

## Course Information

Course Number:	INTA 689
Course Title:	Culture and International Relations
Section:	650
Time:	Thursdays, 6:30-9:10pm
Location:	1620 L St, NW, Suite 700 Washington DC
Credit Hours:	3.0

## Instructor Details

Instructor:	Professor Kateryna Shynkaruk
Office:	1620 L Street NW, Washington, DC
Phone:	202-773-0012 (Office)
E-Mail:	kshynkaruk@tamu.edu
Office Hours:	By appointment, virtual or in-person

## Course Description

This course offers an interdisciplinary view on the role of culture as socially shared ideas and meanings in international relations. In line with the constructivist paradigm in International Relations (IR), this course unpacks the explanatory value-added of the notions of culture and identity for a better understanding of international politics, foreign policymaking, and diplomacy.

We will explore three areas of intersection between the constructivist reading of ideas and International Relations (IR): 1) the role of culture in shaping international structures and actors, their dispositions towards cooperation or conflict, and their change through the socialization of new norms; 2) how the interplay of social psychology and constructivist studies in IR help unpack the notions of Self and Other and the main factors that shape motives and behavior of the international actors; 3) how culture and psychology are applied in cognitive foreign policy analysis and intercultural communication studies and their relevance to foreign policy practitioners and diplomats.

Students will be able to hone their analytical, writing, and presentation skills; develop a multidisciplinary approach to the analysis of the problems discussed, and develop the skills of theorizing, formulating hypotheses, and justifying their views about the course topics. The practical coursework will be based on interactive learning techniques and will comprise individual and group presentations, and written assignments.

By the end of the course, students will have a better understanding of how ideas, culture, and identity shape international behavior and relationships between states. They will be able to analyze international politics through constructivist lenses and apply in practice foreign policy analysis and intercultural communication methodologies.

## Course Prerequisites

Graduate Classification

## Course Learning Outcomes

By completing this course, students will be able to:

- Understand academic and policy debates on the role of ideas and culture in international politics;
- Comprehend the culture and identity perspectives on key issues of international relations;
- Demonstrate working knowledge of research methodologies applicable to this area;
- Apply the culture perspective for explaining empirical cases in the international relations;
- Demonstrate effective analytical, writing and presentation skills.

## Grading Policy

Grades are based on participation and attendance (10%), three in-class presentations (60%, each worth 20%), final research paper (30%).

The following scale will be used for calculating final grades for this course:

- 90-100 A;
- 80-89 B;
- 70-79 C;
- 60-69 D;
- 0-59 F.

*Grades will be determined based on the following:*

### **Participation and Attendance (10%)**

All students are expected to attend each class, and to participate actively in the discussion of the assigned reading materials.

### **In-class presentations (60%)**

Two- or three-person teams will each give a presentation (each member brief for 10 minutes) discussing a specific case study related to that week's topic, beginning week #4. The professor will assign a topic two weeks in advance of each team's presentation. This briefing will count for 20%. Each student will have an opportunity to give three 10 minutes presentations, individually or in teams.

### **Final Research Paper (30%)**

Students will write a 20-page research paper to explore an empirical case of their choice related to the themes of the course. The specific topics for the paper will be discussed with students individually to meet their research and policy interests. The professor will work closely with students to help formulate the research question and suitable analytical framework, as well as academic and policy literature.

## Late Work Policy

- Late submission of the written assignment will be penalized by 5 points per day (based on 100-point grading scale) following the deadline.
- In exceptional cases qualifying for excused absences, an assignment deadline may be changed upon prior arrangement with the professor.

Work submitted by a student as makeup work for an excused absence is not considered late work and is exempted from the late work policy ([Student Rule 7](#)).

## Course Schedule

Please note that all readings are subject to change that will be communicated to students in advance.

### **Week 01: Introduction. Role of Ideas in IR: Ontology, Epistemology, and Social Theory**

- Adler E. Seizing the Middle Ground : Constructivism in World Politics. *European Journal of International Relations*. 1997. Vol. 3, № 3. P. 319–363.
- Hopf, T. The Promise of Constructivism in IR Theory, *International Security*, 23/1 (1998): P. 171-200.
- Wendt A. Four Sociologies of International Politics. In: *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2003. P. 1-44.
- Fearon J. Rationalism v. Constructivism : A Skeptical View In *Handbook of International Relations* [edited by W. Carlsnaes, T. Risse, B. A. Simmons]. London : Sage Publications, 2006. P. 52–72.
- Wendt A. “Ideas all the way down?": on the constitution of power and interest. In: *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2003. P. 92-139.

### **Week 02: Role of Ideas in IR. Agent – Structure Problem and Its Constructivist Reading**

- Wendt A. Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics. *International Organization*, 1992. Vol. 46(3). P. 391-425.
- Wendt A. The Agent-Structure Problem in International Relations Theory. *International Organization*, 1987. Vol. 41, No. 3. P. 335-370.
- Carlsnaes W. The Agency-Structure Problem in Foreign Policy Analysis. *International Studies Quarterly*, 1992. 36: 245-270.
- Wendt A. The state and the problem of corporate agency. In: *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2003. P. 224 – 246.
- J. David Singer, “The Level-of-Analysis Problem in International Relations,” *World Politics*, Vol. 14, No. 1 (1961): 77-92.
- Gourevitch P. “The Second Image Reversed: The International Sources of Domestic Politics,” *International Organization*, Vol. 32, No. 4 (1978): 881-912.
- Robert Putnam, “Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-level Games,” *International Organization*, Vol. 42, No.3, (1988): 424-460.

**Week 03: Culture in World Politics: Social Structures, Norms, and Values**

- Hedley Bull, "Society and Anarchy in International Relations," in Herbert Butterfield and Martin Wright, editors, *Diplomatic Investigations: Essays in the Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968. P. 35-50.
- Y. Lapid Y., F. Kratochwil F. (eds.) *The Return of Culture and Identity in IR Theory*. Lynne Rienner, 1996. Chapters 1,2, 11.
- Johnston A.I. "Treating International Institutions as Social Environments," *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 45, No. 4 (2001): 487-515.
- Lebow, R. N. *A cultural theory of international relations*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2008. P. 43 -121.
- Reus-Smit, C. *On Cultural Diversity: International Theory in a World of Difference*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018. P. 16–49.
- Tannenwald N. "The Nuclear Taboo: The United States and the Normative Basis of Nuclear Non-Use," *International Organization*, Vol. 53, No. 3 (1999): 433-468.

**Week 04: Culture in World Politics: Cooperation and Conflict**

- Wendt A. *Three cultures of anarchy*. In: *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. P. 246-313.
- Kinnvall, C. and J. Mitzen, 'Anxiety, fear, and ontological security in world politics: thinking with and beyond Giddens', *International Theory* 12/2 (2020): 240-256.
- Jack Snyder, "Anarchy and Culture: Insights from the Anthropology of War," *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 56, No. 1 (2002): 7-45.
- Katzenstein, P. J. (ed): *The Culture of National Security*. Columbia University Press, 1996. Chapters 2, 4, 8, 12.
- Emanuel Adler M., Barnett M. (ed): *Security Communities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. Chapters 1-3, 5, 12.
- Lebow, R. N. *A cultural theory of international relations*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2008. P. 122 -164.
- Adler-Nissen, R. *Stigma Management in International Relations: Transgressive Identities, Norms, and Order in International Society*. *International Organization*, 68, No. 1 (2014): 143-176.

**Week 05: Self and Other: Identity, Trust and Recognition in International Relations I**

- Neumann, I. B. 'Self and Other in International Relations', *European Journal of International Relations* 2/2 (1996): 139-174.
- Tajfel H., Turner J. C. *The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behaviours*. In *Psychology of Intergroup Relations* edited by Worchel S., Austin L. W. Monterrey, CA : Brooks-Cole, 1986. P. 7–24.
- Fearon J. D. *What is Identity (as We Now Use the Word)?* Stanford : Mimeo, Stanford University, November 1999. 43 p.
- Mercer J. *Anarchy and identity*. *International Organization*, 49/2 (1995): 229-252.
- Zehfuss, M. 'Constructivism and identity: A dangerous liaison', *European Journal of International Relations* 7/3 (2000): 315-348.

- Neumann, I. B. *Uses of the Other: 'The East' in European Identity Formation*. University of Minneapolis Press, 1999. Chapters 1-3.
- Oelsner A. Friendship, Mutual Trust and the Evolution of Regional Peace in the International System, *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 10/2 (2007): 257-279.

### **Week 06: Self and Other: Identity, Trust and Recognition in International Relations II**

- Honneth, A. *Struggle for Recognition: The Moral Grammar of Social Conflicts*. Polity, 1996. Chapters 3-5, 8.
- Ringmar E. *The Recognition Game: Soviet Russia Against the West*. *Cooperation & Conflict*. 2002. Vol. 37, № 2. P. 115–136.
- Fukuyama F. *Identity: The Demand for Dignity and the Politics of Resentment*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2018. 240 p.
- Lindemann, T. and E. Ringmar (eds) *The International Politics of Recognition*. Routledge, 2014. Chapters 1-4, 8, 11.
- Greenhill B. *Recognition and Collective Identity Formation in International Politics*. *European Journal of International Relations*. 2008. Vol. 14, № 2. P. 343–368.
- Special Issue on 'Misrecognition in World Politics: Revisiting Hegel', *Review of International Studies*, 44/5 (2018): 787-943.

### **Week 07: Identity Operationalization: Case Studies.**

- Fearon J. Rationalism v. Constructivism : A Skeptical View. In *Handbook of International Relations* [edited by W. Carlsnaes, T. Risse, B. A. Simmons]. London : Sage Publications, 2006. P. 52–72.
- Sending O. Constitution, choice and change: problems with the 'logic of appropriateness' and its use in constructivist theory // *European Journal of International Relations*. 2002. №8. P. 443-70.
- Müller H. Arguing, bargaining and all that: Communicative action, rationalist theory and the logic of appropriateness in international relations. *European Journal of International Relations*. 2004. №10. P. 395-43.
- Cederman, L.-E. and C. Daase, 'Endogeneizing Corporate Identities: The Next Step in Constructivist IR Theory', *European Journal of International Relations*, 9/1 (2003): 5-35.
- Molchanov M. A. *Regional Embedding in Social Identity Construction: Post-Soviet "Four" and the European Union*. Paper prepared for the 46th Annual ISA Convention. Honolulu, Hawaii, March 2005. 22 p.
- Hopf T. 'Identity, legitimacy, and the use of military force: Russia's great power identities and military intervention in Abkhazia' *Review of International Studies* 31 (2005): 225–43.

### **Week 08: Cultural Change and Socialization in International Relations: Case Studies**

- Alderson K. *Making Sense of State Socialization* // *Review of International Relations*. 2001. Vol. 27, № 3. P. 415–433.
- Finnemore M., Sikkink K. *International Norm Dynamics and Political Change*. *International Organization*. 1998. Vol. 52, № 4. P. 887–917.

- Manners I. Normative Power Europe : A Contradiction in Terms? *Journal of Common Market Studies*. 2002. Vol. 40, № 2. P. 235–258.
- Flockhart T. ‘Complex Socialization’ : A Framework for the Study of State Socialization. *European Journal of International Relations*. 2006. Vol. 12, № 1. P. 89–118.
- Sasse G. The ENP Process and the EU’s Eastern Neighbours : ‘Conditionality-lite’, Socialisation and ‘Procedural Entrapment’. *Global Europe Papers 2008/9*. University of Bath, 2008. 25 p.

#### **Week 09: Culture in Foreign and Security Policy I**

- Jepperson R. L. Norms, Identity and Culture in National Security. In R. L. Jepperson. A. Wendt, P. J. Katzenstein. *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics* [edited by P. J. Katzenstein]. New York: Columbia University Press, 1996. P. 33–78.
- Stein, J. G. “Foreign Policy Decision Making: Rational, Psychological, and Neurological Models.” In *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases*, edited by Steve Smith, Tim Dunne, and Amelia Hadfield. Oxford University Press, 2016. P. 187-203.
- Kinnvall C., Manners I., Mitzen J. Introduction to 2018 special issue of *European Security*: “ontological (in)security in the European Union”. *European Security*. 2018. Vol. 27, № 3. P. 249-265.
- Williams, M. C. ‘Identity and the Politics of Security’ *European Journal of International Relations* 4/2 (1998): 204-225.
- Adler, E. ‘Imagined (Security) Communities: Cognitive Regions in International Relations’, *Millennium*, 26/2 (1997): 249-77.

#### **Week 10: Culture in Foreign and Security Policy II**

- Campbell D. *Writing Security. United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*. Minneapolis, MN : Minnesota University Press, 1992. Chapters 3-4, 6-7.
- Waever O. Identity, Communities and Foreign Policy. *Discourse Analysis as Foreign Policy Theory*. In *European Integration and National Identity: the Challenge of the Nordic States* [edited by L. Hansen, O. Waever]. London, New York: Routledge, 2002. P. 20–49.
- Hopf T. Identities, Institutions, Information, and Interests: Moscow’s Foreign Policy, 1945-2000. In: *Cambridge History of Russia* [edited by R. G. Suny]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. Volume 3. P. 662–705.
- McSweeney B. *Security, Identity and Interests: A Sociology of International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. Chapters 7, 9-11.
- Wick S. Capabilities, Cooperation and Culture: Mapping American Ambivalence Toward China. *Foreign Policy Analysis* 10/3 (2014): 289-309.

#### **Week 11: Culture, Psychology and Foreign Policy Analysis I**

- Mercer J. Rationality and Psychology in International Politics. *International Organization*, 59/1 (2005): 77–106.
- Thies C. G. International Socialization Processes v. Israeli National Role Conceptions: Can Role Theory Integrate IR Theory and Foreign Policy Analysis? *Foreign Policy Analysis* 8/1 (2012): 25-46.

- Barnett, M. 'Culture, Strategy and Foreign Policy Change: Israel's Road to Oslo', *European Journal of International Relations* 5/1 (1999): 5-36.
- Berger, T. U. 'Norms, Identity and National Security in Germany and Japan', in Katzenstein (ed.) *The Culture of National Security* (Columbia University Press, 1996): 317-356.
- Nau, H. *At home abroad: identity and power in American foreign policy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002. Chapters 3, 5, 7-8.
- Ward, S. M. 'Lost in Translation: Social Identity Theory and the Study of Status in World Politics', *International Studies Quarterly* 61 (2017): 821-834.
- Weldes, J. *Constructing National Interests: The United States and the Cuban Missiles Crisis*. University of Minnesota Press, 1999. Chapters 3, 6-7.
- Malici A. *Germans as Venetians: The Culture of German Foreign Policy Behavior*. *Foreign Policy Analysis* 2 (2006): 37-62.

### **Week 12: Culture and Psychology in Foreign Policy Analysis II**

- Houghton, D. P. *Reinvigorating the Study of Foreign Policy Decision Making: Toward a Constructivist Approach*. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 3/1 (2007): 24-45.
- Flanik, W. "Bringing FPA Back Home:" *Cognition, Constructivism, and Conceptual Metaphor*. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 7/4 (2011): 423-446
- Doty, Roxanne Lynn. *Foreign Policy as Social Construction: a Post-Positivist Analysis of U.S. Counterinsurgency Policy in the Philippines*. *International Studies Quarterly* 37/3 (1993): 297-320.
- Foster, D.M., Keller W.J. *Leaders' Cognitive Complexity, Distrust, and the Diversionary Use of Force*. *Foreign Policy Analysis* 10/3 (2014): 205-223.
- Subotić J. *Narrative, Ontological Security, and Foreign Policy Change*. *Foreign Policy Analysis* 12/4 (2016): 610-627.
- Hansel M., Oppermann K. *Counterfactual Reasoning in Foreign Policy Analysis: The Case of German Nonparticipation in the Libya Intervention of 2011*. *Foreign Policy Analysis* 12/2 (2016): 109-127.

### **Week 13: Intercultural Communication and Diplomacy I**

- Bennett M.J. (ed.) *Basic concepts of intercultural communication*. Yarmouth, ME.: Intercultural Press, 1998. Chapters 1, 5, 8-10.
- Bennett, M. *Constructivist approach to intercultural communication* in Kim, Y. (Ed). *International Encyclopedia of Intercultural Communication*. Wiley, 2017.
- Holliday A.R. *Intercultural communication and ideology*. London: Sage, 2011. Chapters 1, 4, 6, 9.
- Holliday A.R., Hyde M., Kullman J. *Intercultural communication: An advanced resource book*. 4th Edition. London, Routledge., 2021. P. 59 - 80; 123 -130.

### **Week 14: Intercultural Communication and Diplomacy II**

- Landis, D., Bennett, J.M. and Bennett, M.J. (eds.) *Handbook of intercultural training*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition. London: Sage, 2004. Chapters 6-9.

- Samovar L.A., Richard E. Porter R.E., McDaniel E.R. (eds.) *Communication Between Cultures*, 8<sup>th</sup> Edition., Wadsworth, Cengage Learning, 2013. Chapters 1-2, 6.
- Samovar L.A., Richard E. Porter R.E., McDaniel E.R. (eds.) *Intercultural Communication: A Reader*, 14<sup>th</sup> Edition. Wadsworth, Cengage Learning, 2015. Chapters 3-4, 7-9.
- Meyer E. *The Culture Map*. PublicAffairs, 2016. Chapter 1.

## University Policies

### Attendance Policy

The university views class attendance and participation as an individual student responsibility. Students are expected to attend class and to complete all assignments.

Please refer to [Student Rule 7](#) in its entirety for information about excused absences, including definitions, and related documentation and timelines.

### Makeup Work Policy

Students will be excused from attending class on the day of a graded activity or when attendance contributes to a student's grade, for the reasons stated in Student Rule 7, or other reason deemed appropriate by the instructor.

Please refer to [Student Rule 7](#) in its entirety for information about makeup work, including definitions, and related documentation and timelines.

Absences related to Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 may necessitate a period of more than 30 days for make-up work, and the timeframe for make-up work should be agreed upon by the student and instructor" ([Student Rule 7, Section 7.4.1](#)).

"The instructor is under no obligation to provide an opportunity for the student to make up work missed because of an unexcused absence" ([Student Rule 7, Section 7.4.2](#)).

Students who request an excused absence are expected to uphold the Aggie Honor Code and Student Conduct Code. (See [Student Rule 24](#).)

### Academic Integrity Statement and Policy

"An Aggie does not lie, cheat or steal, or tolerate those who do."

"Texas A&M University students are responsible for authenticating all work submitted to an instructor. If asked, students must be able to produce proof that the item submitted is indeed the work of that student. Students must keep appropriate records at all times. The inability to authenticate one's work, should the instructor request it, may be sufficient grounds to initiate an academic misconduct case" ([Section 20.1.2.3, Student Rule 20](#)).



You can learn more about the Aggie Honor System Office Rules and Procedures, academic integrity, and your rights and responsibilities at [aggiehonor.tamu.edu](http://aggiehonor.tamu.edu).

## Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Policy

Texas A&M University is committed to providing equitable access to learning opportunities for all students. If you experience barriers to your education due to a disability or think you may have a disability, please contact the Disability Resources office in the Student Services Building or at (979) 845-1637 or visit [disability.tamu.edu](http://disability.tamu.edu).

Disabilities may include, but are not limited to attentional, learning, mental health, sensory, physical, or chronic health conditions. All students are encouraged to discuss their disability related needs with Disability Resources and their instructors as soon as possible.

Disability Resources is located in the Student Services Building or at (979) 845-1637 or visit [disability.tamu.edu](http://disability.tamu.edu).

Disability Resources is located in the Student Services Building or at (979) 845-1637 or visit [disability.tamu.edu](http://disability.tamu.edu).

## Title IX and Statement on Limits to Confidentiality

Texas A&M University is committed to fostering a learning environment that is safe and productive for all. University policies and federal and state laws prohibit gender-based discrimination and sexual harassment, including sexual assault, sexual exploitation, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking.

With the exception of some medical and mental health providers, all university employees (including full and part-time faculty, staff, paid graduate assistants, student workers, etc.) are Mandatory Reporters and must report to the Title IX Office if the employee experiences, observes, or becomes aware of an incident that meets the following conditions (see [University Rule 08.01.01.M1](#)):

- The incident is reasonably believed to be discrimination or harassment.
- The incident is alleged to have been committed by or against a person who, at the time of the incident, was (1) a student enrolled at the University or (2) an employee of the University.

Mandatory Reporters must file a report regardless of how the information comes to their attention – including but not limited to face-to-face conversations, a written class assignment or paper, class discussion, email, text, or social media post. Although Mandatory Reporters must file a report, in most instances, a person who is subjected to the alleged conduct will be able to control how the report is handled, including whether or not to pursue a formal investigation. The University's goal is to make sure you are aware of the range of options available to you and to ensure access to the resources you need.

Students wishing to discuss concerns in a confidential setting are encouraged to make an appointment with [Counseling and Psychological Services](#) (CAPS).

Students can learn more about filing a report, accessing supportive resources, and navigating the Title IX investigation and resolution process on the University's [Title IX webpage](#).

## Statement on Mental Health and Wellness

Texas A&M University recognizes that mental health and wellness are critical factors that influence a student's academic success and overall wellbeing. Students are encouraged to engage in healthy self-care by utilizing available resources and services on your campus

Students who need someone to talk to can contact Counseling & Psychological Services (CAPS) or call the TAMU Helpline (979-845-2700) from 4:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m. weekdays and 24 hours on weekends. 24-hour emergency help is also available through the National Suicide Prevention Hotline (800-273-8255) or at [suicidepreventionlifeline.org](http://suicidepreventionlifeline.org).

## College and Department Policies

The Bush School of Government and Public Service supports the Texas A&M University commitment to diversity, and welcomes individuals of all ages, backgrounds, citizenships, disabilities, ethnicities, family statuses, genders, gender identities, geographical locations, languages, military experiences, political views, races, religions, sexual orientations, socioeconomic statuses, and/or work experiences (see <http://diversity.tamu.edu/>). Accordingly, all of us in this class are expected to respect the different experiences, beliefs, and values expressed by others, and to engage in reasoned discussions that refrain from derogatory comments or dehumanizing language about other people, cultures, groups, or viewpoints.

Intellectual argument and disagreement are a fundamental element of both the academic world and the policy process. Disagreement does not, in and of itself, mean disrespect. However, the way that disagreement is expressed can be disrespectful. Unprofessional, insensitive, or disrespectful behaviors (such as using dehumanizing, derogatory, or coarse language; dismissing ideas based on the characteristics of the speaker/writer; or expressing threat or intent to harm, even if framed "as a joke") are inconsistent with the Bush School's commitment to diversity and will not be tolerated by faculty or students participating in this class. This applies both inside and outside of the classroom and includes electronic venues such as GroupMe.