

---

## PS: 395 INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND NATIONAL POLICY

---

Professor Karen J. Alter  
Scott Hall 314  
[Kalter@northwestern.edu](mailto:Kalter@northwestern.edu)

Office Hours: Tuesday: 2:00-3:30pm (by appointment)  
Wednesday 1:30 pm-3:30 pm (drop in)

### Course Goals & Format

International organizations are designed to facilitate cooperation between states, addressing problems and issues that affect all nations, the global commons and humanity in general. In many if not most cases, for the goals of international organizations to be achieved a change of domestic policy is necessary. This seminar examines the questions of if, when and how international actors influence national policy so as to promote objectives of international institutions.

This course is designed as a capstone seminar for the political science major. Students will write an original research paper, and the entire course is oriented around helping students undertake this paper. Reading on international regimes tends to be abstract and dry. You will get the most out of this seminar if you start your project immediately, so that you can read the seminar readings through the lens of your research question. I have focused on readings that helps you see *how* international organizations try to influence political actors.

Your research project will be your own, but each participant will contribute to the breadth of our understanding. The different topics and findings of our seminar participants will help us see how international influence varies across issues and target countries. We shall also be working together on determining what writing and presentation styles are most effective at convincing a reading and listening audience.

---

### ASSIGNMENTS AND ASSESSMENT

---

**Participation (40%)** includes:

- Regular attendance, preparation to discuss the readings, and class participation
- Three short memos for the class. The memos come directly from your research project and prepare you and your audience for your oral presentation. (Described at end of syllabus)
- Three class presentations related to your project (Described at end of syllabus)
- Written Peer reviews—Turned in by person receiving the review. Make sure that the peer reviewer's name is clearly indicated on the review.

**Seminar paper (60%)- Due June 6 (includes peer review)**

Your main project for this course will be a seminar paper. This can be an individual paper (18-22 pages), or a co-authored paper if there are two students interested in the same topic and willing to work together (25-30 pages). The paper will pick an issue that an international organization is addressing, describe the international organization's policy and the tools the IO is using to elicit compliance with the agreement, and explore the influence of the IO on one country's policy. Group papers will include more country cases (one per group member), and a comparison of what happened across the cases. The issue is for you to choose- a list of suggested topics is on blackboard. I will help you select a country case that makes sense given the issue. Or you can select a country, and we can work backwards to select an issue. (For more, see Assignments and Due Dates)

**On Due Dates, Attendance, and Deadlines**

In the real world deadlines are deadlines, and you are expected to pull your own weight and turn in quality work. You owe it to your colleagues to get your work to them in time for them to read it. You owe it to the seminar to be present at every meeting, to be fully prepared, and to be ready when your turn comes to make a presentation. Our schedule is too tight to delay presentations. If you are able to arrange to trade places with

another participant in another presentation group, you may reschedule a presentation. If you are not able to trade places, and you miss your presentation, you will be given a zero as a grade. Late assignments will have a penalty of 1/3 grade for each day late. This penalty will be waived only in exceptional circumstances.

## READINGS FOR PURCHASE

---

Chayes, Abram, and Antonia Handler Chayes. 1995. *The New Sovereignty: Compliance with International Regulatory Agreements*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press

Keck, Margaret E., and Kathryn Sikkink. *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1998.

Case studies available at: <http://www.guisd.org/>

Fox Baker, Annette "Guatemala, Human Rights and U.S. Foreign Policy" *Pew Case Studies in International Affairs* no. 430.

Letovsky, Robert and Brian Dwyer "Protecting Endangered Species: U.S. Trade Policy and the Cases of China and Taiwan" *Pew Case Studies in International Affairs* no. 218.

Starred readings are on line. I am working with the library to create a web page where these readings are easier to find.

## SCHEDULE WITH READING ASSIGNMENTS

---

### **WEEK 1: Introduction to the Seminar/ Picking an issue to research**

*Since we only meet once a week, we need to start right away. The first day we will:*

- Discuss the Abbott & Snidal reading and brainstorm on why international organizations are created
- Discuss which issues to we expect to be easier or harder?
- Consider the research topic list.
- Discuss paper, memos & presentations

#### **Reading:**

\*Kenneth W. Abbott and Duncan Snidal. 1998. "Why States Act Through Formal International Organizations," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 42, 1, 3-32.

---

### **WEEK 2: International Institutions as Coordinating Devices**

**E-mail 2-3 sentences about the issue you will research- due by Tuesday noon.**

*Why do nations cooperate with each other? When will nations cooperate with each other?*

#### **Readings:**

\*Keohane, Robert. *After Hegemony*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984. (p.49-109)

|   |
|---|
| Discussion about what makes presentations effective and compelling.<br><i>Library tour &amp; Starting your research project</i> |
|---|

---

**WEEK 3: Why the “problem structure” of your issue shapes what can be and is done to address the problem**

**Memo 1: Issue Area Group A:** A polished draft due to me & peer reviewer by 9 am Monday. Meetings with Professor Alter Monday or Tuesday.

*How the nature of the problem structures the design of the solution*

**Readings:**

\*Arthur Stein. 1982. "Coordination and collaboration: regimes in an anarchic world" *International Organization* 36 (2): 115-140.

\*Mitchell, Ronald. 1994. "Regime Design Matters: Intentional Oil Pollution and Treaty Compliance." *International Organization* 48 (3): 425-58.

**Memos & Presentation I by Group A**

---

**WEEK 4: Direct & Indirect IO efforts to influence international and national policy: the good and the bad**

**Memo 1: Issue Area Group B:** A polished draft due to me & peer reviewer by 9 am Monday. Meetings with Professor Alter Monday or Tuesday afternoon.

**Readings:**

\*Martha Finnemore “International organizations as the teachers of Norms: UNESCO and Science policy” *International Organization* 47 (4) 1993: 565-597

\*Barnett, Michael N. 2009. Evolution Without Progress? Humanitarianism in a World of Hurt. *International Organization* 63 (4):621-663

\*Haas, Peter M., Robert O. Keohane, and Marc A. Levy. 1993. Institutions for the Earth: Sources of Effective International Environmental Protection, Global Environmental Accords Series. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press. Conclusion, p. 397-426.

**Memos & Presentation I by Group B**

---

**WEEK 5: Compliance is not the goal; rather effectiveness is the goal**

*Do states even intend to comply? What is effectiveness and how does it matter?*

**Readings:**

\*Raustiala, Kal. "Compliance & Effectiveness in International Regulatory Cooperation." Case Western Reserve Journal of International Law (2000). (p. 387-427 only)

\*Simmons, Beth. 2009. Mobilizing for Human Rights: International Law in Domestic Politics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapter on “Theories of Commitment.” P. 57-111

*Discussion about proper citations for research papers.  
Individual meetings to discuss case study selections for projects*

**WEEK 6: Enforcement v. Management approaches to compliance** Warning: Heavy reading!

**Memo II: International Actors Group B:** A polished draft due to me & peer reviewer by 9 am Monday. Meetings with Professor Alter Monday or Tuesday afternoon.

*Sticks and stones are not necessarily the best approach*

**Readings:**

Chayes, Abram, and Antonia Handler Chayes. 1995. *The New Sovereignty: Compliance with International Regulatory Agreements*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 63-67

\*Drezner, Daniel W. 2000. Bargaining, Enforcement and Multilateral Sanctions: When is Cooperation Counterproductive? *International Organization* 54 (1):73-102.

Chayes, Abram, and Antonia Handler Chayes. 1995. *The New Sovereignty: Compliance with International Regulatory Agreements*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. P. 109-249 (read for the categories of management tools and how they work—the case studies are not important)

Methods discussion about process tracing

*Presentation II: Group B*

---

**WEEK 7: Mobilizing Social Pressure on States**

**Memo II: International Actors Group A:** A polished draft due to me & peer reviewer by 9 am Monday. Meetings with Professor Alter Monday or Tuesday afternoon.

*How IOs influence state policy—by mobilizing societal interests*

Keck, Margaret E., and Kathryn Sikkink. *Activists Beyond Borders : Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1998. (All read Intro from p. 8 & Conclusion. We will divide the issue area chapters)

Methods Discussion about counterfactual analysis

*Presentation II: Group A*

---

**WEEK 8: Thinking forward to your paper**

*Two Case studies on a state and an international policy*

**Readings:**

Fox Baker, Annette “Guatemala, Human Rights and U.S. Foreign Policy” *Pew Case Studies in International Affairs* no. 430.

Letovsky, Robert and Brian Dwyer “Protecting Endangered Species: U.S. Trade Policy and the Cases of China and Taiwan” *Pew Case Studies in International Affairs* no. 218.

Discussion about final memos & presentations- please download and read handout on blackboard.  
Individual Progress Meetings

**WEEK 9: Presenting our Research Findings**

**Memo II: Final Memos:** A polished draft due to me & peer reviewer by 9 am Monday. Meetings with Professor Alter Monday or Tuesday afternoon.

**Readings:**

\*Barnett, Michael; Finnemore, Martha “The Politics, Power, and Pathologies of International Organizations” *International Organization* 53, no. 4 (1999): 183-220.

\*\*“Epilogue” in Miles, Edward L., Arild Underdal, Steinar Andresen, Jorgen Wettstad, Jon Birger Skjaereth, and Elaine Carlin. 2002. *Environmental Regime Effectiveness: Confronting Theory with Evidence*. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press.

Final Presentations

Discussion about variations across issue areas

**CALENDAR OF ASSIGNMENTS & DUE DATES****1. Pick your topic. Week 2**

**March 30-** E-mail about the issue area you will be researching. You are welcome to include thoughts about a country case, but this isn't required.

**2. Memo 1: Produce a memo and a presentation about your issue area. Weeks 3 & 4**

*The Memo:* The first assignment is to write a 2 page memo (single space 12 pt font) which explains, in compelling terms, the nature of the problem you are investigating. The memo should be to the point, compelling and polished. An example is on blackboard. A draft of the memo is due as noted before your presentation. Ideally we will meet so I can give you feedback for revisions, and so that we can talk about your presentation. *You will need to bring to class copies of the memo for all participants.*

*The Presentation:* In this presentation you will work on creating a compelling story to convince your audience to take action. The presentation will be 5 minutes max! You should focus your message to your audience. Pretend we are potential donors to your cause. You must tell us listeners why we should care about the issue you are investigating. The presentation should be informative, *substantive* and convincing. Dress for the presentation. Make the plight you are investigating seem compelling. *Be prepared to answer questions from the audience.*

*Peer Review:* You should provide written feedback to your peers about their memo and their presentation. Memo peer reviews are due Monday afternoon (it is better to meet). Presentation peer review should be constructive, and include the following:

- 1) What was the main point you took away from the presentation?
- 2) Which aspect of the issue is still unclear to you?
- 3) What did your peer do well in the presentation and memo
- 4) What might be improved for the next presentation

**Dates**

**Peer review comments** should be completed promptly, so that your partner can have a revised memo for the class. E-mail them to your partners, and bring a copy to me Wednesday. There are some peer review guidelines on blackboard.

**Group A Memo: March 11-** Monday 9am. We'll try to meet Monday or Tuesday for feedback.

**Group A Presentation March 13** in class: Distribute revised memo to class and present 5 minute presentation on the issue area

**Group B Memo I March 18** Monday 9am.

**Group B Presentation I- March 20-** in class: Distribute revised memo to class and present 5 minute presentation on the issue area

### 3. Memo II: Research on international actors and their efforts. Weeks 6 & 7

Which actors are trying to influence the policy choices? What are they doing to try to influence policy? You should focus on the main international actors involved, those who are doing the most to address the issue.

*The Memo:* This time your memo (2-4 pages) will give us information about the international efforts to address your policy. (An example is on blackboard). You should tell us which international actors are involved, what these actors are doing (what international policy is, and how these actors work with international institutions to elicit compliance). If two or more of you are drawing on the same organization, you should work on these memos together.

*The Presentation:* You will give us a 5-7 minute presentation on the organization you have researched in conjunction with your project. For the presentation, pretend you are an outside evaluator of the effectiveness of the organization. The presentation should tell us a bit about the history of the organization, the nature of decision-making in the organization, the tools the organization has to influence national policy, and some of the problems the organization faces both internally and in terms of influencing national policy. Be frank about the politics within the organization and among nation states. The presentation should be organized, clear, and well delivered. Be prepared to answer questions about your organization.

**Group B memo II** May 2 (Monday)

**Group B Presentation II** May 4 (Wednesday)

**Group A memo II** May 9 (Monday)

**Group A Presentation II** May 11 (Wednesday).

|   |
|---|
| <p><b>Peer review comments</b> should be completed by Thursday evening after the session. E-mail them to your partners, and bring a copy to me Tuesday.</p> |
|---|

### 4. Memo III: Presentation of Research Week 9

#### Third Memo

Two page memo that summarizes the issue, assesses the international efforts, explains why there was change or no change in state behavior. The memo should draw some lessons from your study, highlighting particular features of your issue and country that significantly shaped what happened. This will help us to compare across issues and countries

Presentation: Conclusions The final presentation should be 5-7 minutes. It should not repeat what is in the memo, or what you covered in other presentations, but rather tell us conversationally what you found... Was your case a success or failure (perhaps explain or tell a story that shows us the success or the failure)? Why was your case a success or failure? What was the most surprising thing you discovered in your research? (your surprise is likely our surprise--- so we take shared joy in knowing) What lessons do you take from your study? What lessons do you think others might learn from your research? (here your personal connection to the material will make the presentation compelling).

Draft memo due to peer reviewer on May 23. Peer review due by May 24 9 am.

**5. Final Paper 17-22 pages (12 point font, double spaced, 1 inch margins).  
Due June 6.**

*The paper should have gone through peer review. Please turn in the paper that was peer reviewed, the peer review comments, and the final revised paper.*

*Breakdown of paper grading:*

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Writing, organization, clarity, conciseness of paper             | 20% |
| Argument, analysis, research, use of evidence & proper citations | 40% |

You are free to organize the paper as you like. Below is just an optional suggestion.

- 1) Introduction-(1-2 pages)- tell us the punch line up front- what lesson will your paper show? What argument will you develop? Provide a roadmap to the papers sections and arguments, so that we can see where the paper is going
- 2) *The problem of xxx* The Nature of the policy issue- (your memo I & III should give you a sense of what to cover here) (2-4 pages)
- 3) *YYY effort to address xxxx* International organizations and the tools they have to influence national policy (2-4 pages) (a discussion of the policies and tools the IO used- from your memos II & III- but make it focused on the 2-4 key tools and their effectiveness, not on the IO per se, and not a laundry list of everything done.)
- 4) *The Politics of xxx in zzz* What did the country do? Were the tools at all effective? (5-6 pages for one, 10-12 for team projects)
- 5) *Some lessons from yyys experience addressing xxx in country zzz*: Lessons from your study: summary of the findings, was your case typical or exceptional? Does your case supports or undermines literature on international organizations, policy recommendations etc. (2-5 pages)