

# PLS 458/558: International Organization

Nazarbayev University

Fall 2023

W, 3:00 PM – 5:50 PM (8.322B)

**Professor:** Dr. Bimal Adhikari

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

**Office Location:** 8.502

**Office Hours:** TR, 10:30 AM - 11:45 AM

## 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. 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 the library's webpage 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 (25%)

There will be one comprehensive in-class exam which will consist of short questions, essay responses, multiple choice questions, etc.

## 2. Response Paper (15%)

Students are expected to write one response paper (1,250 - 1,500 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 1:00 PM via Moodle (Turnitin) on Mondays of the chosen weeks. You will be able to submit 24 hours late without any penalty. After that, your submission 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. Submissions after that will not be graded. No make-up opportunity will be provided. Please note that the due date on Moodle may not correspond to the actual due date – this is to accommodate students with excused absences only.

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 (1,000 - 1,250 words). Submissions that do not meet the word count will be deemed as an incomplete submission.

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.

### 3. **Research Proposal & Presentation** (40%)

This course also requires students to write 3,500-4,000 words (excluding bibliography) quantitative 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. 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 existing puzzle(s) you have observed in the 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 Astana to reduce COVID-19 infections?”). The tentative topic must be approved by the instructor. As such, students are required to consult with the professor by the end of Week 4. 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 real 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 13:** An annotated bibliography with ten scholarly sources (250-350 words for each source) (5%; will be graded on a satisfactory/unsatisfactory basis). Begin the assignment by writing the research question and the argument in one sentence each.
- **October 11:** A general statement of your theoretical argument and hypotheses (1,000-1,500 words) (5%; will be graded on a satisfactory/unsatisfactory basis). Begin the assignment by writing the research question and the argument in one sentence each.
- **November 22:** Presentation (5%)
- **TBD:** Final research design project due (25%).

Failure to complete any of these steps will adversely affect your final grade; students may get a zero for the whole assignment. 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 explicit permission after the submission of the theoretical argument and hypotheses. I will post a grading rubric on Moodle. I will not provide any feedback after Week 15.

Students are also expected to present their research design in class (worth 5%). These presentations will follow the academic conference format. I will act as the chair. Each presenter will have 8-10 minutes to present their paper. The use of PowerPoint is mandatory. Five minutes are allocated for the question and answer session.

**4. Recommended Reading Presentation (5%)**

Students will present an outline of one of the recommended readings in groups. The weeks will be assigned by Week 2. Your presentation must be between 8-10 minutes, and 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 upload the final version of the slides by 1:00 PM the day of the presentation. Please do not use a different version than the one uploaded to Moodle during your presentation, as doing so will hurt your grade.

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/professional conferences. Both content and style of presentation will be evaluated.

**5. Current Event Presentation (5%)**

Students will be assigned weeks to present any current events related to the week's topic. The weeks will be assigned by Week 2, and it will be teamwork. In the presentation, students must prepare a single-page handout to distribute to the class. Students are free to use memes, comic strips, and other creative endeavors to make the presentation interesting and not 'dry'. The final version of the handout must be uploaded by 1:00 PM the day of the presentation. The presentation must engage with i) how the particular news relates to the topic of the week, ii) how the current event shows the strengths and/or limitations of international organizations, iii) do the international organizations serve the interests of countries regardless of their power and influence in world politics?

**6. Participation (10%)**

This is an upper-level seminar course that requires extensive participation from students. As such, students are expected to have closely read the required readings prior to the class and are expected to engage in meaningful discussion during seminars. Any more than one unexcused absence will result in the total failure of the course (showing up later than 5 minutes from the start of the class will count as being absent). One unexcused absence will cost you 5% of the course grade. Please do not fiddle with your cellphone or engage in disruptive behaviors during class. Students engaged in such behavior may be asked to leave the classroom

and marked as absent for the day. If a student refuses to heed the instructions, the instructor will file an official complaint to the Vice Dean. I will keep a tab of your performance throughout the semester, and you are free to ask about it at any point. Office hours visits with informed queries will also positively help students do better in this component of the course.

## Grading

### Grading Components

Exam :	25%
Response Paper :	15%
Research Proposal & Presentation :	40%
Recommended Reading Presentation :	5%
Current Event Presentation :	5%
Participation :	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 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.

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). Lastly, I do not scale or curve exams, and I do not envision any extra credit opportunities.

### **Availability**

Office hours are listed at the beginning of the syllabus, and I strongly recommend you schedule meetings during office hours. 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.

I aim to be responsive to emails 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. Please read this [post](#) on email etiquette by the end of the first week. I will not respond to overly informal emails.

### **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 the assignment.

### **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.

### **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. The use of generative artificial intelligence, such as Chat-GPT is not permitted.

# Class Outline

The information contained in the course syllabus may change throughout the semester. All changes will be announced in class or via Moodle/email. 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 16): Introduction

- Syllabus
- [How to Read Political Science: A Guide in Four Steps](#)
- [Three Templates for Introductions to Political Science](#)
- [American Political Science Review - Author Instructions](#)
- ® [Raul Pacheco-Vega's Resources Page](#)
- ® [Replication Data in Political Science](#)
- ® Knopf, Jeffrey W. 2006. “Doing a Literature Review.” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 39(1): 127-132.

### Week 2 (August 23): International Organizations in World Politics

- Pevehouse, Jon C. W., and Inken von Borzyskowski. 2017. “International Organizations in World Politics” In *The Oxford Handbook of International Organizations*, edited by Jacob Cogan, Ian Hurd, and Ian Johnstone. Oxford University Press.
- Adhikari, Bimal. Forthcoming. “The Impact of the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank on the United Nations” In *Global Institutions in a Time of Power Transition*, edited by Kendall Stiles and Joel E. Oestreich. Edward Elgar Publishing: The ACUNS Series on the UN System.
- ® 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.



- Ⓒ Roger, Charles B., and Sam S. Rowan. 2022. “Analyzing International Organizations: How the Concepts We Use Affect the Answers We Get.” *Review of International Organizations* 17(3): 597-625.

**Week 3 (August 30): Constitution Day**

**Week 4 (September 6): 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.
- Ⓒ Karlas, Jan. 2022. “Why States Inform: Compliance with Self-reporting Obligations in Universal Treaty Regimes.” *International Political Science Review* 43(4):531-546.
- Ⓒ Chayes, Abram, and Antonia Handler Chayes. 1993. “On Compliance.” *International Organization* 47(2):175-205.
- Ⓒ Downs, George, David Rocke, and Peter Barsoom, 1996. “Is the Good News about Compliance Good News about Cooperation?” *International Organization* 50(3): 379-406.
- Ⓒ Dai, Xinyuan. 2002. “Information Systems in Treaty Regimes.” *World Politics* 54: 405-436.

**Week 5 (September 13): 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.

- Ⓡ 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.
- Ⓡ 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.
- Ⓡ Pevehouse, Jon. 2002. “Democracy from the Outside-In? International Organizations and Democratization.” *International Organization* 56(3): 515-549.
- Ⓡ Wright, Joseph. 2009. “How Foreign Aid Can Foster Democratization in Authoritarian Regimes.” *American Journal of Political Science* 53(3): 552-571.

## Part II: The United Nations System

### Week 6 (September 20): UN General Assembly

- [The United Nations System](#)
- [Functions and Powers of the 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.
- Ⓡ Mesquita, Rafael, and Antonio Pires. 2023. “What Are UN General Assembly Resolutions for? Four Views on Parliamentary Diplomacy.” *International Studies Review* 25(1): viac058.
- Ⓡ Panke, Diana. 2014. “Absenteeism in the General Assembly of the United Nations: Why Some Member States Rarely Vote.” *International Politics* 51(6): 729-749.
- Ⓡ 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.

#### **Week 7 (September 27): UN Security Council**

- [What is the 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.
- Wang, Yu. 2022. "Leader Visits and UN Security Council Membership." *International Studies Quarterly* 66(4): sqac064.
- 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.
- Ⓡ Dreher, Axel, Valentin Lang, B. Peter Rosendorff, and James Raymond Vreeland. 2022. "Bilateral or Multilateral? International Financial Flows and the Dirty-Work Hypothesis." *Journal of Politics* 84(4): 1932-1946.
- Ⓡ Lim, Daniel, and James Raymond Vreeland. 2013. "Regional Organizations and International Politics: Japanese Influence over the Asian Development Bank and the UN Security Council." *World Politics* 65(1): 34-72.
- Ⓡ Langmore, John, and Ramesh Thakur. 2016. "The Elected but Neglected Security Council Members." *Washington Quarterly* 39(2): 99-114.
- Ⓡ Hosli, Madeleine O., Rebecca Moody, Bryan O'Donovan, Serguei Kaniovski, and Anna CH Little. 2011. "Squaring the Circle? Collective and Distributive Effects of United Nations Security Council Reform." *Review of International Organizations* 6(2): 163-187.

#### **Week 8 (October 4): Fall Break**

#### **Week 9 (October 11): UN Commission on Human Rights / UN Human Rights Council**

- [What is the 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.

- DiBlasi, Lora. 2020. "From Shame to New Name: How Naming and Shaming Creates Pro-Government Militias." *International Studies Quarterly* 64(4): 906-918.
- Adhikari, Bimal, Jeffrey King, and Lie Philip Santoso. Forthcoming. "The Limits of Shame: UN Shaming, NGO Repression, and Women's Protests." *Conflict Management and Peace Science*.
- Ⓜ Adhikari, Bimal. 2021. "UN Human Rights Shaming and Foreign Aid Allocation." *Human Rights Review* 22(2): 133-154.
- Ⓜ 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.
- Ⓜ 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.

## Part III: International Economic Organizations

### Week 10 (October 18): International Monetary Fund

- [The IMF at a Glance](#)
- 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.
- Ⓜ 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.
- Ⓜ Stubbs, Thomas, Bernhard Reinsberg, Alexander Kentikelenis, and Lawrence King. 2020. "How to Evaluate the Effects of IMF Conditionality." *Review of International Organizations* 15(1): 29-73.

<b>Week 11 (October 25): Republic Day</b>
---

<b>Week 12 (November 1): World Bank</b>
---

- [Getting to Know the 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.
- Ⓜ Kilby, Christopher, and Carolyn McWhirter. Forthcoming. "The World Bank COVID-19 Response: Politics as Usual?" *Review of International Organizations*.
- Ⓜ Watkins, Mitchell. 2022. "Undermining Conditionality? The Effect of Chinese Development Assistance on Compliance with World Bank Project Agreements." *Review of International Organizations* 17(4): 667-690.
- Ⓜ Clark, Richard, and Lindsay R. Dolan. 2021. "Pleasing the Principal: US Influence in World Bank Policymaking." *American Journal of Political Science* 65(1): 36-51.
- Ⓜ Kilby, Christopher. 2009. "The Political Economy of Conditionality: An Empirical Analysis of World Bank Loan Disbursements." *Journal of Development Economics* 89(1): 51-61.

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

### **Week 13 (November 8): 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, Inken, 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.
- ® Lake, David A., Lisa L. Martin, and Thomas Risse. 2021. “Challenges to the Liberal Order: Reflections on International Organization.” *International Organization* 75(2): 225-257.
- ® Hooghe, Liesbet, Tobias Lenz, and Gary Marks. 2019. “Contested World Order: The Delegation 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.
- ® Weiss, Jessica Chen, and Jeremy L. Wallace. 2021. “Domestic Politics, China’s Rise, and the Future of the Liberal International Order.” *International Organization* 75(2): 635-664.

## **Part V: Assessments**

### **Week 14 (November 15): Exam**

### **Week 15 (November 22): Research Proposal Presentation**

- ® 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.
- ® König, Thomas, and Guido Ropers. 2022. “How Gendered Is the Peer-Review Process? A Mixed-design Analysis of Reviewer Feedback.” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 55(1): 135-141.