *International Studies Quarterly* 36(4): 439–466.



## Thursday

- Baum, Matthew. 2002. "The Constituent Foundations of the Rally-Round-the-Flag Phenomenon." *International Studies Quarterly*. 46: 263–298.
- 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.
- ® Drury, A. Cooper, L. Marvin Overby, Adrian Ang, and Yitan Li. 2008. "'Pretty Prudent' or Rhetorically Responsive? The American Public's Support for Military Action." *Political Research Quarterly* 63(1): 83–96

### Week 8 (March 1-5): Exam I Week

## Tuesday

- Review

## Thursday

- **Exam I Due @ 5:00 PM**

### Week 9 (March 8-12): The Politics of Foreign Aid (I)

## Tuesday

- Dietrich, Simone. 2013. "Bypass or Engage? Explaining Donor Delivery Tactics in Foreign Aid Allocation." *International Studies Quarterly* 57(4): 698–712.
- Dietrich, Simone. 2016. "Donor Political Economies and the Pursuit of Aid Effectiveness." *International Organization* 70(1): 65–102.
- ® Burnside, Craig, and David Dollar. 2000. "Aid, Policies, and Growth." *American Economic Review* 90(4): 847–868.
- ® Gamso, Jonas, and Farhod Yuldashev. 2018. "Targeted Foreign Aid and International Migration: Is Development-Promotion an Effective Immigration Policy?" *International Studies Quarterly* 62: 809–820.

## Thursday

- Alesina, Alberto, and David Dollar. 2000. "Who Gives Foreign Aid to Whom and Why?." *Journal of Economic Growth* 5: 33–63.
- Allen, Susan Hannah, and Michael E. Flynn. 2018. "Donor Government Ideology and Aid Bypass." *Foreign Policy Analysis* 14: 449–468.
- ® DiLorenzo, Matthew. 2018. "Bypass Aid and Unrest in Autocracies." *International Studies Quarterly* 62(1): 208–219.

## **Week 10 (March 15-19): The Politics of Foreign Aid (II)**

### **Tuesday**

- Kuziemko, Ilyana, and Eric Werker. 2006. "How Much is a Seat on the Security Council Worth? Foreign Aid and Bribery at the United Nations." *Journal of Political Economy* 114(5): 905–930.
- Easterly, William. 2002. *The Elusive Quest for Growth: Economists' Adventures and Misadventures in the Tropics*. The MIT Press. Chapter 2.
- Ⓡ Dreher, Axel, Andreas Fuchs, Brad Parks, and Austin M. Strange. 2018. "Apples and Dragon Fruits: The Determinants of Aid and Other Forms of State Financing from China to Africa." *International Studies Quarterly* 62(1): 182–194.
- Ⓡ Dippel, Christian. 2015. "Foreign Aid and Voting in International Organizations: Evidence from the IWC." *Journal of Public Economics* 132: 1–12.

### **Thursday**

- Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce, and Alastair Smith. 2011. *The Dictator's Handbook: Why Bad Behavior is Almost Always Good Politics*. Public Affairs. Chapter 7.
- Birdsall, Nancy. 2008. "Seven Deadly Sins: Reflections on Donor Failings" In *Reinventing Foreign Aid*, eds. William Easterly. The MIT Press. Chapter 20.
- Ⓡ [Silk Road Diplomacy: Deconstructing Beijing's Toolkit to Influence South and Central Asia](#)
- Ⓡ Knack, Stephen. 2004. "Does Foreign Aid Promote Democracy?." *International Studies Quarterly*. 48(1): 251–266.
- Ⓡ Bush, Sarah. 2015. "Democracy Promotion is Failing. Here's Why." *Washington Post*.

## **Week 11 (March 22-26): Spring Break – No Classes**

## **Week 12 (March 29-April 2): Economic Statecraft**

### **Tuesday**

- Smith, Hadfield, and Dunne, Chapter 11
- Marinov, Nikolay. 2005. "Do Economic Sanctions Destabilize Country Leaders?." *American Journal of Political Science* 49(3): 564–576.
- Drezner, Daniel W. 2019. "Economic Statecraft in the Age of Trump." *The Washington Quarterly* 42(3): 7-24.
- Ⓡ Peksen, Dursun, and A. Cooper Drury. 2010. "Coercive or Corrosive: The Negative Impact of Economic Sanctions on Democracy." *International Interactions* 36: 240–264.
- Ⓡ Peksen, Dursun, Timothy M. Peterson, and A. Cooper Drury. 2014. "Media-driven Humanitarianism? News Media Coverage of Human Rights Abuse and the Use of Economic Sanctions." *International Studies Quarterly* 58(4): 855–866.

## Thursday

- Gordon, Joy. 2011. "Smart Sanctions Revisited." *Ethics & International Affairs* 25(3): 315–335.
- Lopez, George A. 2012 "In Defense of Smart Sanctions: A Response to Joy Gordon." *Ethics & International Affairs* 26(1): 135–146.
- ® Peksen, Dursun. 2009. "Better or Worse? The Effect of Economic Sanctions on Human Rights." *Journal of Peace Research* 46(1): 59–77.
- ® Whang, Taehee. 2011. "Playing to the Home Crowd? Symbolic Use of Economic Sanctions in the United States." *International Studies Quarterly* 55(3): 787–801.

### **Week 13 (April 5-9): Future Issues in Foreign Policy Analysis**

## Tuesday

- Smith, Hadfield, and Dunne, Chapter 12
- ® Warner, Carolyn M., and Stephen G. Walker. 2011. "Thinking About the Role of Religion in Foreign Policy: A Framework for Analysis." *Foreign Policy Analysis* 7(1): 113–136.

## Thursday

- Lai, Brian. 2006. "An Empirical Examination of Religion and Conflict in the Middle East, 1950–1992." *Foreign Policy Analysis*. 2: 21–36.
- **Debate Paper Due @ 5:00 PM**

### **Week 14 (April 12-16): Exam II Week**

## Tuesday (April 14)

- Review

## Thursday (April 16)

- **Exam II Due @ 5:00 PM**

### **Week 15 (April 19-23): Debate Week**

## Tuesday

- **Debate Presentation Due @ 5:00 PM**

## Thursday

- **Synthesis Paper Due @ 5:00 PM**