

Course Title:	Seminar in International Political Economy
Course Code:	POL 4001
Recommended Study Year:	Third or Fourth Year
No. of Credits/Term:	3
Mode of Tuition:	Sectional Approach
Class Contact Hours:	3 hours per week
Category in Major Program:	Major in Political Science (Elective Course)
Discipline:	Political Science
Teaching Period:	First Term, 2019-2020

Instructor:

Dr. Dong ZHANG

Office Location: WYL316

Tel: 2616-7636

Email: dongzhang@Ln.edu.hk

Office Hours: Wednesday 1:30–3:30 PM; Thursday 4:30–6:30 PM; or by appointment

Seminar: Thursday 1:30–4:30 PM (MB G10)

Course Overview:

This undergraduate seminar provides a general survey of research in the field of International Political Economy (IPE). IPE involves the study of how domestic and international politics (power, material interests, ideas, norms) influence and are influenced by economic relations between states. We study international trade, international finance, international production and international development by exploring the cross-border flow of goods, production, capital and labor from political perspective. The goal of this seminar is to expose advanced undergraduates to the major debates of IPE and help students develop an analytical toolkit to study the interplay between the state and the market or politics and economics.

Teaching Methods:

This course consists of short lectures, classroom discussions, presentations, and research and writing.

Aims:

- Understand the major theoretical debates in the field of IPE and recognize conflicting perspectives;
- Interpret and critically assess empirical evidence on political and economic issues;
- Discuss a number of critical global issues which are currently being debated.

Learning Outcomes:

By the end of the course, the aim is that students will have improved the ability to:

- Use key concepts and theoretical frameworks from economics and political science to improve the understanding of the world;
- Apply critical thinking and analytical writing skills to the study of global political economy;
- Assess the validity of existing arguments based on empirical evidence;
- Develop a logical argument or theory that can be evaluated using evidence.

Assessment of Learning Outcomes:

- **Participation (20%):** Students are expected to complete all required readings prior to each meeting. To secure a good participation grade, students are encouraged to actively contribute to the conversation. **If you miss one third of seminars without documenting a valid reason for your absence, you will lose ALL the participation grade for this course.**
- **Presentation (20%):** Each student will sign up for one meeting during the course. Two (up to three) students will work as a team to make a presentation and lead discussion in each week's seminar. You will be expected to summarize the main arguments in the required reading, critically assess the evidence and propose several discussion questions. The PowerPoint slides should be submitted via email to me **no later than 8 PM** the evening before the meeting in which the reading(s) appear. I will circulate it in advance to other members of the class.
- **Term Paper (30%):** Each student will write a paper of approximately 6 to 8 pages (Times New Roman, 12-point font, double spaced). Further details of expectations will be given during the course. This assignment will be due on **Monday, December 2 at noon.**
- **Final Exam (30%):** The final will cover all the course material. The exam questions will be in the format of short answer questions (IDs).

Prerequisites:

Prior coursework in political science and/or economics is advised.

Course Materials:

There are no required books for this course. All readings will be made available in electronic form through Moodle.

Important Notes:

1. Students are expected to spend a total of 9 hours (i.e. 3 hours of class contact and 6 hours of personal study) per week to achieve the course learning outcomes.
2. Students shall be aware of the University regulations about dishonest practice in course work, tests and examinations, and the possible consequences as stipulated in the Regulations Governing University Examinations. In particular, plagiarism, being a kind of dishonest practice, is "the presentation of another person's work without proper acknowledgement of the source, including exact phrases, or summarised ideas, or even footnotes/citations, whether protected by copyright or not, as the student's own work." Students are required to strictly follow university regulations governing academic integrity and honesty.
3. Students are required to submit writing assignment(s) using Turnitin.
4. To enhance students' understanding of plagiarism, a mini-course "Online Tutorial on Plagiarism Awareness" is available on <https://pla.ln.edu.hk/>.

Course Schedule and Reading List

Week 1: Introduction

Thursday, September 5

- Thomas Oatley, *International Political Economy: Interests and Institutions in the Global Economy* (Pearson Longman, 2012)
 - Chapter 1

Recommended:

- David Lake, "Open Economy Politics: A Critical Review," *Review of International Organizations* 4, (3) 2009: 219-244.
- Thomas Oatley, "The Reductionist Gamble: Open Economy Politics in the Global Economy," *International Organization* 65, (2) 2011: 311-341.
- Kathleen McNamara, "Of Intellectual Monocultures and the Study of IPE," *Review of International Political Economy* 16, (1) 2009: 72-84.
- Jonathan Kirshner, "The Economic Sins of Modern IR Theory and the Classical Realist Alternative," *World Politics* 67, (1) 2015: 1-29.

Week 2: Origins and Overview of the Contemporary International Economic Order

Thursday, September 12

- Jeffrey Frieden, "The Modern Capitalist World Economy: A Historical Overview," in Dennis Mueller, ed., *Oxford Handbook of Capitalism* (Oxford University Press, 2012): Chapter 1

Recommended:

- Jeffrey Frieden, *Global Capitalism: Its Fall and Rise in the Twentieth Century* (W.W.Norton & Company, 2007)
- Barry Eichengreen, *Globalizing Capital: A History of the International Monetary System* (Princeton University Press, 2008)

Week 3: International Trade I : Domestic Preferences and Institutions

Thursday, September 19

- Ronald Rogowski, "Political Cleavages and Changing Exposure to Trade," *American Political Science Review* 81, 4 (1987): 1121-1137.

Recommended:

- Michael Hiscox, "Class versus Industry Cleavages: Inter-Industry Factor Mobility and the Politics of Trade," *International Organization* 55, (1) 2001: 1-46.

- Kenneth Scheve and Matthew Slaughter, “What Determines Individual Trade-Policy Preferences?” *Journal of International Economics* 54, (3) 2001: 267-92.
- In Song Kim, “Political Cleavages within Industry: Firm-Level Lobbying for Trade Liberalization,” *American Political Science Review* 111, (1) 2017: 1-20.
- Michael A. Bailey, Judith Goldstein, and Barry R. Weingast, “The Institutional Roots of American Trade Policy: Politics, Coalitions, and International Trade,” *World Politics* 49, (3) 1997: 309-338.

Week 4: International Trade II: International Power and Institutions

Thursday, September 26

- Stephen Krasner, “State Power and the Structure of International Trade,” *World Politics* 28, (3) 1976: 317-47.

Recommended:

- Joanne Gowa and Edward Mansfield, “Power Politics and International Trade,” *American Political Science Review* 87, (2) 1993: 408-20.
- Christina Davis, “International Institutions and Issue Linkage: Building Support for Agricultural Trade Liberalization,” *American Political Science Review* 98, (1) 2004: 153-69.
- Judith Goldstein, Douglas Rivers, and Michael Tomz, “Institutions in International Relations: Understanding the Effects of the GATT and the WTO on World Trade,” *International Organization* 61, (1) 2007: 37-67.
- Jeffrey Kucik and Eric Reinhardt, “Does Flexibility Promote Cooperation? An Application to the Global Trade Regime,” *International Organization* 62, (3) 2008: 477-505.

Week 5: International Finance I: Financial Liberalization

Thursday, October 3

- Stephan Haggard and Sylvia Maxfield, “The Political Economy of Financial Internationalization in the Developing World,” *International Organization* 50, (1) 1996: 35-68.

Recommended:

- Dennis Quinn and Carla Inclan, “The Origins of Financial Openness: A Study of Current and Capital Account Liberalization,” *American Journal of Political Science* 41, (3) 1997: 771-813.
- Beth Simmons, “The International Politics of Harmonization: The Case of Capital Market Regulation,” *International Organization* 55, (3) 2001: 589-620.
- Beth Simmons and Zachary Elkins, “The Globalization of Liberalization: Policy Diffusion in the International Political Economy,” *American Political Science Review* 98, (1) 2004: 171-189.
- Dennis Quinn and Maria Toyoda, “Ideology and Voter Preferences as Determinants of Financial Globalization,” *American Journal of Political Science* 51, (2) 2007: 344-363.

Week 6: International Finance II: International Monetary Relations

Thursday, October 10

- Jeffrey Frieden, *Currency Politics: The Political Economy of Exchange Rate Policy* (Princeton University Press, 2015).
 - Chapter 2

Recommended:

- Jeffrey Frieden, “Invested Interests: The Politics of National Economic Policies in a World of Global Finance,” *International Organization* 45, (4) 1991: 425-451.
- J. Lawrence Broz and Jeffrey Frieden, “The Political Economy of International Monetary Relations,” *Annual Review of Political Science* 4, 2001: 317-343.
- William Bernhard and David Leblang, “Democratic Institutions and Exchange Rate Commitments,” *International Organization* 53, (1) 1999: 71-97.
- Beth Simmons, “International Law and State Behavior: Commitment and Compliance in International Monetary Affairs,” *American Political Science Review* 94, (4) 2000: 819-835.

Week 7: International Production: The Multinational Corporations (MNC) and Foreign Direct Investment

Thursday, October 17

- Stephen Kobrin, “Testing the Bargaining Hypothesis in the Manufacturing Sector in Developing Countries,” *International Organization* 41, (4) 1987: 609-638 (skim pages 625-638)

Recommended:

- Nathan Jensen, “Democratic Governance and Multinational Corporations: The Political Economy of Foreign Direct Investment,” *International Organization* 57, (3) 2003: 587-616.
- Tim Büthe and Helen Milner, “The Politics of Foreign Direct Investment into Developing Countries: Increasing FDI through International Trade Agreements?” *American Journal of Political Science* 52, (4) 2008: 741-62.
- Sonal Pandya, “Democratization and FDI Liberalization, 1970-2000,” *International Studies Quarterly* 58, (3) 2014: 475-488.
- Leslie Johns and Rachel Wellhausen, “Under One Roof: Supply Chains and the Protection of Foreign Investment,” *American Political Science Review* 110, (1) 2016: 31-51.

Week 8: International Development I: Economic Growth and Divergence

Thursday, October 24

- Daron Acemoglu, Simon Johnson, and James Robinson, “Institutions as a Fundamental Cause of Long-Run Growth,” in Philippe Aghion and Stephen Durlauf, eds. *Handbook of Economic Growth*, (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2005)
 - Read pages 388-428

Recommended:

- Theotonio Dos Santos, “The Structure of Dependence,” *American Economic Review* 60, (2) 1970: 231-36.
- Dani Rodrik, “Goodbye Washington Consensus, Hello Washington Confusion?” *Journal of Economic Literature* 44, (4) 2006: 973-87.
- William Easterly, *The Elusive Quest for Growth: Economists’ Adventures and Misadventures in the Tropics* (The MIT Press, 2002)
 - Chapters 2 and 3
- Jared Diamond, *Guns, Germs, and Steel: The Fates of Human Societies* (W.W. Norton & Co.,1997)
 - Chapter 4

Week 9: International Development II: State, Bureaucracy and Economic Development

Thursday, October 31

- Richard Doner, Bryan Ritchie, and Dan Slater, “Systemic Vulnerability and the Origins of Developmental States: Northeast and Southeast Asia in Comparative Perspective,” *International Organization* 59: (2) 2005: 327-361.

Recommended:

- Chalmers Johnson, “Political Institutions and Economic Performance: The Government Business Relationship in Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan,” in Frederic Deyo, ed. *The Political Economy of the New Asian Industrialism*(Cornell University Press, 1987): pp. 136-64.
- Alexander Gerschenkron, *Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective: A Book of Essays*(Harvard University Press, 1962)
 - Chapter 1
- Stephan Haggard, *Pathways from the Periphery: The Politics of Growth in the Newly Industrializing Countries* (Cornell University Press, 1990)
 - Introduction and Chapters 1-2
- Peter Evans, *Embedded Autonomy: States and Industrial Transformation* (Princeton University Press, 1995)
 - Chapter 3

Week 10: International Development III: Foreign Aid

Thursday, November 7

- William Easterly and Tobias Pfutze, “Where Does the Money Go? Best and Worst Practices in Foreign Aid,” *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 22, (2) 2008: 29-52.

Recommended:

- Joseph Wright and Matthew Winters, “The Politics of Effective Foreign Aid,” *Annual Review of Political Science* 13, 2010: 61-80.
- Alberto Alesina and David Dollar, “Who Gives Foreign Aid to Whom and Why?” *Journal of Economic Growth* 5, (1) 2000: 33-63.
- Ilyana Kuziemko and Eric Werker, “How Much is a Seat on the Security Council Worth? Foreign Aid and Bribery at the United Nations,” *Journal of Political Economy* 114, (5) 2006: 905-930.
- Michael Faye and Paul Niehaus, “Political Aid Cycles,” *American Economic Review* 102, (7) 2012: 3516-3530.

Week 11: Political Economy of Immigration

Thursday, November 14

- Gordon Hanson, “The Economic Consequences of International Migration,” *Annual Review of Economics* 1, 2009: 179-208 (skim Section 3)

Recommended:

- Layna Mosley and David Singer, “Migration, Labor, and the International Political Economy,” *Annual Review of Political Science* 18, 2015: 283-301.
- Will Moore and Stephen Shellman, “Whither Will They Go? A Global Study of Refugees’ Destinations, 1965-1995,” *International Studies Quarterly* 51, (4) 2007: 811-34.
- David Leblang, “Familiarity Breeds Investment: Diaspora Networks and International Investment,” *American Political Science Review* 104, (3) 2010: 584-600.
- Jens Hainmueller and Michael Hiscox, “Attitudes toward Highly Skilled and Low-Skilled Immigration: Evidence from a Survey Experiment,” *American Political Science Review* 104, (1) 2010: 61-84.

***** **No Meeting on November 21(Congregation)** *****

Week 12: Course Wrap-up & Review

Thursday, November 28

Assessment Rubrics

Participation (20%)

Criteria	Excellent	Proficient	Meets Minimum Standard	Below Standard
Comprehension of all the relevant concepts.	Demonstrates a deep insightful level of understanding	Demonstrates a good surface level of understanding	Demonstrates an adequate level of surface understanding	Demonstrates an inadequate level of understanding
8%	7-8 marks	5-6 marks	3-4 marks	0-2 marks
Application of concepts to the topic.	Appropriate concepts are all applied correctly, to provide in-depth analysis elaboration to all aspects of the topic	Appropriate concepts are correctly applied, to provide analysis to all important aspects of the topic	Appropriate concepts are, for the most part, correctly applied, to provide analysis to all important aspects of the topic	Concepts are not applied, or are generally applied inappropriately or incorrectly; important aspects of the topic unaddressed
8%	7-8 marks	5-6 marks	3-4 marks	0-2 marks
Presentation	Expression of ideas were consistently accurate, logical and clear	Expression of ideas were generally accurate, logical and clear. Lapses were rare and minor in nature.	Expression of ideas were generally accurate, logical and clear, but with a number of minor lapses	Ideas were not expressed logically, and were characterized by significant inaccuracies and lack of clarity
4%	4 marks	3 marks	2 marks	0-1 marks

Presentation (20%)

Category	Excellent	Fair	Below Standard
Conceptual understanding of subject matter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cover a good range of relevant concepts/ theories • Important ideas pertinent to the topic are skilfully applied 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concepts/ theories and important ideas pertinent to the topic are accurately used 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concepts/theories and important ideas pertinent to the topic are not accurately used
5%	4 marks	2-3 marks	0-1 mark
Analysis of issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thoroughly interpret and evaluate the information • Comprehensively analyse and synthesize the issues from multiple perspectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information with some interpretation/ evaluation • Basic analysis or synthesis from two perspectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List information without interpretation/evaluation • Superficially analyse or synthesize the issue • Single perspective is discussed
5%	4 marks	2-3 marks	0-1 mark
Integration of sources and evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Empirical evidence or information (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) is highly relevant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Empirical evidence or information (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) is generally relevant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Much of Information included is not relevant and inadequate to support the topic. Some information is inaccurate or unverifiable
5%	4 marks	2-3 marks	0-1 mark
Appropriate time allocation and pace	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocated time appropriately and managed time effectively • Appropriate pace 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marginally long or marginally short but uses time reasonably effectively • Reasonable pace 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significantly too short or too long and did not use time effectively • Pace is significantly • Too fast or too slow
5%	3 marks	2 marks	0-1 mark

Term Paper (30%)

Category	Excellent	Proficient	Meets Minimum Standard	Below Standard
Argument	Arguments both well supported and genuinely compared to conflicting explanations	Main arguments valid, systematic, and well supported	Some arguments valid and well supported, some not	Weak, invalid, or no argument, perhaps a simple assertion
10%	8-10 marks	5-7 marks	3-4 marks	0-2 marks
Use of data or evidence	Fully exploits the richness of the data/evidence/ideas, and is sufficiently persuasive	Feasible evidence appropriately selected and not over-interpreted	Some appropriate use of evidence but uneven	Draws on little or no evidence, mostly relies on assertions or opinions, or evidence not clearly presented
10%	8-10 marks	5-7 marks	3-4 marks	0-2 marks
Organization and writing	Structure enhances the argument, strong sections and seamless flow. Virtually no English error.	Structure supports the argument, clearly ordered sections fit together well. Some minor English errors.	Structure is of inconsistent quality, may have redundancies or disconnections. Frequent English errors.	Needs significant reorganization. English errors significantly impair readability.
10%	8-10 marks	5-7 marks	3-4 marks	0-2 marks

Exam (30%)

Criteria	Excellent	Proficient	Meets Minimum Standard	Below Standard
Comprehension of all the relevant aspects about the question	Demonstrates a deep insightful level of understanding	Demonstrates a good surface level of understanding	Demonstrates an adequate level of surface understanding	Demonstrates an inadequate level of understanding
9%	7-9 marks	4-6 marks	2-3 marks	0-1 mark
Application of concepts to the problem posed	Appropriate concepts are all applied correctly	Appropriate concepts are correctly applied	Some concepts are applied at too general a level or misapplied but the central ones are applied correctly and specifically	Most concepts are applied at too general a level or misapplied
9%	7-9 marks	4-6 marks	2-3 marks	0-1 mark
Extent to which ideas are expressed logically, accurately and clearly	Expression of ideas were consistently accurate, logical and clear	Expression of ideas is generally accurate, logical and clear with some minor lapses	Expression of ideas is comprehensible but there are some major lapses	Largely incomprehensible with some major inconsistencies and errors
6%	6 marks	4-5 marks	2-3 marks	0-1 mark
Quality of English	English is consistently excellent	English is proficient with no major errors	English conveys the essential meaning but contains a number of errors	English is below acceptable university standard
6%	6 marks	4-5 marks	2-3 marks	0-1 mark

Final Overall Grade

Mark Ranges	Grade	Standard
85 -100	A	}Excellent
80-84	A-	}
75-79	B+	}
70-74	B	}Good
65-69	B-	}
60-64	C+	}
55-59	C	}Fair
50-54	C-	}
45-49	D+	}Pass
40-44	D	}
0-39	F	Failure