

PLS 360: Foreign Policy Analysis

Nazarbayev University
Spring 2023
TR, 4:30–5:45 PM (8.105)

Professor: Dr. Bimal Adhikari
Email: bimal.adhikari@nu.edu.kz
Office Location: 8.502
Office Hours: TR, 10:30 AM-11:45 AM

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 (20 + 20 = 40%)

There will be two exams (each worth 20%). The exams will consist of essay questions and/or short questions.

2. **Quizzes** (3 * 5 = 15%)

There will be three unannounced in-class and/or take-home assignments (each worth 5%), which may include quizzes, group activities, short essays, etc. These assignments will be over the assigned readings for a given class meeting and/or on the materials presented in previous lectures. Absentees and those showing up late on the day of the quiz or the day when the quiz is handed over (i.e., later than five minutes from the start of the class) will not be allowed to participate in the assignment.

3. **Response Paper** (15%)

Students are expected to write a response paper (1200-1500 words) on the week's required reading (do not write on recommended readings). 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 closely and carefully. 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 Tuesday of the chosen week. 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 (peer-reviewed sources only!). 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 (1000 - 1250 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 authors' 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? A good response paper engages with all relevant recommended readings, and also cites at least 4-5 outside scholarly sources. The use of non-scholarly sources will severely affect your grade.

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 (2.5 points), the depth of your analysis/reflections (10 points), and the strength of the writing (2.5 points). 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.

4. **Foreign Policy Case Presentation (5%)** Students are required to do a group presentation on major foreign policy cases toward the end of the semester. The professor will assign the cases. Additional details will be provided during class at a later date.

5. **Quantitative Paper Presentation (5 + 5 = 10%)**

On Week 14, students will be required to do a group presentation on a recently published quantitative paper. The professor will form groups and assign the paper on a random basis by the start of the second week. The major objective of this assignment is to show students how a newer dataset can advance political science scholarship. In the presentation, the students are required to prepare a single-page handout for the class (worth 5%). The handouts must be uploaded on Moodle by 12:00 PM the day of the presentation. In the handout, students should demonstrate how the particular paper advances the literature. In other words, students will discuss the paper's novelty and how the authors seek to advance the literature with the particular article. The presentation should last for 8-10 minutes (worth 5%). Students will then field questions from the class for 2-3 minutes.

6. **Policy Brief (15%)**

Students will write a 1500-2000 words policy brief on [Kazakhstan Agency for International Development "KazAID"](#) (worth 15%). This assignment is designed so that students can apply the theoretical concepts learned over the semester to a real-life scenario. In this assignment, students are required to discuss i) whether KazAID has so far been able to further the national interest of Kazakhstan; ii) if the Kazakh government is sincere about using KazAID to meet the stated goals and objectives of official development assistance, and iii) the sectors that KazAID should focus more going forward, and why. A good paper will extensively cite both peer-reviewed and non-peer reviewed sources. Additional details will be provided at a later date. This assignment will be due during the finals week instead of the final exam.

Grading

Grading Components

Exams (20 + 20) :	40%
Response Paper :	15%
Quizzes (3 * 5) :	15%
Quantitative Paper Presentation (5 + 5) :	10%
Foreign Policy Case Presentation:	5%
Policy Brief	15%

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. Please read this [post](#) on email etiquette and this [post](#) on the importance of attending office hours. Lastly, I will not answer emails that do not use or use an improper salutation.

Classroom Conduct

Disruptive behavior such as side conversation, sleeping, and participating in an unproductive manner will adversely affect your classroom performance. I also do not tolerate any rudeness directed at your classmates or myself. Students are also prohibited from using cellphones for the duration of the class. Students found in violation of these policies will be asked to leave the classroom. In severe cases, the student will be reported to the Vice Dean for Academic Affairs. Any more than two offenses will have their final course grade adjusted by a full letter for each additional violation.

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. I strongly recommend you to use the [American Political Science Association](#) citation style. You are free to choose other citation styles. However, you must be consistent throughout the assignment. Keep in mind the page limit does not include references. Failure to adhere to these formatting instructions will adversely affect your assignment grade. 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), 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.

Class Outline

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

Week 1 (January 9): 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 16): Theories and Concepts

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.
- ® Levitsky, Steven, and Lucan Way. 2002. “The Rise of Competitive Authoritarianism.” *Journal of Democracy* 13(2): 51-65.
- ® Smith, Hadfield, and Dunne, Chapter 6

Thursday

- Huntington, Samuel P. 1993. “The Clash of Civilizations?.” *Foreign Affairs* 72(3): 22–49.
- Video: [The 9/11 Decade : The Clash of Civilizations?](#)
- ® 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*.
- ® Wright, Robert. 2015. “The Clash of Civilizations that Isn’t.” *The New Yorker*.

Week 3 (January 23): 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.
- Ⓜ Allen, Susan H., and Maryann E. Gallagher. 2022. “Is He Speaking Our Language? Donald Trump’s Leadership Traits in Comparison with Previous Presidents.” *Political Science Quarterly* 137(3): 539–568.

Thursday

- Hill, Chapter 4
- Breuning, Chapter 4
- Ⓜ “I Am Part of the Resistance Inside the Trump Administration” *New York Times*, September 5, 2018
- Ⓜ Dyson, Stephen B. 2006. “Personality and Foreign Policy: Tony Blair’s Iraq Decisions.” *Foreign Policy Analysis* 2(3): 289–306.

Week 4 (January 30): 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 5 (February 6): 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.
- Ⓜ Nye, Joseph S. 2005. "The Rise of China's Soft Power." *Wall Street Journal Asia* 29: 6–8.
- Ⓜ Datta, Monti Narayan. 2009. "The Decline of America's Soft Power in the United Nations" *International Studies Perspectives* 10:265-284.

Thursday

- Bodea, Cristina, and Fangjin Ye. 2020. "Investor Rights Versus Human Rights: Do Bilateral Investment Treaties Tilt the Scale?." *British Journal of Political Science* 50.3 (2020): 955-977.
- Ⓜ Adhikari, Bimal, Jeffrey King, and Lie Philip Santoso. 2022. "A BIT of Help? The Divergent Effect of Bilateral Investment Treaties on Women's Rights." *Journal of Human Rights* 21(4): 419-433.
- Ⓜ Zhang, Sheng. 2019. "Human Rights and International Investment Agreements: How to Bridge the Gap?." *Chinese Journal of Comparative Law* 7(3): 457-483.
- Ⓜ Calvert, Julia. 2018. "Constructing Investor Rights? Why Some States (Fail To) Terminate Bilateral Investment Treaties." *Review of International Political Economy* 25(1): 75-97.

Week 6 (February 13): Exam I

Tuesday

- Review

Thursday

- Exam I

Week 7 (February 20): 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.

- Ⓡ Gilboa, Eytan, Maria Gabrielsen Jumbert, Jason Miklian, and Piers Robinson. 2016. "Moving Media and Conflict Studies beyond the CNN Effect." *Review of International Studies* 42(4): 654-672.

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.
- Ⓡ Kertzer, Joshua D., and Thomas Zeitzoff. 2017. "A Bottom-up Theory of Public Opinion about Foreign Policy." *American Journal of Political Science* 61(3): 543-558.

Week 8 (February 27): Coercive Diplomacy

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.
- Ⓡ Peksen, Dursun, and A. Cooper Drury. 2010. "Coercive or Corrosive: The Negative Impact of Economic Sanctions on Democracy." *International Interactions* 36: 240–264.
- Ⓡ Allen, Susan Hannah. Forthcoming. "The Uncertain Impact of Sanctions on Russia." *Nature Human Behaviour*.
- Ⓡ Lektzian, David, and Glen Biglaiser. Forthcoming. "Sanctions, Aid, and Voting Patterns in the United Nations General Assembly." *International Interactions* (2022): 1-27.

Thursday

- Adhikari, Bimal, Jin Mun Jeong, and Dursun Peksen. 2022. "Compliant or Defiant? Economic Sanctions and United Nations General Assembly Voting by Target Countries." *International Interactions*: 1-26.
- 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 9 (March 6): 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.
- Ⓡ Dupuy, Kendra, and Aseem Prakash. 2018. "Do Donors Reduce Bilateral Aid to Countries with Restrictive NGO Laws? A Panel Study, 1993-2012." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 47(1): 89-106.

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.
- Ⓡ Adhikari, Bimal. 2019. "Power Politics and Foreign Aid Delivery Tactics." *Social Science Quarterly* 100(5): 1523-1539.
- Ⓡ Adhikari, Bimal. 2021. "UN Human Rights Shaming and Foreign Aid Allocation." *Human Rights Review* 22(3): 133-154.

Week 10 (March 13): 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.
- Ⓡ Dippel, Christian. 2015. "Foreign Aid and Voting in International Organizations: Evidence from the IWC." *Journal of Public Economics* 132: 1–12.
- Ⓡ Adhikari, Bimal. 2019. "United Nations General Assembly Voting and Foreign Aid Bypass." *International Politics* 56(4): 514-535.

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](#)
- Ⓜ 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.

Week 11 (March 20): Spring Break

Week 12 (March 27): Enduring Interstate Rivalries

Tuesday

- Lai, Brian. 2006. “An Empirical Examination of Religion and Conflict in the Middle East, 1950–1992” *Foreign Policy Analysis*. 2: 21–36.
- Clary, Christopher, and Niloufer Siddiqui. 2021. “Voters and Foreign Policy: Evidence from a Conjoint Experiment in Pakistan.” *Foreign Policy Analysis* 17(2): orab001.
- Ⓜ 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

- Video: [An Endless War: Iran, Israel and the United States](#)

Week 13 (April 3): Exam II Week

Tuesday

- Review

Thursday

- Exam II

Week 14 (April 10): Presentations: Quantitative Advances in Foreign Policy Analysis

Tuesday

- Ⓜ [Passmore, Timothy, Megan Shannon, and Morgan Nadeau. 2023. “Financial Contributions to United Nations Peacekeeping, 1990–2010: A New Dataset.” *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 40\(1\): 88-107.](#)
- Ⓜ [Henke, Marina E. 2019. “UN Fatalities 1948–2015: A New Dataset.” *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 36\(4\): 425-442.](#)
- Ⓜ [Weber, Patrick M., and Gerald Schneider. 2022. “Post-Cold War Sanctioning by the EU, the UN, and the US: Introducing the EUSANCT Dataset.” *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 39\(1\): 97-114.](#)

- ④ Vabulas, Felicity, and Duncan Snidal. 2021. "Cooperation under Autonomy: Building and Analyzing the Informal Intergovernmental Organizations 2.0 Dataset." *Journal of Peace Research* 58(4): 859-869.
- ④ Haglund, Jillienne, Courtney Hillebrecht, and Hannah Roesch Read. 2022. "International Human Rights Recommendations at Home: Introducing the Women's Rights Compliance Database (WRCD)." *International Interactions* 48(5): 1070-1087.

Thursday

- ④ Iakhnis, Evgeniia, and Patrick James. 2021. "Near Crises in World Politics: A New Dataset." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 38(2): 224-243.
- ④ Levin, Dov H. 2019. "Partisan Electoral Interventions by the Great Powers: Introducing the PEIG Dataset." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 36(1): 88-106.
- ④ Wiegand, Krista E., Emilia Justyna Powell, and Steven McDowell. 2021. "The Peaceful Resolution of Territorial Disputes Dataset, 1945–2015." *Journal of Peace Research* 58(2): 304-314.
- ④ Allen, Susan Hannah, and Amy T. Yuen. 2020. "Action or Inaction: United Nations Security Council Activity, 1994–2013" *Journal of Peace Research* 57(5): 658-665.
- ④ Moyer, Jonathan D., Sara D. Turner, and Collin J. Meisel. 2021. "What Are the Drivers of Diplomacy? Introducing and Testing New Annual Dyadic Data Measuring Diplomatic Exchange." *Journal of Peace Research* 58(6): 1300-1310.

Week 15 (April 17): Foreign Policy Case Presentation

Tuesday

- Presentation Day 1

Thursday

- Presentation Day 2